

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	R5034	Chillington		RA5										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 5151	Stokenham		RA6										There is no objection in principle to the development of this site.		
SA 0271	R 5297	Stokenham		RA6										Natural England raise concern at proposal RA6. It is a relatively large development with several issues raised. The future of the A379 as a through road between Dartmouth and Kingsbridge is questionable in a 30-60 year timescale; with the road link likely to suffer an increased probability of permanent severance caused by coastal change at Slapton shingle bar. This aspect was not considered in the SA but could have potential impacts on the site meeting SA objectives. For instance, this may reduce accessibility by public transport, leading to an increased use of cars. Hence, the potential impact on SA objectives of a closure of the road at Slapton needs to be considered.		
SA 0286	R 5310	Stokenham		RA6										Inadequate publicity and consultation for Site Allocations proposals - residents suggest that there should have been further publicity locally and in the local papers and media. The STA indicated RA6 not suitable in comparison to other sites and with sustainability issues - AONB, impact on visual character and landscape. There is already consent for new houses in Chillington. With lack of availability to extend road structure on A379 and lack of other infrastructure village unable to support further housing. A few areas identified within RA6 are in private ownership and will not be available for development. Further copy of email dated 22 January 2010 included in representation with additional comments as follows: Residents adjacent to proposal consider site would be isolated from key services and facilities, poorly integrated to adjacent land uses and RA6 would not be allocated as STA indicated other more sustainable sites.		
SA 0700	R 53212	Stokenham		RA6		✓		✓						Confirms landowners support of proposal RA6 (landowner of western field of proposal). Currently commissioning consultations to prepare relevant planning, highways and infrastructure information prior to consulting with the council.		

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 0700	R 53213	Stokenham		RA6		✓		✓					Landowner also owns small triangular parcel of land to west of RA6 which is amenity woodland. There is a permissive footpath across the land and the landowner would be willing to upgrade to a combination footpath and cyclepath in respect of the section which crosses his land.			
SA 0700	R 53214	Stokenham		RA6		✓		✓					Proposal RA6 should be clarified to ensure that the requirement for cycle and footpath provision does not create a ransom situation for any landowner owning the remainder of the footpath to Chillington. Preventing the development of RA6 until a fully connected combined path would not be justified and would be a disproportionate requirement given the need for development for Stokenham in its own right and the separate provision for Chillington under RA5.	Amend the last bullet point of RA5 to read "...as far as this can be achieved within the ownership of the landowners of the land designated as site RA6."	No	
SA 0995	R 51815	Stokenham		RA6									Neither of the sites have safe footpath links. As these would be very difficult to rectify these sites are not supported.			
SA 1015	R 53554	Chillington		RA5									Environment Agency: Some serious flood risk issues associated with southern part of site which have not been addressed or assessed as part of SFRA.			L
SA 1015	R 53555	Stokenham		RA6									Environment Agency: Need to ensure no increase in runoff as result of development, taking into account potential impacts of climate change.			L
Individuals																
SA 0848	R 51613	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0044	R 5055	Stokenham	6.44	RA6		✓		✓	✓				Refers to the eastern section of RA6 only. Considers that the proposal does not conform to policy DP2 of the Pre-submission publication appendix 3 which states that development will not have an unacceptable impact on the living conditions of occupiers of nearby properties. Feels that building on the eastern part of RA6 will have significant impact on present occupiers in so far as the topography of the land would make new dwellings dominate the existing environment with major loss of privacy/amenity due to being totally overlooked.	Remove the eastern part of RA6.	Yes	
SA 0044	R 5056	Stokenham	6.43	RA6		✓		✓	✓				Comments as R 5055 and in addition: Refers to the STA of the site (9) which received an orange and the notes which accompanied the May/June 09 STA. Feels that the eastern part of RA6 should not have been included as part of the site allocations DPD as it does not meet the criteria set out in the Development Policies DPD and is unsustainable.	Remove the eastern part of RA6. Consider an alternative site at SX809426 which would provide a logical entrance to Stokenham due to its position on entry from the east and adjacent to the village green, pub and church.	Yes	
SA 0044	R 5057	Stokenham	6.45	RA6		✓		✓	✓				The eastern part of RA6 does not front any roads and therefore an appropriate street frontage is not possible to create. There is no direct access from the A379 and highway problems are already difficult with existing conditions and traffic.	Remove eastern part of RA6. Consider an alternative site at SX 809426.	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 0065	R 5078	Stokenham		RA6									Concerned about the proposed level of development and considers it to be out of proportion with the existing community. Traffic is a problem for the village. The health centre which is already busy will place pressure on the existing facilities and infrastructure. The houses that have recently been bought have gone to second home owners as they are too expensive for local people to buy. Questions why a greenfield site in the AONB has been considered.			
SA 0065	R 51591	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0065	R 5305	Stokenham		RA6									Concerns for proposed development. The scale of development is out of proportion with the existing village. The development would lead to an increase in traffic. Questions whether the healthcare centre could cope with the increase in population. Fears that the homes will not be affordable or for local people. Considers that any new development should be north of the A379 to the west of the village, allowing better access to the school.			
SA 0111	R 5119	Stokenham	1.2			✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	Refers to SHLAA site 53_23_08 and considers that it is not consistent with national policy as it would fail to maintain the rural environment in an AONB, particularly when combined with 53_14_08. There is poor access to the site which would cause danger to pedestrians. The size of the A379 and existing problems and density would also be a constraint. Feel the proposal is unjustified because employment opportunities in the area do not justify extra housing density.	Abandon SH 53_23_08 and 53_14_08 in the absence of a solution to the road problem.	Yes	
SA 0118	R 5124	Stokenham		RA6									Objects to proposed development in Stokenham. Considers the scale of development to be unacceptable and unsustainable and the village does not have the necessary infrastructure to support the growth. The site is within an AONB and should remain so, with only limited housing to supply local demand.			
SA 0118	R 53254	Stokenham		RA6									Inadequate publicity and consultation for Site Allocations proposals - residents suggest that there should have been further publicity locally and in the local papers and media. The STA indicated RA6 not suitable in comparison to other sites - AONB, impact on visual character and landscape. There is already consent for new houses in Chillington and general increase in traffic on A379 will result in lack of infrastructure to support further housing. A few areas identified within RA6 are in private ownership and will not be available for development. Further copy of email dated 22 January 2010.			

