

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	R 5033	Salcombe		RA3 & RA4										Adequate sewage treatment works capacity in all the settlements will be available to meet the allocations up to 2016. Whilst SWW will endeavour to meet the demand beyond 2015 being the next investment period, the timing of any improvements that may be required to meet the demand will be subject to approval of future business plans by OFWAT. Localised improvements to both the water distribution and sewerage networks may be necessary which will be assessed on a site specific basis.			
SA 0139	R 5148	Salcombe		RA3										There is no objection in principle to the development of this site.			
SA 0139	R 5149	Salcombe		RA4										There is no objection in principle to the development of this site.			
SA 0159	R 5198	Salcombe		RA3										The evidence justification for allocating site RA3 is unclear. The site was not recommended as part of the DRA. The SA fails to acknowledge site 11. Sites 1 and 8 in the STA were identified with significant adverse visual impact and therefore colour coded orange. The National Trust are particularly concerned about site 1 at Batson Cross. The field adjacent to Batson Cross, included within RA3, slopes steeply down from the A381 ridge towards Batson Creek, is highly visible in the landscape when viewed from public vantage points on the other side of the creek and appears more visually detached from Salcombe. The AONB Landscape Character Assessment locates the site within 'inland undulating uplands' and identifies the magnificent views over the estuary and the high impact on the A381. Development of the site needs to be subject to a more detailed assessment to be adequately justified.	Proposal RA3 needs to be subject to more detailed assessment of its suitability and overall capacity. The field adjacent to Batson Cross should be omitted because of landscape impact. The rest of the site should only be proposed for development subject to minimising impact on the skyline and overall visual impact. *** The Trust wish to reserve the right to participate dependent on what issues the Inspector considers the most appropriate for discussion at examination.	Yes - see comments in previous.	
SA 0271	R 5302	Salcombe		RA3										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 Salcombe RA3 is identified as having a negative impact on the AONB. Although performing well against SA objectives, the size and location of this site at the top of the hill would be likely to have adverse impacts on the landscape of the AONB.			
SA 0287	R 5311	Salcombe												Salcombe Town Council in support of submission of proposals set out in Publication Stage RA Site Allocations DPD (Salcombe) to Inspector.			

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 0693	R 53009	Salcombe		RA3					✓	✓			<p>The proposed site is located on particularly prominent and elevated open fields on the town edge. The site is very conspicuous on the main approach to the town and from a wide range of viewpoints. The northern element of the site faces out and slopes steeply away from the settlement into open countryside with extensive inter-visibility with surrounding countryside. This part of the site is poorly related to the settlement form of Salcombe and will be seen as skyline development. Development is likely to accentuate the already significant and harmful effect on the settlement edge spilling out of its estuary-facing pattern and dominating views of the area.</p>	<p>Either redraw the site boundary to exclude the northern part of the site, or specify in the supporting text that a smaller scale of development should be pursued and that is should be located on the southern part of the site.</p>	Yes	
SA 0693	R 53010	Salcombe		RA3					✓	✓			<p>It is hard to see that the landscape works would overcome the disadvantages of topography of the elevated northern part of the site.</p>	<p>Either redraw the site boundary to exclude the northern part of the site, or specify in the supporting text that a smaller scale of development should be pursued and that is should be located on the southern part of the site.</p>	Yes	
SA 0693	R 53011	Salcombe		RA3					✓	✓			<p>In selecting the entirety of the site for development, the proposal appears inconsistent with national policy for AONBs (PPS7 para 21) because insufficient weight has been given to the conservation and enhancement of the nationally protected landscape.</p>	<p>Either redraw the site boundary to exclude the northern part of the site, or specify in the supporting text that a smaller scale of development should be pursued and that is should be located on the southern part of the site.</p>	Yes	
SA 0693	R 53012	Salcombe		RA3					✓	✓			<p>The proposal appears to be in conflict with the draft RSS policy ENV3 and Devon Structure Plan Policy CO3 which advocate that in AONBs the conservation and enhancement of their natural beauty will be given priority over other considerations.</p>	<p>Either redraw the site boundary to exclude the northern part of the site, or specify in the supporting text that a smaller scale of development should be pursued and that is should be located on the southern part of the site.</p>	Yes	
SA 0693	R 53013	Salcombe		RA3					✓	✓			<p>The proposal appears to be in conflict with the Council's Development Policies DPD policies DP1 and DP2.</p>	<p>Either redraw the site boundary to exclude the northern part of the site, or specify in the supporting text that a smaller scale of development should be pursued and that is should be located on the southern part of the site.</p>	Yes	
SA 0693	R 53014	Salcombe		RA3					✓	✓			<p>The proposal as it stands appears to be unjustified because insufficient consideration appears to have been given to specifying the most suitable extent and scale of development to avoid causing unacceptable harm to the surrounding landscape.</p>	<p>Either redraw the site boundary to exclude the northern part of the site, or specify in the supporting text that a smaller scale of development should be pursued and that is should be located on the southern part of the site.</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 0769	R 53015	Salcombe			Omission	✓		✓					Proposes alternative land at Batson Creek, close to RA4. The site could be accessed from the primary road network and could accommodate and is appropriate to support housing and other mixed uses in a sustainable location. The site received an orange in the STA The site is available for development and could be released before 2016. If however, the need for Salcombe is sustained by another site in the first instance then the land is available to come forward in the plan period 2016-2026.		No	
SA 0995	R 51817	Salcombe		RA3									The Park and Ride should be located to the north of the site.			
