

Responses to Staverton Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood Plan

The table below contains the comments submitted to the Regulation 14 Consultation Draft Neighbourhood Plan and how these comments have been considered by the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) and have informed the amendments made in the Regulation 15 Submission version of the Neighbourhood Plan.


Consultee	Page	Reg 14 draft Plan reference and Comments	Response
Kathryn Wareham	all	Well written and easily digestible document. Aspirations within it are easy to support for anyone who believes in maintaining and enhancing thriving villages, values the rural environment and heritage of the area and believes that action is required to limit further climate change impact.	
Kathryn Wareham	11	SNP1: 3 & 8.4/ SNP13 The importance of safe passage by non-vehicle users of the highway cannot be emphasised enough. To this end it is important that regional bodies (e.g. Devon Highways, SHDC) take on board local concerns about traffic speeds and become more willing to support measures which will enhance the safety of non-vehicular road users	Agree
Kate Wareham	11	Para 3.5 The number of dwellings is not unreasonable but the distribution must be shared across the area. Planners must not simply play lip-service to the Plan but must be seen to support it by limiting development outside those supported by the Plan. This must include valid arguments by the planners for allowing development outside the Plan. Any unsupported development should be considered as contributing towards the target set for the parish	Agree.
Kate Wareham	19	SNP5: It is unfortunate that the very real need for the affordable homes required to allow young people to remain in the Parish will need to be met through exceptions sites. It is understood that the authors of the plan have argued long and hard for a more flexible approach to the location of the new housing sites	We have noted all your points.

		<p>recognised by the plan.</p> <p>It is unlikely that exception plots will attract developers and whilst the policy may help limit the development of large high price dwellings on smaller sites it is unlikely to result in affordable housing stock. Regional policy makers should work with the Parish to facilitate the generation of affordable stock through a more flexible approach to the identification of recognised sites</p>	
Kate Wareham	17	<p>4.10</p> <p>It is understood that many of the restrictive covenants date from the sale of church land in the 1970s. The covenants were almost certainly intended to deter development and so ensure the maintenance of the rural nature of Staverton. The penalties associated with the covenants will continue to deter development unless waived or reduced. The church will therefore never benefit from receipt of the penalties and now forty or more years on the local community recognises the need for some level of development if the Parish is to continue to thrive. Efforts should be made with the active support of the SHDC, and the JLP policy makers to engage with the Church Commissioners to facilitate the removal of the covenants from the one or more of the most appropriate sites in Staverton.</p>	<p>Noted but the group have no authority to negotiate with the Church Commissioners on the land owner's behalf.</p>
Kate Wareham	21	<p>SNP6 3/5.6</p> <p>The site should be added to the site assessment map for information purposes or its location be specified in the text of 5.6</p>	<p>Site numbers need to be added to the site assessment map.</p> <p>Add site 30 to 6.3 and 5.6</p>
Kate Wareham	22	<p>SNP7:</p> <p>Such changes in usage should be protected from later development into dwellings. Examples already exist of modern/recently erected "agricultural" buildings (e.g. stables) morphing into dwellings through change of usage planning applications</p>	<p>Part Q conversions apply only to barns built before March 2013. Existing planning law already covers this issue.</p>
Kate Wareham	24	<p>SNP9: h</p>	<p>We have noted all</p>

		<p>Serious consideration should be given to linking the number of car parking spaces to the number of bedrooms. In a rural community such as ours with limited public transport the need for vehicles extends to young adults of driving age. Houses with 4 or more bedrooms are family homes and can be expected to have more than 2 vehicles. Our roads are generally unsuitable for on road parking</p> <p>In light of the increased level of home working and small home run businesses developments of more than 1 house should also include additional provision for visitor/trades parking since spaces allocated to the dwellings themselves are likely to be already in use at all times of the day</p>	your points.
Kate Wareham	34	<p>SNP15: Planners and SDHC must be seen to actively support these policies and ensure all planning applications maximise the opportunity to aim for zero carbon development</p>	Agree
Kate Wareham	36	<p>Appendix 1 Site map – should have site numbers to allow the reader to easily identify site location Site map – the site identified for business use at Barkingdon should be added to the map</p> <p>Table 2 should be updated e.g. by addition of a new column to highlight new information which has become available since the table was originally drawn up. E.g. currently Table 2 would suggest that sites 8,13, in Staverton ought be the prime candidates for development. So why are they excluded. All sites with restrictive covenants should be noted If site 15 is as unacceptable as indicated in Appendix 3 para 8.3 how did it ever get an overall assessment of good/very good according to table 1 and 2! Inconsistencies weaken arguments and undermine</p>	<p>See above.</p> <p>Add a note to Table 2 to reference evidence paper for final site selections.</p>