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 0119	R 5125	Stokenham		RA6			✓		✓	✓			The area identified in the plan contains a cesspit in the main part of the field which is owned by three residents in the village, who also have a right of way from the A379 to the tank for emptying purposes.	In the event that the three land owners be unwilling to sell, the western part of RA6 should be removed.	No	
SA 0119	R 51596	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0167	R 5207	Stokenham		RA6									Objects to the proposed development. Considers that the site does not meet the criteria as it is identified as being within the undeveloped coast (Protected Coastal Zone), where there will be a presumption against development unless it does not detract from the unspoilt character and appearance of the coast and is essential for the benefit of the wider community. Concerns over the impact on the coastal zone and landscape. SHDC DP 15 refers to AONB and undeveloped coastal zone.			
SA 0177	R 5215	Stokenham		RA6									Scale of development would create imbalance between public services and population and place strain on infrastructure, including causing traffic congestion.			
SA 0200	R 5232	Stokenham		RA6									Objects to the proposed development. Neighbouring residents will be deprived of privacy. There are no shopping facilities within the village and the healthcare facility would be unable to cope with additional patients. The roads are inadequate for further vehicles and will be a safety hazard, particularly for those waling between the two settlements and the school. Considers that there are other areas in the South Hams better suited for small scale infill development.			
SA 0203	R 5235	Stokenham		RA6									Objects to the proposed development. Considers that the infrastructure (road, sewers, health service) will not be able to cope with additional development and there will be a loss of farming land and wildlife in an AONB.			
SA 0204	R 5236	Stokenham		RA6									Objects to the proposed development. Considers that the infrastructure (road, sewers, health service) will not be able to cope with additional development and there will be a loss of farming land and wildlife in an AONB.			

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 0206	R 5237	Stokenham		RA6									<p>Objects to the proposed development. The site is within the AONB and is designated to prevent over development. The infrastructure is inadequate to cope with significant development. Construction traffic will cause congestion and will destroy existing routes. The congestion could be a safety hazard if emergency vehicles are unable to get through.</p> <p>There is a lack of services in Stokenham (no shop or post office), which will encourage car travel to access services adding to the congestion. An increase in the school capacity will upset the academic framework which the school has established. Questions whether the health centre could cope with an increase in population. Lack of footpaths and increased traffic flow raises safety concerns. Fears that the quality of life in the village will be lost with such a development.</p> <p>Questions whether SHDC can afford the investment necessary in the sewage facilities to serve the new development. Concerned that the development will destroy the natural farmland habitat, invade privacy and remove the natural landscape. Suggests locating development on brownfield sites closer to Kingsbridge.</p>			
SA 0208	R 5239	Stokenham	6.43	RA6		✓			✓				<p>The site is within an AONB and the scale of development proposed would ruin the area and reduce property prices. There is not sufficient infrastructure to support the dwellings, with a lack of shops, facilities and employment. The development will lead to an increase in congestion. Questions whether there will be a road improvement scheme to reduce pressure on local roads.</p>		No	
SA 0211	R 5241	Stokenham		RA6									<p>Objects to the proposed development. The site is within an AONB which would be ruined by the development. There is a large amount of derelict houses in the country which could be utilized without ruining the environment and would mean there was no need for development. Fear that the new development would be largely second homes. Asks SHDC to reconsider the plans. The development would lead to an increase in cars and would be detrimental to the landscape and environment.</p>			
SA 0212	R 5242	Stokenham		RA6									<p>Objects to the proposed development. Considers that the development will lead to traffic congestion and over population. There are concerns over schooling, road safety and the farmland environment. The health centre is already working to capacity. Raises queries about the sewage and water works.</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 0217	R 5249	Stokenham		RA6									Objects to the proposed development. The site is an AONB and on farmland and it should be protected and preserved for the farming tradition. Considers the development will place strain on the roads and health care provision. The two sites are prominent and the development would have a visual impact in the rural landscape.			
SA 0219	R 5250	Stokenham		RA6									Objects to the proposed development. The proposal will alter the character of the village and affect the quality of life of the existing residents. Questions where the access to the new development would be and raises concern at the additional traffic generated. There would be pressure on medical services and the school. The development encroaches on to an agricultural area which historical were promised would not be built on. Development would place pressure on services including drainage, sewage, policing and postal services. Questions where the jobs will be for the new families.			
SA 0225	R 5246	Stokenham		RA6									Objects to the proposed development. Was assured that the land in front of the bungalow would always be greenbelt. Concerns that the village would be spoilt because of traffic congestion, the pressure on schooling and healthcare facilities, the quality of life of residents, and invasion of privacy.			
SA 0228	R 5263	Stokenham		RA6									Concern about scale of development, located on busy A379 to which further housing will add increased traffic. Pressure on local facilities, such as primary school, doctor's surgery, sewage system. Parking on site? Housing should be for local young people.			
SA 0229	R 5264	Stokenham		RA6									A379 road, sewage etc, health centre, primary school at capacity. Support smaller scale housing but proposed scale too many.			
SA 0259	R 5281	Stokenham		RA6									Objects to the proposed development. Considers the area may need some additional homes but on an individual basis and that it should be very carefully considered if the AONB is to be retained. Considers the village have not been properly consulted. Does not agree with the reasoning of the District Councillor as to why Stokenham need the development and that the closure of the facilities (and the reopening of some) have been due to financial pressures in most cases.			

