

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 0027	K 4002	Kingsbridge												<p>The sewage capacity treatment works serving Kingsbridge is unlikely to have adequate spare capacity to accommodate the proposed growth in the period to 2016.</p> <p>Site K6 does not however have access to public drainage facilities and has public water mains located within it which would require diversion.</p> <p>In order to establish level of growth which could be accommodated, it would be necessary for an evaluation to be undertaken which would need to be funded by the developer.</p> <p>Whilst SWW would endeavour to meet the demand beyond 2015 being our next investment period, the timing of any improvements that may be required to meet the demand will be subject to approval of our future business plans by OFWAT.</p> <p>Investigations to establish available capacity within the localised public sewerage networks are likely to be necessary as there are existing capacity issues which would need to be developer funded as would any resultant improvements deemed necessary.</p> <p>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>			
SA 0040	K 4003	Kingsbridge	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>				

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 0050	K 4004	Kingsbridge					✓		✓	✓	✓		<p>Sorley Cross has a very bad accident record. The creation of a business park with housing will increase the incidence of accidents with more traffic movements. More traffic flow through Churchstow which already has problems with speeding. Queries whether the AONB should be ignored in the creation of jobs as the site would occupy a prominent location. The caravan park adjacent would be affected by trade and tourism into the area. More noise pollution would occur in the area. Considers that the site isn't large enough to sustain the development should it proceed and need to expand in the future. There are already 5 empty units at Churchstow Business Park. One unit at Orchard Ind Est has been vacant for 3 years. Queries why there is housing in an industrial area. Questions why Churchstow Parish Council were not consulted at the beginning of the process.</p>	Consider the decision to create a housing and business park at Sorley is totally unsound.	Yes	
SA 0110	K 4008	Kingsbridge		K1		✓			✓	✓	✓		<p>Owners acknowledge the need to meet the strategic requirements in the Core Strategy and that there are no easy options given the complex topography of the town. The evidence base has pointed to the need for a strategy of growth to the west, in conjunction with optimising the use of previously developed land within the town centre.</p> <p>The owners of the site are therefore cooperating with SHDC to investigate the feasibility and suitability of proposed development at K1 and K5 and are supportive in principle of the proposals, subject to some points of detail which will require clarification or amendment in the adopted DPD. There is no intention to progress a planning application in advance of the adopted Site Allocations DPD</p>	<p>Although the DPD should not seek to provide full details about the form of development for each site, it would be desirable to indicate (inter alia) how road access to the development sites will be provided and how specific infrastructure proposals will be achieved.</p> <p>It is clear that the primary access for K1 will need to be via Trebble Park. The north east boundary of K1 should be contiguous with the public highway and the boundary of the surgery's car park, rather than follow the hedgerow, as currently shown.</p>	Yes	
SA 0110	K 4009	Kingsbridge		K1		✓			✓	✓	✓		<p>Owners acknowledge the need to meet the strategic requirements in the Core Strategy and that there are no easy options given the complex topography of the town. The evidence base has pointed to the need for a strategy of growth to the west, in conjunction with optimising the use of previously developed land within the town centre.</p> <p>The owners of the site are therefore cooperating with SHDC to investigate the feasibility and suitability of proposed development at K1 and K5 and are supportive in principle of the proposals, subject to some points of detail which will require clarification or amendment in the adopted DPD. There is no intention to progress a planning application in advance of the adopted Site Allocations DPD</p>	<p>Although the DPD should not seek to provide full details about the form of development for each site, it would be desirable to indicate (inter alia) how road access to the development sites will be provided and how specific infrastructure proposals will be achieved.</p> <p>It would be helpful to clarify whether it is one of the aims of K1 to seek to retain as allotments as much as possible of the allotment land that currently occupies the filled cutting of the former railway land.</p>	Yes	