SA 1015	R 53552	Salcombe		RA3									Environment Agency: Need to ensure no increase in runoff as result of development, taking into account potential impacts of climate change.			L
SA 1015	R 53553	Salcombe		RA4									Environment Agency: Site should be laid out sequentially according to vulnerability to flood risk and provision of safe access and egress.			L
SA 1043	R 53581	Salcombe	3.3			✓			✓		✓		In previous correspondence, have drawn SHDC's attention to anomalies in the SHLAA report. No overall objections to the conclusions but would recommend these anomalies are addressed.	Inconsistencies in the SHLAA relating to sites 41_01_08 and 41_02_08 and 41_03_08 and the period these sites are available should be corrected.	No	
SA 1043	R 53582	Salcombe	3.13			✓			✓				The consultation process in May/June 2009 attracted limited number from the community. This engagement was supplemented by considerable involvement of Salcombe Town Council facilitating public meetings and an exhibition which were well attended. The work of Salcombe Town Council should be credited in the DPD.		No	
SA 1043	R 53583	Salcombe	6.27			✓			✓				Client is owner of part of RA3 and is in support of the proposal. However, would wish to draw to the Inspectors attention to additional evidence in support of the immediate housing need in Salcombe which has not been addressed within the existing built permission referred to in para 6.25. A housing needs survey carried out in October 2009 identified an immediate need for 20 rented homes and 4 intermediate properties. Therefore recommend that the additional homes are brought forward before 2016. The land ownership extends further north than should in proposal RA3.	Recommends that RA3 be enlarged to cover the full extent of client's site in order to ensure that all the components identified in RA3 can be adequately accommodated in a comprehensive manner.	No	
Individuals																
SA 0013	R 5019	Salcombe	6.25			✓			✓		✓		It is unclear whether the 44 dwellings are part of the required 50 and nor does it indicate how many affordable houses have already been built.		No	
SA 0275	R 5303	Salcombe											Confirms that STA site 6 (Beadon Farmhouse) is not available for development.	Considers that the best site is at Shadycombe which would become an integral part 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 0427	R 5348					Salcombe										
SA 0460	R 53007	Salcombe		RA3		✓			✓	✓			Acknowledges the need for affordable housing but considers that Salcombe does not need any more commercial housing.		No	
SA 0460	R 53008	Salcombe		RA3		✓			✓	✓			Concerns over large greenfield development.		No	
SA 1016	R 53239	Salcombe											Surprising enquiry is continuing in light of withdraw of RSS.	Current proposals for Salcombe are rejected and returned for proper evaluation		L
SA 1016	R 53240	Salcombe											Economic circumstances have changed, this needs careful appraisal, and was largely overridden by the consultants, where the work was sketchy and inadequate and failed to recognise the Town Housing Needs Survey (2009) (which identified 22 units of social rented housing).	Current proposals for Salcombe are rejected and returned for proper evaluation		L
SA 1016	R 53241	Salcombe											Current situation has been reached in a disjointed and haphazard way. Process has been rushed to meet unrealistic timescales given the level of resource. Question consultation process, main focus has been to prevent massive development at Croft fields. Own a proportion of site 2 but have never been approached.	Current proposals for Salcombe are rejected and returned for proper evaluation		L
SA 1016	R 53242	Salcombe											Unnecessary and unacceptable to build majority of development on greenfield sites. Number of brown field sites exist (Gould Road Car Park, ex gas works site). Further survey needed to identify sites within curtilage of town.	Current proposals for Salcombe are rejected and returned for proper evaluation		L
SA 1016	R 53243	Salcombe											Salcombe critically dependant upon tourism. Areas under consideration border conservation area and infringe upon AONB. Any development would threaten these qualities.	Current proposals for Salcombe are rejected and returned for proper evaluation		L
SA 1016	R 53244	Salcombe											Site 1 (RA 3) would dramatically alter gateway to Salcombe and link self contained hamlet of Batson. Site is particularly visual from surrounding area.	Current proposals for Salcombe are rejected and returned for proper evaluation		L
SA 1016	R 53245	Salcombe											Letter dated Feb 2010 attached to rep, which in principle content still holds valid (Objecting to development on land adjacent to Batson and Shadycombe Creek).	Current proposals for Salcombe are rejected and returned for proper evaluation		L