

Bigbury Neighbourhood Plan

Schedule of Responses to Regulation 16 Consultation

Bigbury Neighbourhood Plan was submitted to South Hams District Council on 22/07/2019. The Council consulted on the submitted plan for a six week period between 29/7/19 - 9/9/19 in accordance with Regulation 16 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations.

The tables below set out the representations on the Bigbury Neighbourhood Plan made in response to consultation at Regulation 16.

TABLE 1 Responses to Regulation 16 Consultation

Date	Name/Organisation	Comments
30-7-19	John Davies [REDACTED]	<p>Hi,</p> <p>I would make 3 points. I ran BT's UK network for 7 years and introduced broadband and installed backhaul from mobile masts .Mobile coverage in rural areas is dependent on distribution from masts .There is a trade-off between tall mast height and lots of short masts . One tall mast can mean only one visual intrusion compared to lots of short masts. It is also cheaper. The Norwegians have tall masts to deal with their rural terrain ! TV transmission masts are accepted and much higher than mobile masts .The plan should take a view on what precise coverage it wants and how much land and coastline should have access and then consider the cost –height-coverage trade-off and not adopt an approach which ignores the physics and number of visually intrusive masts.</p> <p>Second, fixed network broadband in rural areas is often commercially unattractive and again the scale of coverage is a trade-off of cost to added customers .Public funded subsidy is helpful and broadband connections can boost local business profits alongside more domestic users. I have been involved in Wales `s approach to superfast broadband and whilst the roll out has added wide new access there is still an economic limit which excludes the most remote locations. Community schemes can be lower capital cost and lend themselves to interconnect partnerships with commercial firms. The schemes being self funded or with public funds and network build being done with gifts in kind (including labour).It is likely given the terrain that mobile coverage from a tall mast would be a more satisfactory data link than</p>

		<p>broadband in the remotest locations. There is a mobile v broadband trade off to recognise, again deciding on precise coverage limits is a policy issue.</p> <p>The plan links property developments to s106 agreements but does not define precisely the policy on where the planning gain will be spent. I would suggest the policy should be 100% to be on social housing for local people from within the plan boundary .There are draft policies which take a restrictive approach to development. It is interesting because on a generational perspective much of the present strength of the community and local tax revenue comes from past housing expansion. A trade-off worth considering for policy would be a more liberal approach to expansion in existing settlements linked to a greater s106 gain plough straight back into new social housing in the same settlements.</p> <p>John Davies</p>
31-7-19	<p>Developer Services Planning <DeveloperServicesPlanning@southwestwater.co.uk></p>	<p>Sarah thank you for providing detail on the above the content of which is note and upon which we have no comment.</p> <p>Regards</p> <p>Martyn Dunn Development Coordinator</p>
8-8-19	<p>Garnier, Chrystèle <Chrystele.Garnier@highwaysengland.co.uk></p>	<p>Sarah,</p> <p>Thank you for providing Highways England with the opportunity to comment on the Bigbury Neighbourhood Plan Consultation.</p> <p>Highways England is responsible for operating, maintaining and improving the strategic road network (SRN) which in this instance comprises the A38 to the north. As the plan area is some distance from the Strategic Road Network, we are satisfied that the plan's proposed</p>

		<p>policies will not impact on our network and we therefore have no comments to make.</p> <p>This response does not however prejudice any future responses Highways England may make on site specific applications as they come forward through the planning process, and which will be considered by us on their merits under the prevailing policy at the time.</p> <p>Regards,</p> <p>Spatial Planning Team South West Email: planningsw@highwaysengland.co.uk</p>
28-8-19	Marrina Neophytou <Marrina.Neophytou@devon.gov.uk>	<p>Good Afternoon Sir/Madam,</p> <p>Arch/DM/SH/32628</p> <p>Thank you for your email to the Historic Environment Team (HET) requesting any comments we wish to make on the Bigbury Neighbourhood Plan proposal. The HET has no further comments. Please do contact me if you require any further information.</p> <p>Yours faithfully,</p> <p>Marrina Neophytou Historic Environment Officer</p>
29-8-19	Stuart, David <David.Stuart@HistoricEngland.org.uk>	<p>FAO Sarah Packham</p> <p>Thank you for your Regulation 16 consultation on the submitted version of the Bigbury Neighbourhood Plan.</p>