		confidence	
Kate Wareham	64-65	P64-65 table needs some explanation of the scoring matrix, is this actually to raw data used to generate Tables 1, how was the ranking established. What is the relationship between Lee Bray total and Group total (guessing group total is the sum of the figures in the green column)	The group and Lee made their assessments separately.
Kate Wareham	18	<p>SNP4: 1 [also p17 4.7 "sites already advanced through the planning system were to be included in the assessment"] It is unclear why the development at Whiteways Farm (0146/18/FUL) which lies within the Memory Cross settlement boundary is excluded from the Plan when Beara Farm (1419/20/FUL) is included. The Whiteways Farm development was first submitted in 2015 as a change in usage not requiring approval, at some time between then and 2018 conversion of single building (barn 9) was begun, application 0146/18/FUL was submitted with specific exclusion of barn 9 in Jan 2018, conditional approval was granted 23 Dec 2019. The land was therefore known to be available for development at the time the site assessments were done, but was not included.</p> <p>The conditional approval for Beara was given in May 2015. Updated plans were submitted in 2018 but rejected. The current plans (conditional approval) were submitted in 2020.</p> <p>Given the overlapping time scales of the planning history of these two sites it is hard to understand why one is included and the other not. Consideration should be made to adding an explanation for this exclusion of Whiteways from the target number of houses in the Plan (e.g. a footnote or addition appendix 1) or better still adding them to the Plan</p> <p>SNP4: 1b It is difficult to see how this provision supports concept of sustainable villages. There is a clear need and desire for affordable housing to encourage young people</p>	<p>The base date of our plan was March 2017. The Whiteway Farm development was agreed before this date Beara Farm original consent lapsed and was reapplied for after the base date.</p> <p>SNP4 Developments of less than 11 houses are not required to provide onsite affordable housing.</p>

		to stay within the Parish. Syphoning funds away to support affordable housing elsewhere would appear to be counter intuitive. The funds levied should be available to support affordable housing within the Parish	
Paul Joyce	All	<p>I've read the Neighbourhood Plan and want to congratulate you all on a well-crafted, well-researched and informative document.</p> <p>I support your initiatives for managing the rate and flow of traffic, particularly in areas where development would increase the number of vehicles. The move towards 20mph speed limits is especially welcome given the increasing numbers of cars.</p> <p>I have no objection to the integration of new homes, provided the proportion of affordable homes remains as stated. I also support the goal to significantly reduce our 'carbon footprint' as a shared initiative to combat climate change.</p> <p>This is a wonderful area in which to live, and with considered, collective action I feel its special qualities can be retained whilst embracing change.</p>	Agree
Sally Parish, Planning Manager (Highways Development Management), Operations		<p>Thank you for providing National Highways with the opportunity to comment on the pre-submission draft of the Staverton Neighbourhood Plan. We are responsible for operating, maintaining and improving the strategic road network (SRN) which in this instance consists of the A38 trunk road which forms the north western boundary to the proposed plan area.</p> <p>Following our review of the draft Plan we are satisfied that the proposed policies within the Plan are unlikely to result in development which will adversely impact the SRN and we therefore have no specific comments to make. This does not however prejudice any future responses National Highways may make on site specific applications as they come forward through the planning process, and which will</p>	<p>We have noted all your points.</p> <p>No action required.</p>