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 0260	R 5282	Stokenham		RA6									<p>Objects to the proposed development.</p> <p>Considers that the rapid expansion of the village will impact on the population in many ways and not least on the increase in traffic. The area is an AONB and the proposed development will create an urban community and that the tourist attraction for visitors will be lost.</p> <p>Fear that the housing will become second homes.</p> <p>Concerned that infrastructure will be costly, both financially and ecologically.</p> <p>Questions why the proposal includes provision for a village hall.</p> <p>Queries the phasing of the development.</p> <p>Believes that change should evolve slowly and be absorbed naturally.</p>			
SA 0266	R 5291	Stokenham		RA6									<p>Objects to the proposed development.</p> <p>The village is an AONB. The proposed development is not compatible and will be more than an overdevelopment to the detriment of the village.</p> <p>It is agreed that a small number of affordable houses may be required, however the RA6 is totally out of keeping.</p> <p>There are already difficulties in the road network with traffic and congestion, particularly in the summer months.</p> <p>There are concerns over the infrastructure capacity for this development to be viable.</p>	If the development is to proceed, then there should be a large reduction in housing numbers.		
SA 0267	R 5292	Stokenham		RA6									<p>Considers the community have been let down by the parish and district councillors due to the lack of consultation.</p> <p>Questions the change in status of the land from agricultural land to "amenity use" and queries when this was done.</p> <p>Whilst accepting that there is a shortage of housing, to build 100 houses would be detrimental in terms of congestion and impact on infrastructure capacity.</p>			
SA 0268	R 5293	Stokenham		RA6									<p>Objects to the proposed development.</p> <p>The site is an AONB.</p> <p>Development will have impact on the road network.</p> <p>Questions why the houses are needed in the village.</p> <p>Concerns over infrastructure capacity and increase in car use.</p> <p>Considers the development to be out of character with the existing village and that there aren't the local shop facilities in the parish.</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 0269	R 5294	Stokenham		RA6									<p>Considers that the land is designated as "green field" and therefore should not be developed for residential purposes. Given the new governments intention not to build on greenfield site, questions whether this will stop the plan from going ahead.</p> <p>Concerned at the impact on village life the 100 new houses will have and the pressure on the infrastructure. Asks that if development does proceed, that it occur in small numbers until it becomes assimilated into the community.</p>			
SA 0270	R 5295	Stokenham		RA6									<p>Objects to the proposed development.</p> <p>Considers the scale of development is disproportionate. New development should not affect the balance of the village.</p> <p>The site is in an AONB and it is wrong to locate this scale of development and density in such an area. The development will generate more traffic, and the A379 is congested, particularly in summer months. The nearest shop is in Chillington. The footpath connection to the shop is dangerous. There is insufficient parking provision in Chillington. People will still need to travel for the weekly shops to the main towns.</p> <p>Concerns at the infrastructure capacity. The public transport service is poor and not well used. Concerned at the lack of local employment opportunities. Questions consideration for the A379 at Slapton Ley should this be closed in the future.</p> <p>The visual impact of the development will be prominent. Given its location in an AONB, the development should not be considered.</p> <p>Do not understand the implications for the employment allocation.</p> <p>Feels that there has been inadequate consultation and questions whether the site is even needed.</p> <p>Not against new housing but it should be in small developments which do not affect the balance of the community.</p>			
SA 0276	R 5304	Stokenham		RA6									<p>Questions why the sites are proposed given that other sites in the STA scored higher.</p> <p>Considers the scale of development is out of proportion and would cause environmental damage.</p> <p>Any new buildings should be north of the A379 to the west of the village, allowing better access to the school.</p>	Any new buildings should be north of the A379 to the west of the village, allowing better access to the school.		
SA 0276	R 53158	Stokenham		RA6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			