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 0110	K 4010	Kingsbridge		K1		✓		✓		✓	✓		<p>Owners acknowledge the need to meet the strategic requirements in the Core Strategy and that there are no easy options given the complex topography of the town. The evidence base has pointed to the need for a strategy of growth to the west, in conjunction with optimising the use of previously developed land within the town centre.</p> <p>The owners of the site are therefore cooperating with SHDC to investigate the feasibility and suitability of proposed development at K1 and K5 and are supportive in principle of the proposals, subject to some points of detail which will require clarification or amendment in the adopted DPD. There is no intention to progress a planning application in advance of the adopted Site Allocations DPD</p>	<p>Although the DPD should not seek to provide full details about the form of development for each site, it would be desirable to indicate (inter alia) how road access to the development sites will be provided and how specific infrastructure proposals will be achieved.</p> <p>The proposal to use the site of the former railway line as a footpath and cycle way would conflict with retaining all or some of the allotments. The feasibility of providing a continuous footpath and cycle way around the western edge of the town cannot be resolved by the planning of individual sites. The DPD and Infrastructure Delivery Plan should provide more information about the justification for this proposal, its feasibility and deliverability; including its intended role, expected levels of use and how implementation would be funded.</p>	Yes	
SA 0110	K 4011	Kingsbridge		K5		✓		✓		✓	✓		<p>Owners acknowledge the need to meet the strategic requirements in the Core Strategy and that there are no easy options given the complex topography of the town. The evidence base has pointed to the need for a strategy of growth to the west, in conjunction with optimising the use of previously developed land within the town centre.</p> <p>The owners of the site are therefore cooperating with SHDC to investigate the feasibility and suitability of proposed development at K1 and K5 and are supportive in principle of the proposals, subject to some points of detail which will require clarification or amendment in the adopted DPD. There is no intention to progress a planning application in advance of the adopted Site Allocations DPD</p>	<p>In relation to K5, where the use of the former railway line for a footpath/cycleway is proposed, the sharp change in levels between the Station Yard Industrial Estate and site K5, and the relationship with the hedgerow/tree belt along the former railway cutting need to be considered. It is not clear how the proposed route could be provided in conjunction with the development of site K5.</p>	Yes	

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 0110	K 4012	Kingsbridge		K5		✓			✓	✓			<p>Owners acknowledge the need to meet the strategic requirements in the Core Strategy and that there are no easy options given the complex topography of the town. The evidence base has pointed to the need for a strategy of growth to the west, in conjunction with optimising the use of previously developed land within the town centre.</p> <p>The owners of the site are therefore cooperating with SHDC to investigate the feasibility and suitability of proposed development at K1 and K5 and are supportive in principle of the proposals, subject to some points of detail which will require clarification or amendment in the adopted DPD. There is no intention to progress a planning application in advance of the adopted Site Allocations DPD</p>	<p>Site K5 is bisected by Norden Lane, which also marks a change in levels, lined by steep Devon banks. The topography of this site and the character of Norden Lane suggest that it may be better considered as two sites with employment land adjoining Station Yard and housing west of Norden Lane.</p>	Yes	
SA 0110	K 4013	Kingsbridge		K5		✓			✓	✓			<p>Owners acknowledge the need to meet the strategic requirements in the Core Strategy and that there are no easy options given the complex topography of the town. The evidence base has pointed to the need for a strategy of growth to the west, in conjunction with optimising the use of previously developed land within the town centre.</p> <p>The owners of the site are therefore cooperating with SHDC to investigate the feasibility and suitability of proposed development at K1 and K5 and are supportive in principle of the proposals, subject to some points of detail which will require clarification or amendment in the adopted DPD. There is no intention to progress a planning application in advance of the adopted Site Allocations DPD</p>	<p>Appears to be space for a junction at West Alvington Hill with satisfactory sight lines, east of Norden Lane. Positioning a road junction at Norden Lane is more problematic and is unlikely to be possible in K5. A road junction will probably need to be opposite Balkwill Road where there is a gap in the roadside bank and minimum difference in levels between site and road. The site will therefore need to be extended</p>		
SA 0110	K 4014	Kingsbridge		K5		✓			✓	✓			<p>Owners acknowledge the need to meet the strategic requirements in the Core Strategy and that there are no easy options given the complex topography of the town. The evidence base has pointed to the need for a strategy of growth to the west, in conjunction with optimising the use of previously developed land within the town centre.</p> <p>The owners of the site are therefore cooperating with SHDC to investigate the feasibility and suitability of proposed development at K1 and K5 and are supportive in principle of the proposals, subject to some points of detail which will require clarification or amendment in the adopted DPD. There is no intention to progress a planning application in advance of the adopted Site Allocations DPD</p>	<p>West of K5 is a much better location for a sports pitch, in terms of location and topography. This location is understood to have been identified in the past as being suitable, and is in the ownership of SHDC. It is flatter than land adjacent to K1, could be accessed from the A381, West Alvington Hill, via K5 and is conveniently located for joint use in conjunction with Kingsbridge Community College, including shared use of changing facilities and joint management of playing surfaces.</p>	Yes	