		<p>be considered by us on their merits under the prevailing policy at the time.</p>	
 <p>The Coal Authority <small>SEP</small> Deb Roberts M.Sc. MRTPI Planning & Development Manager – Planning & Development Team</p>		<p>Thank you for your notification below regarding the Staverton Parish Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation.</p> <p>The Coal Authority is only a statutory consultee for coalfield Local Authorities. As South Hams District Council lies outside the coalfield, there is no requirement for you to consult us and / or notify us of any emerging neighbourhood plans.</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>
<p>Michael Jowett ANRAN</p>		<p>Firstly, I would like to say that I think the plan is an excellent document, well thought out and put together and something that the people involved should be proud and will serve the communities well into the future.</p> <p>I think the points about supporting local enterprise is the key to the sustainability of the Parish. This can be in many forms, and I was pleased to see tourism was a major feature which provides year-round jobs. In addition, the encouragement of locally based enterprises to flourish.</p> <p>As you quite rightly stated pubs, schools, the church and village halls are integral to the success of a village. Keeping the Live and Let Live Inn as a viable business is still really a challenge and only survives because of the tourists along with guaranteed business generated from the accommodation at Anran and the local community support.</p> <p>Of course, increasing tourism brings greater traffic to our roads which brings me to the main point. I think we need to have a section that describes what is acceptable to the Parish in terms of traffic and how we intend to address it. We should truly emphasise how important this in the</p>	<p>We have noted all your points.</p>

	<p>document so that it is highlighted to the council and can be used as a reference point.</p> <p>(We were extremely disappointed that planning approval for Rowcroft Hospice to do a small kitchen at ANRAN for their "Devon Farm Kitchen Project" was refused yet it would have created jobs in the area with limited traffic issues and supported local businesses by buying local produce and services) - Bottom line is that they are truly resistant to any changes</p> <p>The other area that we feel strongly about is the need to be able to get to places either by walking or cycling. We need to find a way to connect the villages without using the roads and us not having to drive. (I was happy to see these addressed somewhat in the recent email sent from Staverton.org that was talking about use of public footpaths etc).</p> <p>It would be great to show a Master Plan in the neighbourhood plan as to how we intend to connect the villages within the Parish and also to other Parishes</p> <p>We already have a network of bridle and public footpaths, but these need to be mapped out to see how we can connect them together and potentially approach landowners to give rights of way so they can be joined. Compulsory purchase of edges of land may be needed. Once this is done we need to put pressure on local Government to maintain the pathways and be made fit for purpose.</p> <p>This plan is critical if we are to not only meet environmental goals but as traffic naturally increases, we will need to walk and cycle more and this would make it much easier and safer.</p> <p>On another note I was wondering who iVerde was and</p>	
--	--	--

		<p>where there office is in the Parish as I couldn't find them when I googled .</p> <p>Thanks again to everyone for all their hard work.</p>	
Claire Morgan		<p>Thank you for the time and effort that has gone into this plan. There is no mention as to whether the school at Landscope can accommodate the families of 20 new houses in Landscope, or infact the GP and Dental services in the area. Also it woud appear the independant report gave the yellow overall response for Sites 8, 13, and 15.....all in Staverton have not been short listed by the Neighbourhood plan group although they are given equal colour coded conclusions as to the sites in Landscope that have been selected.</p> <p>There is much to be commended with the report but other Public Services need to be considered (ie GPs + Dentist, and School capacity), not just public transport. It has also ignored the impact of congestion due to increased flow of traffic probably via Cabbage Hill in and out of Landscope towards A38, where as it has stated Staverton Bridge is a pinch point for traffic to the village.</p> <p>I am not against new development and for all the reasons it is required but my overall impression is this is a biased draft document in favour of no development in Staverton.</p>	<p>We are required by the JLP to provide 40 houses in the Parish.</p> <p>JLP took into account the existing infrastructure when designating 40 houses.</p> <p>The district Council advised the group that only sites within or adjacent to the existing settlement boundary could be included in allocations. Neither site 13 nor site 15 satisfy this and site 8 has been withdrawn.</p> <p>We have noted all your points.</p> <p>Refer to Evidence Paper for reasoning.</p>
Anna Lunk		<p>I spent a pleasant hour sitting in the sun in the church porch yesterday morning reading through the</p>	<p>We have noted all your points.</p>