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 0283	R 5308	Stokenham		RA6									<p>Objects to the proposed development. The scale of development represents a 50% increase in households.</p> <p>Queries that the infrastructure cannot sustain this population increase without investment.</p> <p>Concerned that the village will become a dead end in future if Slapton Ley gets breached by the sea.</p> <p>There is no employment opportunities in the village.</p> <p>Concerns that the new development will not be affordable for local people.</p> <p>Traffic and congestion is already a problem.</p> <p>There is a public footpath across the western site which is well used.</p> <p>Visual impact of such a proposed development.</p> <p>If Stokenham does need more development, requests that a smaller site is considered with fewer houses.</p> <p>Comments on the lack of consultation.</p>			
SA 0285	R 5309	Stokenham		RA6									<p>Objects to proposed development. AONB. Scale of development too large (100 new houses in settlement of 180 houses).</p>	Need for affordable housing, on small developments.		
SA 0292	R 53153	Stokenham		RA6									<p>Objects to proposed development for reasons regarding the environment, quality of life and effects on services.</p>			
SA 0292	R 53154	Stokenham		RA6									<p>Questions consultation process.</p> <p>Considers it was reasonable to believe that RA6 would not be subject to development as a result of the STA as there were other more suitable areas identified. Due to this many members of the community did not feel it necessary to inform SHDC of their objections.</p>			
SA 0292	R 53155	Stokenham		RA6									<p>The scale of development represents an increase of up to 65% which will have a negative effect on the quality of life of residents.</p>			
SA 0292	R 53156	Stokenham		RA6									<p>The A379 is busy and a difficult road to travel, particularly in the summer months. Concerns about increase in traffic as a result of development. Also raises concerns about the Slapton Line road which will eventually be lost to the sea.</p>			
SA 0292	R 53157	Stokenham		RA6									<p>Questions where people are going to work. Raises concerns over the sustainability and effect on the environment of people travelling to work.</p>			
SA 0293	R 53148	Stokenham		RA6									<p>Objects to proposed development for reasons regarding the environment, quality of life and effects on services.</p>	Each village to have a maximum of 12 new homes built to ensure the balance of the village is not negatively effected.		
SA 0293	R 53149	Stokenham		RA6									<p>Questions consultation process.</p> <p>Considers it was reasonable to believe that RA6 would not be subject to development as a result of the STA as there were other more suitable areas identified. Due to this many members of the community did not feel it necessary to inform SHDC of their objections.</p>	Each village to have a maximum of 12 new homes built to ensure the balance of the village is not negatively effected.		
SA 0293	R 53150	Stokenham		RA6									<p>The scale of development represents an increase of up to 65% which will have a negative effect on the quality of life of residents.</p>	Each village to have a maximum of 12 new homes built to ensure the balance of the village is not negatively effected.		

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 0293	R 53151	Stokenham		RA6									The A379 is busy and a difficult road to travel, particularly in the summer months. Concerns about increase in traffic as a result of development. Also raises concerns about the Slapton Line road which will eventually be lost to the sea.	Each village to have a maximum of 12 new homes built to ensure the balance of the village is not negatively effected.		
SA 0293	R 53152	Stokenham		RA6									Questions where people are going to work. Raises concerns over the sustainability and effect on the environment of people travelling to work.	Each village to have a maximum of 12 new homes built to ensure the balance of the village is not negatively effected.		
SA 0295	R 5316	Stokenham		RA6									Scale of development too large. Existing traffic problems would be increased, particularly after closure of Slapton Line. Medical centre at capacity. Impact of infrastructure Loss of privacy in nearby properties.	Support new housing in South Hams but should be spread across all villages.		
SA 0298	R 5317	Stokenham		RA6									Inadequate consultation. Over development of village. Impact on local services. Lack of local employment. Need for affordable housing. Traffic problems. Public footpath across Carehouse Cross. Stokenham is an archaeological site and requires excavation prior to development. AONB and wildlife. Possible need for street lighting and light pollution.	Support new housing in South Hams but should be spread across all villages.		
SA 0301	R 5318	Stokenham		RA6									Concerns relate to traffic congestion and road safety, sewage and water capacity, capacity of health care centre, lack of local employment, AONB and wildlife, scale of development.	Reduce numbers to provide small number for local people.		
SA 0302	R 5319	Stokenham		RA6									Scale of development, traffic, lack of local employment, agricultural land, AONB.	Small number of affordable houses for local people.		
SA 0303	R 5320	Stokenham		RA6									Scale of development, spoil integrity of village, traffic, increase in school children.			
SA 0309	R 5322	Stokenham		RA6									Proposed increase in size of village detrimental to village character and community cohesion. Lack of local employment. Traffic congestion. Need for costly investment into infrastructure. Possible introduction of street lighting.			
SA 0310	R 5323	Stokenham		RA6									Infrastructure inadequate to support mixed housing, including health and social, sewage and water. Traffic and capacity of A379. Possible need for street lighting and objection to light pollution. Scale of development too high to absorb new households into village. Proposals not sustainable, deliverable or follow good principles of place making.			
SA 0311	R 5324	Stokenham		RA6									Site could only be developed by large contractor as required to do so in comprehensive manner, scale of development in excess of local need, affect character of village, no requirement for a third village hall, small developments within Stokenham would not destroy AONB, impact on infrastructure.			