		<p>In our response to the Regulation 14 consultation we identified certain issues which we encouraged the community to address in conjunction with your authority's conservation team (see attached). We would reiterate that advice and remain happy to leave the determination of the extent to which the outcome is acceptable and any need for further attention to the discretion of your authority.</p> <p>Kind regards</p> <p>David Stuart</p>
5-9-19	Projectmail - National Grid <n.grid@woodplc.com>	Appendix 1
6-9-19	Richard Walton <Richard@southwestcoastpath.org.uk>	Appendix 2
9-9-19	Hilary Winter <hilary.winter@devon.gov.uk>	<p>Dear Ms Packham</p> <p>Bigbury Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 16</p> <p>The Devon Countryside Access Forum responded to the Bigbury Neighbourhood Plan in February 2019. It submitted a copy of its Position Statement on Neighbourhood Plans and made a specific comment on the health and well-being objectives.</p> <p>The DCAF would like to make the following brief comments on the Neighbourhood Plan version currently out for consultation.</p> <p><i>4.77 The Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 is intended to give greater freedom for people to explore open countryside. It also includes a power to extend the right to coastal land by order and allows landowners to voluntarily dedicate any land to public access in perpetuity. There is now an extensive network of footpaths and bridleways in the southern point of the Parish but very few footpaths in</i></p>

		<p><i>the northern part. Farmers keep the footpaths well maintained and repair gates, fences and stiles when required. Local parishioners act as the footpath and tree wardens to ensure that all footpaths and trees are properly maintained.</i></p> <p>This section makes no mention of the legal responsibilities of Devon County Council's public rights of way team for the inspection and maintenance of public rights of way and recreational trails.</p> <p>Although coastal access land is referred to, the text does not cover the current England Coast Path process and the implications for Bigbury.</p> <p><i>Local Green Space (Paragraph 4.90)</i></p> <p>The Forum is not involved in defining areas of Local Green Space but wishes to ensure that the designation of local green spaces meets the requirements set out under the legislation and according to guidance.</p> <p><i>4.98 These footpaths can however be quite muddy and are certainly not suitable for cyclists, for people with pushchairs or those with mobility difficulties. These problems are compounded by the fact that the local roads connecting the villages are narrow and winding, and apart from a short stretch at Bigbury on Sea and even shorter stretch in Bigbury Village, do not have pavements. The local roads cannot therefore be regarded as providing safe routes for cycling or walking, particularly at night.</i></p> <p>The Devon Countryside Access Forum would like to mention in point 4.98 that cyclists are not permitted on footpaths.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.98 raises the difficulties of access for people with pushchairs or mobility difficulties but there is no mention of improving</p>
--	--	--

		<p>access. An amendment to Policy BP17 to include this as an aspiration would be welcome, in accordance with the Forum’s Position Statement on Disability Access.</p> <p><i>TRANSPORT OBJECTIVE</i></p> <p><i>To retain the existing network of local roads and footpaths and encourage the provision of new footpaths and cycle ways to provide better access to the countryside and increased safety for pedestrians, cyclists and horseriders.</i></p> <p><i>Policy BP25 – Transport and highways</i></p> <p><i>The existing network of mainly single track roads with passing places should be retained, together with the high Devon banks which are important to the character of the area. Any new development should have regard to the need to retain as much Devon bank as possible whilst ensuring adequate visibility. Opportunities for more passing places should be considered providing these do not result in the removal of mature Devon hedgebanks. Existing footpaths should be maintained, and new or improved footpaths and cycle ways provided, where possible, to provide better access to the countryside and greater safety for pedestrians and cyclists.</i></p> <p>The Devon Countryside Access Forum advises that the retention of public rights of way, as outlined in the Transport Objective above, should not prevent Devon County Council from making any necessary adjustments/improvements, for example for the diversion of paths.</p> <p>The Transport Objective refers to making paths safer for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders, but this aspiration is not reflected in Policy BP25 which only refers to pedestrians and cyclists.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>I should be grateful if you could acknowledge receipt of this email.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p> <p>Hilary Winter Forum Officer</p> <p>Email sent on behalf of the Devon Countryside Access Forum. Chair: Sarah Slade. Vice Chair: Chris Cole</p>
11-9-19	Duncan Smith SHDC	Appendix 3
23-9-19	SM-NE-Consultations (NE) <consultations@naturalengland.org.uk>	Appendix 4