		<p>N.P. Congratulations on getting it to this stage – Please pass my congratulations on to everyone involved.</p> <p>I was pleased to see the strong emphasis on climate change and biodiversity measures although I know it's sometimes difficult to include anything over and above statutory legislation.</p> <p>I was also impressed by SNP4.3 Housing Policy : <i>To help balance housing stock in the parish, the development of smaller houses is encouraged. Proposals of more than 4 bedrooms will be required to provide evidence of need'</i> Is there any way this can be strengthened to a square footage limit? I find it very frustrating that when agricultural buildings are replaced by housing (or other existing buildings) that the planning permission is often restricted to a single home however large the footprint. This is often the case when a small terrace of three smaller houses could take up the same footprint. It would be easy to get round the 4 bedroom criteria with the inclusion of study rooms etc. There are examples in the parish where a barn has been replaced by a very large home costing several times the average parish house price – which as the N.P. points out is already high – Thus increasing the parish housing stock of 'high end' housing. I fail to understand why South Hams insist on these large and expensive homes.</p>	
Hilary Langley	2.14	well summarised objectives for the parish going forward	
Hilary Langley	11	<p>Settlement boundaries policy SNP2 p11 (Sorry, only got in the page number in box above)</p> <p>Would comment that, within the Memory Cross 'settlement' boundary, there is already planning permission for significant development at Whiteway's farm plus there have been two applications for</p>	Whiteway Development could not be included in the allocation as it was approved before the base date of the plan.

		conversion for housing of redundant buildings at Hillcroft, & scope for further development of other barns there. This site virtually adjoins the Whiteway site i.e. Surely any increased housing for the Memory Cross area has already been filled already? Also 3.6, the area around Staverton Bridge is mentioned as second centre of activity for Staverton village but no map appears with a settlement boundary in that area.	We will amend 3.6 to clarify.
Hilary Langley	7	Page 7 point 2.9 says average house price in the parish is £537,000 page 16 point 4.3 says £361,000	We will update both.
Hilary Langley	21	Policy SNP6 page 21 point 3, A site is proposed for light industrial and/or business development at Barkington There is no map to indicate exactly where this proposal is situated. It appears as site 30 in both table 1: suitability of sites page 57 table 2: overall assessment of sites page 63	Will put site 30 on the site map.
Hilary Langley	24	policy snp9: design and construction page 24 Very much in favour of points d & h	We have noted all your points.
Hilary Langley	26	Page 26 point 6.7 I'm really pleased to see 'other heritage assets with no official designation' are mentioned. However, despite a brilliant photograph on p.6 you have not included the Penn Recca chimney as a non-designated asset. The Butter Well at Bumpston Policy SNP6 p. 21. Has been included but the substantial Clapper bridge at this site – a very unusual publicly available structure outside the Dartmoor National Park, has been omitted. I would like to see the Penn Recca chimney & the Bumpston Clapper bridge to be added to point 6.7	We will include in the list.

Hilary Langley	30	SNP12 page 30 Brilliant that this has been made as a separate Policy, it is such a wonderful feature of the Parish!	
Hilary Langley	31	Pages 31 & 32 point 8.4 Policy SNP 13 point 3. I also strongly believe reduced traffic speeds in the parish should indeed be an aim for the future.	Agree
Hilary Langley	34	SNP16 page 34 Sustainable Drainage - Once again, so pleased this has been noted as a separate policy	
Hilary Langley	64	page 64 & 65 I didn't find a key to the site scoring matrix, if this appendix is to be included in the final document, I feel an explanation of the assessment figures should be included.	We have noted all your points. We will add a key.
Hilary Langley	39	Page 39, Map of the sites assessed. Again, if this map is to be included in the final document. I counted 26 sites marked (bit difficult to see on a computer screen) but 30 were assessed, I believe all sites assessed should be shown on the map. eg the one assessed at Barkingdon	Will update map for final plan.
Hilary Langley	1	Congratulations on all the hard work involved in producing this draft document. I have searched through but cannot see any mention of who took the beautiful photographs? (Almost all in stunning weather!) Could you add a credit to the photographer?	
Hilary Gibbard	40	In the Table 1 :Suitability of Sites assessment on page 40 of the Plan Site 1 had no drainage issues identified . On the scoring matrix page 64 site 1 scores 1 for access, drainage and services . In fact there is already a problem with drainage and flooding as rain from Hill House /Church Cross runs in a ditch by the side of the lane and then into a narrow drain under the Shippon at 1 The Stables, then turns a corner at Woolston Green Farmhouse. This ditch and drain have regularly blocked causing flooding during heavy rain and the additional runoff from new roofs and hard surfaces	We are aware of the drain near site 1. Any development on site 1 would be expected to manage surface water in accordance with SNP16. Drainage will need to be contained and managed on the site.