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 0313	R 5326	Stokenham		RA6									<p>The site fails to meet the required criteria for selection and would have a negative impact on the immediate neighbourhood, the wider community and the long term preservation of the landscape.</p> <p>Argues that the sites scored considerably worse in the STA/SA and the SA/SEA reports "Overall, the proposal was found to have the potential for negative effect on the SA objectives", yet the DPD claims the site performs well in terms of sustainability.</p> <p>The site is within the undeveloped coast. This development does not require a coastal location and the eastern part of RA6 should be removed from the DPD.</p> <p>Properties on the south east corner of Carehouse Cross are listed. Development on the eastern part of RA6 would affect the setting of the properties.</p> <p>The site would suffer from access problems. Access to the highway is compromised by land ownership issues. There is a lack of pavement provision on part of the road between Carehouse Cross and Stokehnham village.</p> <p>In conclusion, the DPD is neither justified nor consistent with local, regional or national policy. The overall numbers for development is out of proportion with the existing village. RA6 should be limited to the western part.</p>			
SA 0322	R 53164	Stokenham		RA6									Agrees it is both necessary and desirable to have some new affordable homes and opportunities for rural employment, the scale of development does not meet the LDF criteria.			
SA 0322	R 53165	Stokenham		RA6									The development would not reduce the need to travel and it would do little to mitigate against the challenges of climate change. Concerns about effect when Slapton Line is lost to the sea.			
SA 0322	R 53166	Stokenham		RA6									The increase in population would not retain the character of the settlement and nor would it be an appropriate scale.			
SA 0322	R 53167	Stokenham		RA6									Questions how schemes would support the role of local centres and improve self sufficiency and ways in which this could be achieved. Considers the proposals inappropriate at this time.			
SA 0326	R 53168	Stokenham		RA6									Objects to the proposed development. Concerned over scale of development in the AONB and lack of employment opportunities.			
SA 0326	R 53169	Stokenham		RA6									Plans include representors garden and joint cesspit with an established right of way.			
SA 0326	R 53170	Stokenham		RA6									Questions infrastructure capacity, particularly the A379 and Slapton Line road which will become lost to the sea.			

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 0329	R 53171	Stokenham		RA6									Objects to the proposed development. The site is within the AONB. Roads are difficult to negotiate. Concerns at infrastructure capacity. Objects to removal of trees. Concerned over effect on quality of life.			
SA 0333	R 53172	Stokenham		RA6									Objects to the proposed development. Concerned over loss of agricultural land. Questions impact on local facilities. Concerned about increase in second home ownership or properties for the retired. Lack of local employment opportunities.			
SA 0334	R 53173	Stokenham		RA6									Objects to the proposed development. The site is within the AONB and a conservation area. The proposal would affect the character of the village. Concerned about impact on local infrastructure. Considers the quality of life of residents would be compromised. Not against development, but it should be small scale that does not alter the balance of the village.			
SA 0335	R 53174	Stokenham		RA6									Objects to the proposed development. Concerned over scale of development which is disproportionate. Concerns over impact on quality of life. Concerned about traffic problems.			
SA 0336	R 53177	Stokenham		RA6									Objects to the proposed development. Concerned over scale of development which is disproportionate. Concerns over impact on quality of life. Concerned about traffic problems.			
SA 0341	R 53175	Stokenham		RA6									Objects to the proposed development. Concerned over scale of development. Proposals will lead to increase in traffic congestion. Concerns over infrastructure capacity, effect on wildlife and road safety.			
SA 0342	R 53176	Stokenham		RA6									Objects to the proposed development. Concerned over scale of development. Proposals will lead to increase in traffic congestion. Concerns over infrastructure capacity, effect on wildlife and road safety.			
SA 0420	R 53178	Stokenham		RA6									Questions EbD outcomes.			
SA 0420	R 53179	Stokenham		RA6									Questions STA outcomes from May/June 2009 document to the DPD.			
SA 0420	R 53180	Stokenham		RA6									Questions how appropriate street frontage can be achieved.			
SA 0431	R 53181	Stokenham	1.2	RA6		✓			✓	✓			There is no evidence to support the allocation of 100 houses.	Demonstrate need.	No	
SA 0433	R 51595	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0433	R 53182	Stokenham		RA6									Objects to the proposed development. Concerned over scale of development in the AONB. Considers that improvements to the road network need to be made before any development is considered.			