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	K 4026	Kingsbridge											<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>Whilst Kingsbridge is located south of the A38, would still expect the DPD to consider the likely impact of additional major development on the SRN.</p> <p>Recommend that additional development be focused in central and sustainable locations which can be accessed by a wide range of transport modes, including public transport walking and cycling.</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	K 4027	Kingsbridge	5.3										The vision for Kingsbridge is supported, particularly reference to the focus of the regeneration within the town centre.			
SA 0139	K 4028	Kingsbridge	5.6										Objectives identified for Kingsbridge are also supported, particularly objective KO3 which seeks to ensure that development is located to minimise the need to travel and optimises choices between travel modes.			
SA 0139	K 4029	Kingsbridge		K1									<p>Whilst preferring future development to have come forward on brownfield sites, it is acknowledged that this site is one of the best options for growth to be accommodated in terms of availability and sustainability.</p> <p>Would welcome the opportunity to comment on the masterplan and reserve further comment until the necessary transport evidence is available.</p>			
SA 0139	K 4030	Kingsbridge		K2									There is no objection in principle to the redevelopment of central brownfield land.			
SA 0139	K 4031	Kingsbridge		K3									There is no objection in principle to the redevelopment of central brownfield land.			
SA 0139	K 4032	Kingsbridge		K4									There is no objection in principle to the redevelopment of central brownfield land.			
SA 0139	K 4033	Kingsbridge		K5									There is no objection in principle to the redevelopment of central brownfield land.			
SA 0139	K 4034	Kingsbridge		K6									Encouraged that the supporting text requires the provision of a Travel Plan and improved pedestrian and cycle links dues to the sites' detached location from the central area.			

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	K 4035	Kingsbridge		K7									There is no objection in principle to the redevelopment of the Avon Centre.			
SA 0164	K 4123	Kingsbridge											No site specific comments.			
SA 0216	K 4042	Kingsbridge											Kingsbridge Community College withdraw previous objection to Site 9 STA April 2010, although concerns about safeguarding safety of students remain.			
SA 0235	K 4044	Kingsbridge		K6									Objection form Woodleigh Parish Council. Impact on South Devon AONB and designation precludes development (1983 planning refusal?). Very visible in local landscape due to topography. Increased traffic, including on A381 at Sorley accident 'black spot'. Evidence of demand due to current economic climate?			
SA 0245	K 4064	Kingsbridge	2.4			✓			✓	✓			Local people not properly involved in EbD workshops which were mainly attended by SHDC/ DCC Officers.			
SA 0245	K 4065	Kingsbridge	5.3			✓			✓	✓	✓		Vision diagram simplistic and does not add to text, is not deliverable without specific objectives especially relating to economic infrastructure, protection of estuary and quayside and affordable housing.			
SA 0271	K 4050	Kingsbridge											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.			
SA 0271	K 4051	Kingsbridge		K6									AONBs have been confirmed by the Government as having the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. Consequently, development in the AONB should consider the objectives of the AONB management plan and the conservation of the natural beauty of the landscape and countryside should be given 'great weight in planning policies and development control, PPS 7 section 21'. The proposal at Leigh Cross is identified as having a negative impact on the AONB. It is a prominent site that can be seen from many locations in the AONB. There are almost certainly other sites better suited for industrial development.			

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 0294	K 4052	Kingsbridge											Kingsbridge Town Council strongly supports the published Kingsbridge DPD and considers it to be legally compliant, sound in accordance with planning policies and does not suggest any change. In particular the Town Council is very supportive of the proposal for employment at Leigh Cross (K6) as it is considered that this proposal is essential in order to encourage current employers to relocate thereby 'unlocking' brownfield sites in the town.			
SA 0686	K 4066	Kingsbridge		K4		✓		✓					Landowners support inclusion of land in their ownership (significant amount of land identified as K4) for following reasons: Area Centre with range of facilities, use of brownfield land, currently under utilised employment land with potential for development near town centre, mostly within development boundary			
SA 0687	K 4102	Kingsbridge		K6									NFU support tenant farmer, good agricultural land, impact on viability of farm, proximity of fields to Higher Leigh Farm of particular importance as dairy unit within farm buildings.			
SA 0693	K 4105	Kingsbridge	6.27-6.29	K6					✓	✓		✓	AONB office welcomes provision of well located employment to foster social and economic well being of area and recognises difficulty of finding suitable sites. However, proposed site on elevated open exposed plateau top highly visible within different local and wider landscapes, unrelated to topographical feature, unrelated and remote to any settlement. Would cause further weakening of landscape character already affected by factors such as road improvements. Strategic landscaping would not overcome disadvantages of site. Proposal inconsistent with AONB policy in PPS7 para 21; conflicts with Devon Structure Plan CO3, draft Regional Spatial Strategy ENV3 and SHDC DP DPD DP1; not justified as insufficient consideration of alternative sites.	Not considered possible to resolve conflicts by modifying proposal. Identify alternative site which avoids identified policy conflicts e.g. Churchstow.	Yes	