		<p>can only exacerbate this situation.</p> <p>The Plan has a section on page 34 about Sustainable drainage .</p> <p>'All development will be required to deal safely and satisfactorily with foul and surface water drainage without giving rise to flooding either on or beyond the site.</p> <p>POLICY SNP16: SUSTAINABLE DRAINAGE All development should provide for safe and satisfactory foul and surface water drainage, incorporating a Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) that at least meets current standards, incorporating permeable surfaces, water harvesting and storage, green roofs and soakaways, so as to mitigate the risk of flooding which might cause harm to people, property or ecosystems on or beyond the site. No surface water should enter the foul sewage network. '</p>	
Andrew Leslie		<p>overall a commendable effort. well done</p> <p>The problems will emerge during implementation</p> <p>Two areas particularly</p> <p>a) design- there are at least two sites where landowner has created problems for the public highway by not including proper drainage: a classic one is the new tarmac in a gateway near Staverton House opposite the railway marshalling yard</p> <p>b) "new" housing sites coming on the market. Let us hope that "desirable" sites are not approved for "luxurious" spreads contrary to local needs and the Plan</p>	We have noted all your points.
Hilary Langley	72	<p>Page 72 point 9.6 & page 58 to 63</p> <p>Table 2: Overall Assessment of Sites. seem not to correspond. In the 'availability column' all sites are 'understood to be available' when for many, this will only be likely beyond a certain date when restrictive covenants by the Church Commissioners are less valid. I</p>	<p>First sentence of 9.6 to read</p> <p>“ For these reasons land around Staverton has not been put forward by the landowners within the</p>

		think there should be different wording to reflect this and indicate exactly which sites are affected.	timescale of the plan”
Stephanie Parker-Stephenson Lead Adviser (Sustainable Development) Devon, Cornwall & Isles of Scilly Area Team Natural England		<p>Policy SNP2: Settlement boundaries</p> <p>We note that Policy SNP2: Settlement Boundaries supports development within the identified settlement boundary. We accept that the policy includes the caveat that development will be permitted provided that it will cause no significant adverse impacts on natural assets, however, we are concerned that the principle of a presumption in favour of development has not been assessed for its potential to have adverse impacts on the natural environment.</p> <p>We note that the settlement boundaries for Staverton and Woolston Green have been adapted from those identified in the Thriving Towns and Villages Settlement Boundary Topic Paper that was prepared for the Plymouth and South West Devon Joint Local Plan, though the settlement boundaries were not adopted in the JLP. Natural England advise that further evidence is prepared (which could be prepared in the form of an update to Appendix 2) to describe the methodology used in deciding where to position the proposed settlement boundaries, and to justify the inclusion of any undeveloped land within the boundary.</p> <p>This evidence will be required to support the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) screening process.</p>	<p>An SEA will b carried out.</p> <p>Ensure that AECOM look at settlement boundaries.</p>
Stephanie Parker-Stephenson Lead Adviser (Sustainable Development) Devon, Cornwall & Isles of Scilly Area Team Natural England		<p>Policy SNP4: Housing Development</p> <p>Part of the plan area, which includes the location of the two proposed housing allocations, is within the Greater Horseshoe Bat sustenance zone for the South Hams SAC. The competent authority will need to take this into consideration in their Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA).</p>	As above
Stephanie Parker-Stephenson Lead Adviser (Sustainable		<p>Appendix 1 – _Sites Assessment</p> <p>Natural England welcomes the inclusion of the detailed site assessments, and the clear description</p>	Ask South Hams to put original numbers on all the sites assessed.