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 0436	R 53183	Stokenham		RA6									Objects to the proposed development. Concerns about impact on road infrastructure and noise pollution as a result. Considers the village is not appropriate for additional housing.			
SA 0442	R 53184	Stokenham		RA6									Objects to the proposed development. Existing road infrastructure is inadequate and road safety is a concern. Concerns over lack of employment opportunities. The tourist trade will be affected by a large proposal in the village. The proposal represents a loss of arable farmland in its AONB location which should be maintained.			
SA 0445	R 53186	Stokenham		RA6									Objects to the proposed development.			
SA 0451	R 53185	Stokenham		RA6									Objects to the proposed development. The scale of development would affect the character of the village and will lead to an increase in traffic congestion	If development in Stokenham is needed it should be on a considerably smaller scale.		
SA 0452	R 53187	Stokenham		RA6									Objects to the proposed development. Questions where residents will work. Concerned about traffic and road infrastructure. Concerned that quality of life would be badly affected.			
SA 0453	R 53188	Stokenham		RA6									Objects to the proposed development. Concerned about dangerous access from Torcross and Chillington. Concerns over infrastructure capacity. Scale of development is disproportionate. Site is within AONB.			
SA 0454	R 53189	Stokenham		RA6									Objects to the proposed development. Location within the AONB. Concerns about traffic congestion and road safety Concerns over capacity of infrastructure. Concerns over the further decimation of farm land and wild life.			
SA 0455	R 53190	Stokenham		RA6									Objects to the proposed development. Location within the AONB. Concerns about traffic congestion and road safety Concerns over capacity of infrastructure. Concerns over the further decimation of farm land and wild life.			
SA 0461	R 53191	Stokenham		RA6									Considers that some development is necessary in or on the outskirts of the village and appreciate the reasoning. There is undoubtedly a need for some additional housing.			
SA 0461	R 53192	Stokenham		RA6									However, considers the scale of development to be too high.	A smaller number of houses (50) would be acceptable.		
SA 0461	R 53193	Stokenham		RA6									Questions infrastructure capacity, and in particular the road.			
SA 0464	R 53194	Stokenham		RA6									Objects to the proposed development and disproportionate scale of development. Concerns over effect on quality of life and where people will work. Concerns over infrastructure capacity.			
SA 0468	R 53195	Stokenham		RA6									Lack of consultation from Parish Council regarding development in the AONB.			

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 0468	R 53196	Stokenham		RA6									Objects to proposed development. Concerns over infrastructure capacity. Village cannot accommodate any further development.			
SA 0469	R 53197	Stokenham		RA6									Concerns over infrastructure capacity and effect on the AONB.			
SA 0470	R 53198	Stokenham		RA6									Objects to the proposed development. Concerned over increase in traffic. Questions where the jobs will be for the new families.			
SA 0474	R 53199	Stokenham		RA6									Objects to the proposed development. Concerned over loss of quality farmland in the AONB. The proposal will overpopulate the village. Concerns over infrastructure capacity, particularly the road infrastructure.	Reconsider site options.		
SA 0474	R 53200	Stokenham		RA6									The proposed development is in the wrong location when considering the STA May/June 2009.	Reconsider site options.		
SA 0482	R 53201	Stokenham		RA6									Objects to the proposed development but acknowledges there may be a need for some development in Stokenham. Sites have poor access from A379. The site is within the AONB. Concerns over effect on tourism. The scale of development is too much for the village. Concerned over lack of employment. Concerns over infrastructure capacity.			
SA 0493	R 53202	Stokenham		RA6									Objects to the proposed development. Considers site to be unsuitable. Concerns about impact on tourism and location within the AONB. Concerns about infrastructure capacity.			
SA 0500	R 53203	Stokenham		RA6									Concerns about the scale of development. Questions where people will work and there will be increasing numbers of cars on the roads. Concerned about existing traffic problems and infrastructure capacity. Should not be developing on farmland.			
SA 0509	R 53204	Stokenham		RA6									Concerned about disproportionate proposals and concerns about over development. Concerned about infrastructure capacity and in particular the capacity of the A379. New residents would have to travel to find employment.			
SA 0509	R 53205	Stokenham		RA6									Concerned about consultation process.			
SA 0515	R 53206	Stokenham		RA6									Objects to the proposed development. Concerns over the scale of development, the loss of agricultural land and infrastructure capacity, particularly the roads. Questions where new residents are going to work.			