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 0719	K 4106	Kingsbridge		K1		✓		✓	✓			✓	Unsound to allocate K1 ahead of other suitable greenfields sites on edge of Kingsbridge. Consider SHDC have assumed K1 to be the better site without justification being provided as factual evidence about issues such as accessibility, service linkages and landscape impact. Reasonable alternatives have not been properly explored. Sequential test in PPS25 not applied.	<p>Include Woodhouse Farm - West of Westville Road (K9 - STA matrix). It's characteristics include: 2.8 hectares: site lies towards bottom of a slope on south-western edge of town; not particularly prominent due to existing landscaping and topography; will not extend development boundary closer to West Alvington; represents rounding off of edge of this part of town. In addition relates well to existing housing estate to east and new housing will be subordinate to Kingsbridge Community College; discussions have taken place regarding vehicular access via Kingsway Park/ Badgers Close. Sustainable site close to bus routes and main school. Landowners understanding that SHDC support site in principle but not included due to objection from school who have subsequently withdrawn objections. Site available for development. Previous report of site dated June 2009 for further information attached.</p>	Yes	
SA 0719	K 4107	Kingsbridge	K2	K2, K3, K4		✓		✓		✓			K2 The Quay & K3 Union Road not strictly deliverable because SHDC in para. 6.3 of DPD highlights constraints on these sites, multiple ownership and unknown availability and as such therefore unlikely to come forward before 2016. K2, K3 & K4 Garden Mill are contrary to national policy as SHDC have not applied PPS25 sequential approach to vulnerable sites and incorrectly applied the Exception Test which only applies to sites in Flood Zones 2&3. Alternative sites in Flood Zone 1 have been put forward during consultation process.	<p>DPD should remove residential element from sites K2, K3 & K4 which is within Flood Zone 1 and available for development. See site characteristics summarised under Comment ID K4106. Previous report of site dated June 2009 for further information attached.</p>	Yes	
SA 0719	K 4108	Kingsbridge	K3			✓		✓		✓			K2 The Quay & K3 Union Road not strictly deliverable because SHDC in para. 6.3 of DPD highlights constraints on these sites, multiple ownership and unknown availability and as such therefore unlikely to come forward before 2016. K2, K3 & K4 Garden Mill are contrary to national policy as SHDC have not applied PPS25 sequential approach to vulnerable sites and incorrectly applied the Exception Test which only applies to sites in Flood Zones 2&3. Alternative sites in Flood Zone 1 have been put forward during consultation process.	<p>DPD should remove residential element from sites K2, K3 & K4 which is within Flood Zone 1 and available for development. See site characteristics summarised under Comment ID K4106. Previous report of site dated June 2009 for further information attached.</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 0719	K 4109	Kingsbridge	K4			✓			✓		✓		K2 The Quay & K3 Union Road not strictly deliverable because SHDC in para. 6.3 of DPD highlights constraints on these sites, multiple ownership and unknown availability and as such therefore unlikely to come forward before 2016. K2, K3 & K4 Garden Mill are contrary to national policy as SHDC have not applied PPS25 sequential approach to vulnerable sites and incorrectly applied the Exception Test which only applies to sites in Flood Zones 2&3. Alternative sites in Flood Zone 1 have been put forward during consultation process.	DPD should remove residential element from sites K2, K3 & K4 which is within Flood Zone 1 and available for development. See site characteristics summarised under Comment ID K4106. Previous report of site dated June 2009 for further information attached.		
SA 0774	K 4070	Kingsbridge											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.			
SA 0774	K 4071	Kingsbridge											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	K 4072	Kingsbridge											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	K 4073	Kingsbridge											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.			