<p>Development) Devon, Cornwall & Isles of Scilly Area Team Natural England</p>		<p>of how sites were identified, assessed and selected. However, it would be difficult, for someone with limited knowledge of the plan area, to match up the descriptions of the site locations from tables 1 and 2 with the site polygons shown on the map (page 39). Could the map be amended to show the site boundaries (so it is clear if there are two different sites adjacent to each other) and to include labels for the site numbers?</p> <p>Whilst Paragraph 9.2 indicates that landscape and ecological impacts were considered as part of the site assessment, it isn't clear what sources of evidence were used to support the conclusions made in Table 1: Suitability of sites. We refer you to the attached annex which covers the issues, opportunities, and sources of environmental information that should be considered when preparing a Neighbourhood Plan. In particular, the advice relating to the consideration of landscape and ecological issues should be noted.</p>	<p>p.39</p> <p>This will be available on final documnet</p>
<p>Lyn Brown</p>		<p>Thank you for all the work that has gone into this document and for the public meetings.</p> <p>My concerns are still over the number of houses that the parish has been charged with providing. I don't think the infrastructure, especially the roads, will cope with the addition of 20 houses in Landscope, meaning at least 40 cars on already busy and narrow roads. I hope that smaller sites, with one or two houses, will be able to be included in the plan at a later date.</p> <p>A minor point - it might be useful to update the photo of the Victory Hall since it's refurbishment</p>	<p>We have noted all your points.</p> <p>Actioned</p>
<p>Aurotal Ltd,</p>		<p>As owners of the Staverton Mill site (Site 15) we welcome it's consideration in the Neighbourhood Plan (NP). The site has been consistently identified throughout the NP process as having significant potential for housing delivery, ranking #2 in the Site Scoring Matrix (SSM) with scores of average/good/very good throughout. We understand</p>	<p>The District Council made it clear that Site 15 is not within or adjacent to the existing settlement boundary and the NP group have decided that this area does not constitute a</p>

	<p>the need to focus on the primary village centre, and would agree with the assessment of Section 5.4 of Appendix 2 that the site falls within the 'secondary centre' and that ideally other sites would be brought forward in advance of this one. However the rationale set out in 8.3 then appears inconsistent with the SSM and we feel does not fairly reflect the potential of this site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It describes the site as being 'not close' to the village centre, despite being approximately 800m away, with both direct road and off-road pedestrians routes. • The site is indeed within the flood zone, but the SSM notes that 'flood protection measures are likely to be necessary' not that this issue renders the site undevelopable. This is a more appropriate description given its previous use, the extant B1 consent and current advise. • The analysis notes 'poor access and parking', but there is no mention of this in the main SSM analysis which states 'Vehicular access to the site is good'. • Finally it suggests that the site would deliver 'few affordable homes because of viability issues'. This being despite the fact that the site could, on the basis of the NP's own assessment, be able to accommodate about 8 dwellings, or more if flatted development were considered. This would mean that at a minimum the site would have to deliver a 	<p>secondary centre.</p> <p>The group are not allocating the site but this does not prevent the owners putting it forward for development in the normal way.</p> <p>SSM to be updated to identify the problems of access.</p> <p>Reason it scored highly because it is the only</p>
--	---	---

	<p>commuted sum equivalent to 30% of development value. If a flatted scheme of over 11 units were considered, it would then deliver affordable housing on site. This would likely also be homes of a smaller size which the plan notes are needed in the area. Additionally as we have indicated previously, and as noted in the SSM, 'Viability [is] unlikely to be an issue'.</p> <p>We are concerned by these inconsistencies between the main analysis and the decision/summary of Appendix 2. The specific reference to the site in Paragraph 8.3 of Appendix 2, which is unnecessarily negative given that the site has the potential to deliver homes within Staverton's secondary centre, including affordable units, should the anticipated suitable sites referred to in the NP not become available at the end of the plan periods when restrictive covenants expire. We are also unclear as to why this site has been singled out for example reference in the summary given these inconsistencies.</p> <p>Additionally the SSM should also be amended to correct the planning status of the site, which references a 'lapsed' consent. The B1 consent for the development of office accommodation is an extant consent, with utilities and foundations already constructed onsite, and written confirmation provided by the local authority to confirm that development has commenced.</p>	<p>brownfield site.</p> <p>We scored all sites on the basis of the pepperpot approach which was then excluded a number of sites.</p> <p>Noted. This will be amended p.49</p>
--	---	--