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 0522	R 53207	Stokenham		RA6									Objects to the proposed development. Considers the scale of development is too large. The location is restricted with poor roads and no footpaths. There is a lack of facilities and consequently increases car use. Concerns over road infrastructure. The land is good quality land in the AONB. Questions who will finance the development. Not opposed to new homes for local people.	Each village to have a maximum of 12 new homes built to ensure the village is not overwhelmed by urban development.		
SA 0523	R 53208	Stokenham		RA6									Objects to the proposed development. Concerns about the scale of development. Concerns about the road infrastructure. Lack of employment opportunities will increase pressure on the roads. Concerns over infrastructure capacity.			
SA 0524	R 53209	Stokenham		RA6									Objects to the proposed development. Site is within the AONB and protected coastal zone. Understands that there are covenants to stop such developments. Questions the employment provision and considers the provision not to be viable. Feels no business would want to start in Stokenham given the fact that the Slapton Line will one day be lost to the sea. Concerned about capacity of road infrastructure. Proposals will have effect on tourism potential. Concerns about wildlife in hedgerows. The map issued in the DPD does not reflect the level of housing around the site. Not opposed to small scale development. Concerns about infrastructure capacity.	Small developments that do not alter the balance of the village.		
SA 0568	R 53210	Stokenham		RA6									Concerned about the scale of development and capacity of infrastructure. Added pressure on the A379 when the Slapton Line is lost to the sea. Questions where new residents will work.			
SA 0568	R 53211	Stokenham		RA6									Questions local consultation process.			
SA 0762	R 53215	Stokenham		RA6									Raises a number of concerns as a result of the parish council meeting. Concerned about the impact on traffic congestion. Questions whether the existing infrastructure is able to accommodate the new development. Questions whether the quality of life of existing and future residents has been taken into account. Questions where people will work. Concerns about impact on wildlife and AONB.			
SA 0775	R 51585	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0776	R 51590	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0777	R 51589	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0778	R 51588	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0779	R 51587	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			

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 0780	R 51586	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0781	R 51584	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0782	R 51583	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0785	R 53216	Stokenham		RA6									Objects to the proposed development. Considers the proposal to be social engineering and would impact on the existing quality of life, social cohesion and voluntary co-operation in village activities. The land is within the AONB. Concerns about infrastructure capacity. Questions where people would work.			
SA 0795	R 53217	Stokenham	6.46	RA6		✓			✓		✓		No evidence to support the requirement for a financial contribution towards a shop. The area is already served by a shop in Chillington.			
SA 0795	R 53218	Stokenham	6.45	RA6		✓			✓		✓		A new village hall would need to be appropriately located with regard to the population of both settlements. Suggests that RA6 does not provide an opportunity to make a contribution in the form of on site provision. Lack of integration with requirements of proposal RA5 for "provision of enhanced village hall facilities".			
SA 0795	R 53219	Stokenham	6.31	RA6		✓			✓		✓		The justification for designating both villages as the Local Centre is unclear. Questions the value of such a designation when coalescence of the two villages is to be avoided. Inconsistent approach.			
SA 0795	R 53220	Stokenham	6.34	RA6		✓			✓		✓		Lack of clarification over which "community" the text refers to which could be misunderstood. Not clear whether it relates to Stokenham, Chillington or combined. Should not be implied that both communities have the same desires. Considers the text is ambiguous. Questions how the centre of Stokenham will be strengthened by the proposals.			
SA 0795	R 53221	Stokenham	6.43	RA6		✓			✓		✓		It is inappropriate to treat the two areas as one site. The sites are physically separated by a road and buildings and there is a difference in uses.			
SA 0795	R 53222	Stokenham	6.43	RA6		✓			✓		✓		The eastern area did not form any part of the SHLAA. Questions why the decision was made to add it to the western area and treat the two as one single site without any justification.			
SA 0795	R 53223	Stokenham	6.43	RA6		✓			✓		✓		Treating the two sites as one means the statement "the site is close to the village centre and primary school" is meaningless.			
SA 0795	R 53224	Stokenham	6.43	RA6		✓			✓		✓		The proposal seems to ignore the SA/SEA findings with regards to the effect of this level of development.			
SA 0795	R 53225	Stokenham	6.44	RA6		✓			✓		✓		Concerns about the eastern part of the site and access to the highway.			
SA 0795	R 53226	Stokenham	6.44	RA6		✓			✓		✓		Questions the STA results which reveals that the eastern part of the site has more sustainability issues than the western half which are difficult to mitigate.			
SA 0795	R 53227	Stokenham	6.44	RA6		✓			✓		✓		Questions the ability to provide a street frontage on the western part of the site and considers there is no evidence to suggest that this can be achieved.			