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	K 4074	Kingsbridge											<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>			
SA 0774	K 4075	Kingsbridge											<p>Employment and commercial allocations appear to be generally and broadly described as such in the pans proposals. The plan might be improved if it was possible to provide more policy guidance pf the type/nature of employment and commercial development that would be appropriate at these allocations. PPS4 provides national guidance on these matters.</p>			
SA 0774	K 4076	Kingsbridge											<p>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.</p>			
SA 0774	K 4077	Kingsbridge											<p>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.</p>			
SA 0774	K 4078	Kingsbridge											<p>The allocations for Kingsbridge do not appear to include requirements to contribute to some of the infrastructure elements where developer contributions are sought. If not, there should be cross reference in the appendix to these proposals which are intended to make contributions to specific infrastructure items.</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 0774	K 4079	Kingsbridge											It is noted that Kingsbridge Community College requires investment. If any villages (in the Rural Areas DPD) in the proximity of Kingsbridge are within the Community Colleges catchments, should allocations at those villages make an appropriate contribution to this infrastructure? If this is the case, the plan might be improved by clarifying this matter and any other similar matters where villages make use of higher level services at associated Area Centres. This matter might be addressed by CIL.			
SA 0993	K 4069	Kingsbridge											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	K 4068	Kingsbridge											The Coal Authority have no specific comments to make on the document at this stage.			
SA 0995	K 4080	Kingsbridge											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.			
SA 0995	K 4081	Kingsbridge											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.			
SA 0995	K 4082	Kingsbridge											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	K 4083	Kingsbridge		K6									DCC has no strategically significant specific policy objections to the proposals other than to raise objection to the inclusion of site K6 at Leigh Cross which is considered to be unsustainable in transport terms, as well as being in the countryside covered by an AONB national designation.			
SA 0995	K 4084	Kingsbridge		K1									The site should be accessed off Trebble Park.			
SA 0995	K 4085	Kingsbridge		K2									The site is considered to be suitable for residential development but not employment due to the quality of access. The historic quay will need archaeological assessment and evaluation prior to any consents.			
SA 0995	K 4086	Kingsbridge		K3									As this area can be accessed without entering the town, it would be better used as employment allowing other areas to be developed as residential.			
SA 0995	K 4087	Kingsbridge		K4									This area is not suitable for any additional development because of the poor access.			

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	K 4088			K7									As the surrounding area are completely residential with the serving road network not conducive to commercial traffic, this site would be better allocated as residential with the existing use relocated.			
SA 1015	K 4111	Kingsbridge											Sites proposed are on a minor aquifer and groundwater vulnerable zone. May be a risk of contamination to controlled waters from previous, current or existing site uses (industrial buildings, railways, timber yards). Further info will be needed at implementation stage.			L
SA 1015	K 4112	Kingsbridge	K2										Site adjacent to Salcombe-Kingsbridge Estuary SSI. Setting back development to increase inter-tidal area should be explored in line with BAP and Shoreline Management Plan.			L
SA 1015	K 4113	Kingsbridge	K4										Opportunities to enhance watercourse and pond should be explored. A buffer (7m+) should be left between these features and development. Wildlife corridors should be conserved.			L
SA 1015	K 4114	Kingsbridge	K7										Opportunities to enhance watercourse on western boundary. A buffer (7m+) should be left between the watercourse and development. Wildlife corridors should be conserved.			L
SA 1015	K 4115	Kingsbridge	K1										Floodrisk issues covered in 6.12			L
SA 1015	K 4116	Kingsbridge	K2										Floodrisk issues covered in 6.18			L
SA 1015	K 4117	Kingsbridge	K3										Floodrisk issues covered in 6.21			L
SA 1015	K 4118	Kingsbridge	K4										Development of this site should provide opportunities to improve flood risk in the area.			L
SA 1015	K 4119	Kingsbridge	K5										Need to ensure no increased run-off and take into account climate change			L
SA 1015	K 4120	Kingsbridge	K6										Need to ensure no increased run-off and take into account climate change			L
SA 1015	K 4121	Kingsbridge	K7										Kingsbridge north watercourse runs north to south along western edge of the site. This main river will require consent for any works within 7m.			L
SA 1021	K 4110	Kingsbridge											Sport England has no specific comments on sites in Kingsbridge			L
Individuals																
SA 0009	K 4001	Kingsbridge		K6									Questions consultation process, particularly with neighbouring resident, and why the site is being promoted. Feel there has been inadequate consideration of the possible noise and air pollution and increase in traffic.			
SA 0009	K 4007	Kingsbridge		K6					✓	✓			Lack of consultation with the residents of Leigh Cross or Churchstow Parish Council, before Kingsbridge Town Council, thus contrary to national guidelines.		No	
SA 0053	K 4005	Kingsbridge	2.9			✓			✓	✓			In order to meet the aim of the DPD to secure a supply of housing for local people at affordable levels, large areas of land around Kingsbridge are being allocated for development. This will lower the quality of life of people currently living in Kingsbridge and will take away valuable agricultural land.	Delete "To secure a supply of housing for local people at affordable levels".	No	