		<p>We would welcome the opportunity for continued further communication with the NP team to discuss how the site might be presented more consistently, and how the site might be able to positively support the aspirations of the Neighbourhood Plan in the future.</p>	
<p>Claire Jennings</p>		<p>My main concerns are about the increased level of traffic through the centre of Landscope as this is the main through fare for traffic to both Landscope and Staverton from the A38. This is not only from a safety point of view, but also increased traffic noise and pollution.</p> <p>With an expectation of both Landscope & Staverton to accommodate around 20 dwellings each over the plan period, and an average of two vehicles per property, the new developments could bring around an extra 80 vehicles to the area.</p> <p>Under the proposed plans, and if the developments do go ahead where the Housing Sites are marked in red on the Proposals Map (page 76), the current housing within the settlement boundary at Landscope / Woolston Green could see an increase in vehicles of perhaps 50% or more.</p> <p>The proposed site (28) at Beara Farm is on an already</p>	<p>Noted. 20 dwellings in Landscope and 20 dwellings in Staverton have been identified in the JLP rather than chosen by this group.</p>

	<p>difficult bend in the road and extra vehicles turning in and out of this site present an extra level of danger to both walkers and other users of the road.</p> <p>The proposed site (1) between Landscope Church and Woolston Green would again bring a high increase in traffic that would need to turn in from, and out onto, a single track road.</p> <p>Off road parking is already very limited and with visitors to these new properties, there could well be a significant increase to the number of parked cars on the road sides causing more difficult and dangerous situations for the people and animals in the village.</p> <p>Landscope village is a deeply rural parish and it would be so sad to see it expand by such a high proportion and lose some of the peace and quiet and possibly the close knit community feel.</p> <p>I do hope that a fairer split of the location of new housing will be considered with not such a large proportion within the settlement boundary at Landscope.</p>	
Joanna O'Brien	<p>Following conversations with various people at the meeting held at the Court Room and further thought I would now like to voice my concerns as follows: The number of sites considered in both Parishes has resulted in ONLY 1 site coming forward for 6 open market houses, using only half the field identified?! I cannot understand how in all honesty this can be put forward when the houses of this type are not required. I live opposite the site and do not in principal object to it being built on for the correct need. However with an identified need of 19 affordable houses only 5 of which were designated before the local Plan existed out of a total of 29</p>	Outside our remit.

		possible houses to be built I cannot support this proposal being submitted to South Hams. I understand all the reasons given why more affordable houses cannot be built but the Council needs to be encouraged to change the planning regulations so that only needed houses are built, especially when they are green field sites. We are lucky in Landscope that we have an excellent primary school, many young local families would love the opportunity to live here; how wonderful would it be for them to be given that chance	
Jo Reece	2	This details the settlement boundaries for Landscope and is related to the later policy points about housing provision. The development at Whyteways Farm which is underway and would provide approx. 9 homes is not mentioned on the plan nor in the numbers for housing however this largely falls within Landscope and does not include any affordable housing but increases the overall delivery number by approx. a third. Why is this not a consideration.	As answered previously this development was granted permission before the base date.
Jo Reece	5	Affordable housing now has a very wide definition and an affordable rent at 80% of the open market rent is very unlikely to be affordable to those who need the homes. It would be helpful for the plan to specify that the sub market rents would be set at social rent levels approx. 60% of the open market rents. Maintaining dwellings as affordable through a percentage reduction on market value, whilst a nice idea, significantly limits the lenders available for mortgages which potentially will leave home owners having to wait a long time to get buyers. Has any consideration been given to putting the "Devon rule" in place which restricts purchasers to living or working in Devon for a specified period. Exception site affordable housing should be delivered by Community Land Trusts in partnership with Housing Associations to ensure that homes remain affordable in perpetuity and are allocated within the local community. It is suggested that there can be no development in	<p>We have noted all your points.</p> <p>We are constrained by the parameters set by the JLP.</p> <p>The increase in traffic will have been considered in the JLP.</p>