Reference		Settlement	Paragraph	Proposal	Other	Legally Compliant		Sound		If Unsound			Representation		Appeal?	Late Rep?
Respondent ID	Comment ID					Yes	No	Yes	No	Not Justified	Not Effective	Not Consistent	Comments	Suggested changes		
SA 0795	R 53228	Stokenham	6.44	RA6		✓			✓		✓		If the two sites are to be considered as one, the eastern part of the site makes it an undeliverable proposal because of the access problems and as such the proposal is not effective.			
SA 0811	R 53229	Stokenham		RA6									Obejects to the proposed development. The scale of development is disproportionate and would alter the character of the village and would effect the balance of the community. The site is in the AONB and will have a an adverse visual impact and effect on tourism. Concerns about the road infrastructure capacity and impact on infrastructure capacity in the local centre.			
SA 0829	R 51594	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0830	R 51593	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310). In addition, concerns expressed at the impact of 100 homes on the size of the school role.			
SA 0832	R 51597	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0833	R 51598	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0834	R 51599	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0835	R 51600	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0836	R 51601	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0837	R 51602	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0838	R 51603	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0839	R 51604	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0840	R 51605	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0841	R 51606	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0842	R 51607	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0843	R 51608	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0844	R 51609	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310). Does not agree with the district councillors view that the village is dying and considers it to be successful. Questions whether there is a need for new development and is concerned that any new development will become holiday homes.			
SA 0845	R 51610	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0846	R 51611	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0847	R 51612	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			

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 0849	R 51614	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0850	R 51615	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0851	R 51616	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0852	R 51617	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0853	R 51618	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0854	R 51619	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0855	R 51620	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0856	R 51621	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0857	R 51622	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0858	R 51623	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0859	R 51624	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0860	R 51625	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0861	R 51626	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0862	R 51627	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0863	R 51628	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0864	R 51629	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0865	R 51630	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0866	R 51631	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0867	R 51632	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0868	R 51633	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0869	R 51634	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0870	R 51635	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0871	R 51636	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0872	R 51637	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0873	R 51638	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310). New houses should be affordable for people living and working within the parish.			
SA 0874	R 51639	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0875	R 51640	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			

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 0876	R 51641	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0877	R 51642	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0878	R 51643	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0879	R 51644	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0880	R 51645	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0881	R 51646	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0882	R 51647	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0883	R 51648	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0884	R 51649	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0885	R 51650	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0886	R 51651	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0887	R 51652	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0888	R 51653	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0889	R 51654	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0890	R 51655	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0891	R 51656	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0892	R 51657	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0893	R 51658	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0894	R 51659	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0895	R 51660	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0896	R 51661	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0897	R 51662	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0898	R 51663	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0899	R 51664	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0900	R 51665	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0901	R 51666	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			
SA 0902	R 51667	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			

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 0903	R 53230	Stokenham		RA6									Objects to the proposed development. Concerned about impact on AONB. Development will impact on road network and affect the character of the area.	If development in Stokenham is needed, there would need to be a relief road from Kingsbridge on the northern side of the A379. Small scale development only.		
SA 1001	R 53248	Stokenham		RA6									Writing on behalf of many residents of Stokenham. Question consultation process and why villagers are so poorly informed about the proposals. RA6 is within AONB and will almost double the size of the village			L
SA 1001	R 53579	Stokenham		RA6									Concern at lack of information regarding proposed site from the District or the Parish Council and lack of consultation with residents.			
SA 1001	R 53580	Stokenham		RA6									Concerns over visual impact, scale of development, pressure on local infrastructure including the school and doctors and the roads.	Suggests alternative sites which are more discrete and do not have as much impact on the village, for example, site 16.		
SA 1012	R 53255	Stokenham		RA6									Inadequate publicity and consultation for Site Allocations proposals - residents suggest that there should have been further publicity locally and in the local papers and media. The STA indicated RA6 not suitable in comparison to other sites - AONB, impact on visual character and landscape. There is already consent for new houses in Chillington and general increase in traffic on A379 will result in lack of infrastructure to support further housing. A few areas identified within RA6 are in private ownership and will not be available for development. Further copy of email dated 22 January 2010.			L
SA 1012	R 53256	Stokenham		RA6									Proposed land is unsuitable as it will overlook the conservation area, within the AONB and could set a precedence, would only be used to provide executive housing, high quality of views would not be used to provide affordable housing, it is not a compulsory purchase issue as other land could be considered, if a genuine need of affordable housing 100% should be provided, covenant must be placed on the properties, question the need for housing, limited drainage system of Stokenham, flood risk, the slapton line will not be maintained and the alternative route will not be sufficient to cater for extra resident and residents will have to rely on car use.			L
SA 1041	R 53159	Stokenham		RA6									Objects to proposed development. Questions the STA as part of the evidence base. The STA shows that the eastern part of RA6 received an orange and a poor site for development.		Yes	
SA 1041	R 53160	Stokenham		RA6									Questions the SA. The SA indicates the A379 as a problem with negative effects on the accessibility and energy SA objectives. The DPD lacks a plan to significantly improve the A379.		Yes	
SA 1041	R 53161	Stokenham		RA6									The increase in population would not retain the character of the settlement and nor would it be an appropriate scale.		Yes	
SA 1041	R 53162	Stokenham		RA6									The development would not reduce the need to travel.		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 1041	R 53163	Stokenham		RA6									Concerns over infrastructure capacity.		Yes	
SA 1042	R 51592	Stokenham		RA 6									Endorses the views of Stokenham Parish Council (SA/0286 - R5310)			