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 0053	K 4006	Kingsbridge	2.11			✓			✓			✓		If additional land is required for housing, priority should be given to land off Cookworthy Road, currently under consideration for a supermarket. Morrisons already provide Kingsbridge with supermarket facilities and additional land for a supermarket is not necessary and not in the best interests of Kingsbridge.	Include land off Cookworthy Road for housing.	No	
SA 0115	K 4015	Kingsbridge	6.26	K5		✓			✓			✓		This land should be allocated after brownfield sites.	Revise the priority for the site.		
SA 0115	K 4016	Kingsbridge	6.29	K6		✓			✓			✓		The site is too remote from the town centre and other areas of employment to be considered sustainable or justified.	Revise the priority for the site.	No	
SA 0115	K 4017	Kingsbridge	3.7				✓		✓			✓		The results of the SID lack detail. There is no indication in appendix 1 of any evidence that issues of transport, access, environment or geotechnics have been considered.	Produce a more comprehensive and considered SID	No	
SA 0115	K 4018	Kingsbridge	6.3				✓		✓			✓		It is not clear what endeavours SHDC have undertaken to promote and deliver brownfield land. Respondent draws attention to letter dated 5 February 2010, the Kingsbridge Feasibility Study of 2003 where a number of brownfield sites were proposed. Considers that SHDC should be more proactive.	Revise the policy and priority of brownfield sites.	Yes	
SA 0115	K 4019	Kingsbridge	6.6			✓			✓			✓		The table gives insufficient attention to brownfield sites. Questions whether there is sufficient evidence to support the numbers of new homes on brownfield sites? Considers that K2 and K3 are optimistic and should be supported by a capacity check. This is important to safeguard the employment and community facility aspirations.	Amend priorities and review total number of dwellings.	No	
SA 0115	K 4020	Kingsbridge	6.7				✓		✓			✓		Considers it is essential on brownfield sites that SHDC be proactive with existing land owners. Appears to be no commitment to this.	SHDC to promote the sites mentioned.	No	
SA 0115	K 4021	Kingsbridge	6.14	K1			✓		✓	✓		✓		The proposal should only be considered after the development of brownfield sites.	Re-prioritise brownfield sites.	No	
SA 0115	K 4022	Kingsbridge	6.18	K2		✓			✓			✓		The policy fails to give enough reference to the communities proposals for a new community centre. This aspiration has existed for a number of years and is noted in appendix 1. In view of the requirements for a community centre, existing uses, constrains (car parking and flood risk), respondent raises question of the number of dwellings proposed. The numbers should be verified through a capacity check.	Revise the proposal.	No	
SA 0115	K 4023	Kingsbridge	6.22	K3		✓			✓			✓	✓	Supports the principle of redevelopment. But questions the priority given to it by SHDC and how it will be delivered. The area was zoned for mixed use in the Local Plan but with no progress since. Considers that SHDC need to be proactively engaged otherwise it will not be delivered. In addition, question the numbers of new homes proposed. The proposal should be supported by evidence and a capacity check that the existing level of jobs will not be compromised.	Revise and re-prioritise the proposal. The numbers of dwellings should be supported by evidence.	Yes	

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 0115	K 4024	Kingsbridge	Appendix 1				✓		✓		✓		Refer to comments (K4017). Considers the Infrastructure Delivery Plan lacks detail and fails to address some key aspects of delivery - such as site conditions, off site requirements, transport, access and environmental issues.	Produce a more robust document.	No	
SA 0122	K 4025	Kingsbridge		K4					✓	✓	✓		Considers the proposal is unsuitable. This part of Derby Road is a no through single track road which is already hazardous. There is already significant vehicular movement in the area which often becomes congested. There is a lack of pavement provision. Environmental issues need to be addressed including the noise pollution and vibrations. Would put forward alternative access from Belle Cross and the other from end of Rack Park Road.			
SA 0157	K 4036	Kingsbridge		K6			✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	Considers the site to be in an exposed location in the AONB. Feels there are other less conspicuous sites available - Torr Quarry which has better access. Sorley Cross is a dangerous junction nearby. Churchstow Parish Council have not been involved from an early stage in the consultation process. The surrounding road system is not sufficient to cope with an increase in heavy traffic. Fears there will be an impact on the tourism in the area.	There are other sites close to Kingsbridge which are suitable for business use.	No	
SA 0158	K 4037	Kingsbridge		K6					✓	✓	✓		Considers that the location in the AONB should not be sacrificed to provide industrial units when there are empty units at Churchstow Business Park. The development would result in an increase in noise and light pollution in the area. There would also be an increase in traffic, particularly in Churchstow which is already often congested. The development could potentially affect the tourism potential of the area.		Yes	
SA 0205	K 4038	Kingsbridge		K3									Concerned about mix of housing and industrial. Importance of green environment (including trees) and over cramming.			
SA 0205	K 4039	Kingsbridge		K2									Loss of necessary car parking. No provision for alternative.			
SA 0205	K 4040	Kingsbridge		K7									Reduction of important commercial asset . Too many houses for site.			
SA 0205	K 4041	Kingsbridge		K6									Access problem and increase in traffic (unlikely that people will walk from Kingsbridge). Visual impact, including proximity to successful caravan site which will affect holiday visitors. Experience of development of business park in Churchstow.	Expand Torr Quarry. Further development can be effectively screened here or redevelop the site to improve it's appearance.		
SA 0233	K 4043	Kingsbridge		K6									Increase in traffic on narrow Derby Road. Detrimental impact on AONB with great loss to town.			
SA 0265	K 4045	Kingsbridge		K1, K5, K6 & K7									The A road from Wragaton needs upgrading as it cannot cope with the volume of traffic. There will need to be significant investment in infrastructure. Gerston sewerage works at Kingsbridge is already overloaded.			

