

Reference		Settlement	Paragraph	Proposal	Other	Legally Compliant		Sound		If Unsound			Representation		Appear?	Late Rep?	
Respondent ID	Comment ID					Yes	No	Yes	No	Not Justified	Not Effective	Not Consistent	Comments	Suggested changes			
Organisations and Agents																	
SA 0139	R 5174	Ugborough		RA29										The village of Ugborough is located about 1 mile to the east of the A38, as such any new development within this location could have a direct impact on the function and capacity of the SRN. However, the Highways Agency accept the proposed allocation is small scale (20 dwellings), therefore further comment is reserved until the supporting transport evidence is produced/supplied.			
SA 0221	R 5252	Ugborough		RA29										Highlights discrepancy between figures in the proposal and on the table on pg 20. Ugborough Parish Council request that a play area and community parking should be included within the site. Considers the density is excessive and that it should be reduced to 12 dwellings per acre. Development should be spread over a number of sites (as shown on the enclosed map). More emphasis is needed on local connection in the allocation of affordable housing which could be achieved through a Community Land Trust. More passing places may need to be provided on lane access to the village. Some development is needed before 2016.			
SA 0689	R 53528	Ugborough		RA 29					✓	✓	✓			No objection to principle of allocation in Ugborough or residential development in village. However objection to size of site as does not allow for adequate vehicular access or community facilities adjacent to school and village hall sought by Parish Council. Seeks inclusion of land to facilitate satisfactory vehicular access to currently proposed site, community facilities and residential development. Includes further details in support of proposal relating to Core Strategy, PPS 12, STA matrix. However in relation to test of soundness and effectiveness mention is made of deliverability. It is argued that RA29 is not deliverable as appropriate vehicular access is not achievable.	Amend Proposal RA29 to read as follows: Residential development and community facilities, to include: about 45 dwellings, public open space, village car park, footpath and cycle access to the village centre. Amend proposals map to reflect site shown in Appendix A.	Yes	
SA 0689	R 53529	Ugborough		Table 1										No objection to principle of allocation in Ugborough or residential development in village. However object to size of site as does not allow for adequate vehicular access or community facilities adjacent to school and village hall sought by Parish Council. Seeks inclusion of land to facilitate satisfactory vehicular access to currently proposed site, community facilities and residential development. Includes further details in support of proposal relating to Core Strategy, PPS 12, STA matrix. However in relation to test of soundness and effectiveness mention is made of deliverability. It is argued that RA29 is not deliverable as appropriate vehicular access is not achievable.	Make Table 1 and Proposal RA29 consistent.	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 0719	R 53544	Ugborough		RA29		✓			✓				<p>Unsound due to non compliance with national policy as sites RA9 (Aveton Gifford), RA16 Ermington, RA27 (Stoke Gabriel) and RA29 (Ugborough) are partially within functional flood plain. Council has not applied sequential approach to site allocations for venerable uses (e.g. residential) required by PPS25 para.16.Exception Test only applies to sites in Flood Zones 2 & 3. Alternative sites in Flood Zone 1 have been put forward during consultation process, e.g. site WA3 in April 2009 STA. Council has incorrectly applied sequential test to Rural Areas DPD.</p>	<p>Landowners support inclusion of site at West Alvington (see attached map) as alternative to RA9 (Aveton Gifford), RA16 Ermington, RA27 (Stoke Gabriel) and RA29 (Ugborough). Site of 0.7 hectares, on eastern edge of village, well contained by existing natural boundaries, no access or servicing constraints presents 'rounding off' development for approx. 20 dwellings. Not visually prominent within ANOB, not within village Conservation Area and would not affect character or appearance of area. Support local services in village and assist with local infrastructure improvements and provide affordable and open market housing in sustainable location. Site came forward during Princes Foundation consultation and prior to Rural Areas DPD publication stage site was considered. as part of consultation in January/ February 2010. Unclear why site has not come forward as proposal by Council. Landowners would accept development of only western triangle (previously RA35).</p>	Yes	
SA 0995	R 51811	Ugborough		RA29									Notwithstanding ownership issues, the provision of a suitable access would be very difficult.			
SA 1015	R 53575	Ugborough		RA29									Environment Agency: A watercourse runs north to south along eastern boundary of site. An area of Flood Zone 3 is associated with the watercourse. A site specific Flood Risk assessment will be required to identify the exact flood risk issues and to lay out the site to address the issues.			L
Individuals																
SA 0055	R 5066	Ugborough	6.167			✓			✓		✓		The proposal creates a serious imbalance in traffic between Undertown and the Square.	Devise a plan based upon a smaller number of properties (10) on a larger number of sites. There are 5 sites available in a ring to the north of the village and one site to the south west.	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 0055	R 5067	Ugborough	6.168			✓		✓					The proposal creates a serious imbalance in traffic between Undertown and the Square.	Sites exist in the following locations: 1. Between Bittaford Hill and Ivybridge Hill (T Holway) 2. Above the school field and adj to Bittaford Hill (R Tomsett). 3. The proposed development site 4. Above Undertown on White House Farm land (A Rogers) 5. Adjacent to Site 4 on Lutterburn Farm land (S Baker) 6. The lower end of Fore Street on Work House Meadow (E Davies) Considers that development should commence at sites 1 or 2 and proceed in a clockwise direction with smaller number of houses (say 10). As the development progresses, a road link should be provided to link the sites that in time forms an effective circular route around the village to the north east which will relieve pressure on Lutterburn street. Given the need evidence of property being let to young families suggests a need for local affordable houses is urgent.	Yes	
SA 0055	R 5068	Ugborough	6.169			✓		✓					Access infrastructure hasn't been sufficiently well thought through. The additional vehicular traffic will not be sensible through Lutterburn Street.	Link a series of developments in a crescent to the north east of the village. Personally has no objection to 30/40 houses to safeguard the school, shop and pubs.	Yes	
SA 0186	R 5223	Ugborough	6.168	RA30		✓		✓		✓	✓		Considers that the DPD is unsound as proper consultation has not been carried out. There were several landowners who were not included in the site selection process. Feels that the process has been hurried with little consideration for the impact on the village residents, traffic and parking. Congestion, parking and drainage problems are issues, particularly in the Lutterburn Street/Undertown area. Development would mean further congestion. The proposals make no provision for play space. The site is one of the last remaining green spaces in the village and provides benefits to those who live within sight of it. The plans do not include provision for housing allocation for local people. Concerned about integration of new residents into existing community and fears about anti-social behaviour.	There are several sites around the village which would be better suited to development. The most suitable site is at Workhouse Brook. It is a level brownfield site on the edge of the village with access, parking and could accommodate play space. The residents of the village are supportive of this site and the landowner is willing to release land for development.	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 0202	R 5234	Ugborough		RA29				✓		✓	✓		<p>Feels there has been inadequate consultation. Not all suitable plots of land were considered (notably Workhouse Field). Landowners were not consulted prior to the original plans being drawn up. The parish council made objections for the site which included existing parking problems in the vicinity, problems with access to the site, the high density of development, that social housing had no been allocated for local families and there is a lack of community space.</p> <p>Considers that the infrastructure of the village is inadequate to accommodate 40 more cars, there is a limited public transport service and the shop is poorly stocked and inadequate for those without cars.</p>	<p>Consider the needs of the village. Need houses of all sizes. Consider development at Workhouse Field.</p>	Yes	
SA 0251	R 5276	Ugborough		RA26									<p>Owners of field to north of Ugborough school playing field. Support small scale development of land around northern edge of village. Affordable housing for local people is needed now, not post 2016. Site RA29 has previously been rejected for development on grounds of poor access. As this is still the case the land would be more suitable for community space and and/or off-road parking.</p>			
SA 0337	R 53526	Ugborough		RA29			✓	✓		✓	✓		<p>Inadequate infrastructure. Unsound as lacks detail lack of adequate parking, open space or play areas for 20 dwellings. No alternative access route other than congested Lutterburn Street. Loss of amenity to existing residents. Effect of further hard standing on flooding. Wish village to remain at present size and retain original conservation area concept.</p>	<p>Smaller development of 5 Or 6 houses on site RA29 with adequate access, residents parking and open play areas for new residents. Design in keeping with village, solely for local people or those with links to local area. Other more suitable sites (e, g Wrangaton) in area.</p>	No	
SA 0531	R 53527	Ugborough		RA29				✓			✓		<p>DPD unsound as village too small to accommodate further housing. Access roads to village unsuitable to cope with additional traffic. Existing transport problems. Poor bus service. Few facilities in village. detract from Conservation Area and amenity of existing residents. Lack of sufficient parking within proposal would exacerbate existing residents parking problems.</p>			
SA 0531	R 53531	Ugborough		RA 29				✓		✓	✓	✓	<p>Proposed development and necessary facilities will adversely affect character of village to detriment of residents. More appropriate in larger settlements such as Ivybridge. Lack of facilities for young people will lead to crime. Will lead to increased private car use to access facilities and on unsuitable local roads.</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 0712	R 53532	Ugborough	6.168	RA 29		✓		✓		✓			Legal compliance questionable due to Council's SCI not being followed and number of dwellings on site unclear. Unsound as not justified due to limited local participation. Not effective due to unsound infrastructure delivery planning as access to site is poor and unconfirmed by delivery partners. Not consistent with national policies as government seeks to ensure local communities control own future and retain control of affordable houses.	Mentions recent public meeting where opinion sought off street parking and community open space with concern about access and density. Attached map indicates 4 sites (of which respondent is owner of site 1) submitted to promote a co-ordinated approach to development for 65 houses of open market and affordable (with part of sites 1&2 given to a community land trust and access provided) @ 12 per acre, open space, parking and better access. Landowner of Site 2 apparently in agreement. Princes Foundation support for Sites 1&2.	Yes	
SA 1019	R 53236	Ugborough											Request playing field provision in Ugborough			L
SA 1032	R 53530	Ugborough		RA 29				✓		✓			Not opposed to development but disagree with current proposals. Inadequate consultation with landowners (including DCC). Poor research/ fact finding in respect of existing parking problems, access previously reason for planning refusal, limited public transport and local facilities means emphasis on private car use, inadequate parking within proposal for residents. Over development of site, not in keeping with mixed style and size of housing in village, affordable housing not allocated for local families. Lack of community space and using school and village amenity land for building, additional traffic on lanes dangerous.	Variety of sites, housing and associated amenity appropriate to village structure, better consideration of parking, reduce numbers on site with additional parking and addition of amenity space. Better consultation needed seeking community views about future of the village and with landowners.	Yes	