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 0265	K 4046	Kingsbridge		K1 & K5									Considers the level of houses are not needed. Acknowledge the need for affordable housing for the young people of Kingsbridge. Fears that new development will become second homes.			
SA 0265	K 4047	Kingsbridge		K5									Building houses behind Station Yard Industrial Estate is not a good idea. There will be complaints regarding the noise levels. Concerned that operating hours at the Industrial Estate will be reduced from 9am - 5pm.			
SA 0265	K 4048	Kingsbridge		K1, K5 & K6									There are few jobs in Kingsbridge and questions where new businesses will come from. Considers that businesses wish to be located near the A38 trunk road for access and delivery purposes and not have to negotiate narrow roads to Kingsbridge.			
SA 0265	K 4049	Kingsbridge											Considers that the supermarket site has enough land to accommodate all of the required housing for young people. Fears that Tesco in the town will affect trade in Kingsbridge. Considers what is needed in the town is small houses in villages of not more than 10 for local people to regenerate the villages.			
SA 0299	K 4053	Kingsbridge		K6									Concerns over the visual impact of development. The proposal will have a negative impact on the Parklands Camping site. Queries why South Hams are considering development on greenfield sites. Feels that the proposal is contrary to the idea of sustainable development.			
SA 0300	K 4054	Kingsbridge		K6									Objects to the proposed development. The site is in an AONB and development will be highly visible. The site will destroy a large area of productive farmland. The location of an industrial estate can destroy the tranquillity and views that are an integral part of the area. There are potential negative effects on the tourist industry.			
SA 0308	K 4055	Kingsbridge		K6									Objects to the proposed development. The proposal would affect the viability of the farm at Higher Leigh. The caravan park would be affected by a decline in visitor numbers by its location next to an industrial estate. The site is within an AONB. There would be an increase in traffic between Sorley Cross and Churchstow. Considers there are alternative sites if needed and that there is potential to increase the area at Torr Quarry for businesses that do wish to relocate. Suggests that things should be left as they are. People working on the industrial estates use the facilities on offer in the town on a daily basis.			

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 0319	K 4056	Kingsbridge		K6			✓		✓	✓		✓	Inspector at Public Inquiry 1980's relation to Leigh Cross concluded that proposed development not justified. Questions why industrial buildings in Kingsbridge taken down to make way for supermarket if there is a need for further industrial development. Also highlights empty units at Churchstow. Livelihood farming would be affected as services would be put through farm.	Use brownfield sites e.g. Torr Quarry. Do not use AONB land or good grade agricultural land.	Yes	
SA 0338	K 4057	Kingsbridge		K6		✓			✓	✓	✓		Land forms part of Leigh Cross Farm (DCC) and proposal would result in farm no longer being variable. Own business, 'Parkland' (Caravan and Camping), would be badly affected by industrial estate on doorstep, particularly blocking view to south which presently is Kingsbridge Estuary/ Salcombe etc. Importance of views and location to business. Skyline development. Increase in heavy traffic on A381 between Sorley Green Cross to Palegate Roundabout, Churchstow. Questions need for industrial estate in area with existing sites at Torr Quarry, Norton Farm, First Farm Churchstow, Loddiswell Butts, Kingsbridge - some of which remain vacant. Reservoir for Kingsbridge in woods and queries possible river pollution and effect on wildlife.	Suggests if further industrial units needed locate in less visible area.	Yes	
SA 0350	K 4058	Kingsbridge		K6									Objects due to impact on AONB, landscape and increase in traffic which will exacerbate existing problems in vicinity.			
SA 0489	K 4059	Kingsbridge		K6									Exposed site within AONB, building difficult to screen, appropriate employment at nearby Churchstow, if industrial/ commercial need exist opportunity should have been taken at Cookworthy Road instead of permission for second supermarket which is not needed.			
SA 0497	K 4060	Kingsbridge		K6									Object to location of site as too prominent. Suggests that there must a more suitable site nearby that should be used instead.			
SA 0526	K 4061	Kingsbridge		K6									Site would be prominent, impact on negatively on tourism in the area. Demolition of industrial units to make way for new Tesco suggests new industry not needed. Impact on wildlife.			
SA 0528	K 4062	Kingsbridge		K6									Object due to impact on wildlife, tourism and prominence.			
SA 0533	K 4063	Kingsbridge		K6									Object due to visual appearance, traffic impact and night time light pollution.			
SA 0536	K 4089	Kingsbridge		K6									Visually intrusive (including on Coombe Royal Valley), impact of scattered development on wildlife, nearby County wildlife site (Culverwell Meadows), weight given by DCC/SHDC to AONB except when proposing development, effect on amenity (light, run off), environmental damage (traffic increase), previous planning refusal 1982, quality of agricultural land at Torr Quarry less than Leigh Cross.			

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 0563	K 4067	Kingsbridge											DPD does not take into account need to protect designated landscape - Core Strategy (Policy CS9). Developments within AONB. Omission of screening (landscape/ biodiversity) is acknowledged in HRA para 5 but not explained. Insatiable demand for expensive houses from people moving in and given protection of AONB Council should work harder to maximise affordable housing element/ exceptions sites. LDF more complex than Local Plan and omission of Preferred Options Stage lessens community involvement.			
SA 0576	K 4100	Kingsbridge		K6									Inevitable increase in traffic will exacerbate existing traffic problems through Churchstow, pollution, visual impact, loss of grazing land to farmer.			
SA 0694	K 4104	Kingsbridge		K6									Agree with many of objections submitted by others but wish to draw attention to perceived lack of overall long term plan with scattered and 'ribbon' development which do not relate in planning or architectural terms. Need for industrial/ commercial sites as for affordable housing but must be balanced against need to preserve countryside.			
SA 0697	K 4098	Kingsbridge			All								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	K 4103	Kingsbridge		K6									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	K 4122	Kingsbridge											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.			

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 0706	K 4090	Kingsbridge	6.25-6.26	K5				✓	✓	✓			Impact on AONB, development of site would result in loss of trees screening Station Yard Industrial Estate from Westville residents, amenity issues for new housing adjacent to Industrial Estate, difficult to develop and overlooking due to steepness of site, West Alvington Hill dangerous road to access and would need 2 access points (either side of Norton Lane) due to difference of levels within site.		Yes	
SA 0706	K 4091	Kingsbridge	6.25-6.26	K5			✓		✓	✓			Loss of sunlight to Norden House during winter, vagueness of proposal prevents detailed comments, proposal includes large part of Norton lane over which have access rights to Norden House, development may disturb spring which supplies Norden House, effect on boundary mature trees between Norden House and proposal site, access issues onto West Alvington Hill, prominent site and impact on AONB.		Yes	
SA 0707	K 4092	Kingsbridge	6.25-6.26	K5			✓		✓	✓			Loss of sunlight to Norden House during winter, vagueness of proposal prevents detailed comments, proposal includes large part of Norton lane over which have access rights to Norden House, development may disturb spring which supplies Norden House, effect on boundary mature trees between Norden House and proposal site, access issues onto West Alvington Hill, prominent site and impact on AONB.		No	
SA 0765	K 4099	Kingsbridge		K6			✓		✓	✓			As tenant of proposed site loss of 2 field (15 acres) would affect viability of farm. Grade 2 agricultural land important for providing food for increasing population, green field site, prominent position, within AONB. Nearby empty units, e.g. Churchstow. If business justified extend Torr Quarry rather than locate on site distant from A38, on country lanes and without existing infrastructure, within established tourism area.		No	
SA 0786	K 4101	Kingsbridge		K6									Planning refusal 1982 on grounds of visual impact, traffic increase.			
SA 0793	K 4093	Kingsbridge	6.8				✓		✓			✓	High designation status of AONB where major development should not take place except in exceptional circumstances and where the following have been assessed; need, impact on local economy, alternative site or provision, detrimental effect and mitigation on environment, landscape and recreation.		No	
SA 0793	K 4094	Kingsbridge	6.25				✓		✓			✓	High designation status of AONB where major development should not take place except in exceptional circumstances and where the following have been assessed; need, impact on local economy, alternative site or provision, detrimental effect and mitigation on environment, landscape and recreation.		No	

