

## REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION RESPONSES : 2nd December 2019 - 20th January 2020

1

South Huish Neighbourhood Development Plan

REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION RESPONSES : 2nd December 2019 - 20th January 2020

					<p><b>Surveillance:</b> Places where all publicly accessible spaces are overlooked; have a purpose and are well managed to prevent creating areas that could attract criminal activity, the antisocial to gather or for unacceptable behaviour such as dumping, dog fouling and littering etc. to go unnoticed</p> <p><b>Ownership:</b> Places that promote a sense of ownership, respect, territorial responsibility and community</p> <p><b>Physical protection:</b> Places that include necessary, well-designed security features</p> <p><b>Activity:</b> Places where the level of human activity is appropriate to the location and creates a reduced risk of crime, fear of crime and a sense of safety at all times</p> <p><b>Management and maintenance:</b> Places that are designed with management and maintenance in mind to discourage crime, fear of crime and ASB</p> <p>On a final note and in the hope of not sounding too pedantic it is Secured by Design as oppose to Secure by Design – Thank you.</p>		
26	Rossiter, David	No			There is no consideration for the next generation Too much I'm all right Jack. Where has the plan allowed for growth and sustainability of our communities Copy of proposed Galmpton Settlement boundary on file.	Policy SH H1 and H3 addresses the need for more affordable housing. However the needs for you families/ starter homes should be developed further. Proposed Settlement boundaries to be reviewed based on this and other comments	Figures 14 and 15 have been reviewed against this and other comments by the NPG. It is concluded that the boundary in the vicinity of Burton Farm and the East of Galmpton should be amended to more accurately reflect the historic boundary of Galmpton
27	Edwina Smart	Yes			JOE HART EMAIL RE HA'S Can I remind you back in September, Edwina proposed two additional Historical Assets, the Coastguard Terrace and the Rocket House in Inner Hope. After a flurry of emails and to avoid more delays, it was decided to leave these additions until after consultation when further updating of the NP was likely to be necessary. If we are to include Coastguard Terrace, it makes sense to combine the Terrace with the Washhouse and also include the old Duty Room, which are all part of the original 1854 Coastguard Station. I've already roughed out a draft which I forward shortly together with the Rocket House. I've hit a small problem with the Rocket House which I hope you can help to resolve using your connections with the Archive Group. I've no idea when the Rocket House finished its coastguard duties but presume it was sold shortly after the new Coastguard Station was opened. Any information would be appreciated. There's local support for these assets and you will be aware of the many outrageous proposals originating from Mr Bramley. It's only a matter of time before an unscrupulous developer spots more profit in the Rocket House and the grounds to the Old Coastguard Station. ALSO LETTER FROM 8th JAN FROM EDWINA - DOES THIS NEED TO BE INCORPORATED HERE????	Noted	Coastguard Terrace and Rocket House to be considered as LHAs but before their inclusion the NPG must seek owner's approval. No change until landowner's consent is forthcoming
28	Mr & Mrs Cook	Yes			6.3.7 Policy SH Env5 Locality Important Views. We agree with the current selection, but believe it to be very important to indicate the views to and from Hope Barton Barns along the public footpath belonging to the National Trust. These are in our opinion are as important as the others and should be protected. We can send images of the views if required.	Noted, however Hope Barton is outside the parish boundary. A viewpoint from outside the parish could not be considered however a view to Hope Cove from the vicinity of Hope Barton can be considered.	Additional view from the vicinity of Hope Barton eastwards across the parish to be added.
29	James Kirkwood	No			SH T3 Footpaths This should include clauses to address the concerns of the 76% of respondents to the Neighbourhood Plan Consultation about dog fouling. This issue is identified in Figure 7.0 as that of greatest concern but is not addressed in the plan as it stands. In view of its importance I suggest it needs a separate policy addressing various measures (notices, signs, enforcement etc) to tackle the problem.	Dog fouling is recognised as a problem in the plan and supporting surveys however the policies must focus on land use and issues affecting planning applications so a policy on preventing dog fouling is outside the scope of the plan	No changes
					Figure 7.0 identifies dog fouling as the issue that the greatest number of respondents to the neighbourhood plan consultation were concerned about. 193 (76%) were concerned about this. The Plan does not address this major concern. I have suggested above that it could partly be addressed in Policy SH T3 but the Plan should go further than this but fouling is not limited to footpaths. It is a problem on the beaches and in the countryside of the Parish also. As I have suggested, I think this could be best tackled by a specific policy that focuses on the issue in view of its great importance to residents and visitors.	see above	No change
30	Marina Neophytou & Susan Watts Historic Environment Officers, Devon County Council Historic Environment Team				<p>1.0 Introduction, Page 5</p> <p>1.1 Suggest mention in introduction that the parish includes the villages of South Huish, Inner Hope and Outer Hope.</p> <p>Could move paras 5.2.1 and 5.2.2 to the introduction as they set the scene well.</p> <p>Evidence for occupation and activity in the parish stretches back further than the Iron Age. Suggest change to prehistoric period (see 5.2 below).</p> <p>Could mention reference to South Huish in Domesday Book of 1086 here. South Huish was first recorded as Heuis in the Domesday Survey of 1086. Various forms of Huish were later recorded, but by 1302 the more familiar sounding name Suththysh was recorded in the Assize Rolls.</p> <p>2.2 Themes, Aims and Objectives Page 9</p> <p>Historic built environment and heritage.</p> <p>To include protection of above and below ground designated and non-designated heritage assets and that an appropriate record is made of archaeological evidence that may be affected by development. (See National Planning Policy Framework 2019, paragraph 199 (NPPF)).</p> <p>3.1 Page 10</p> <p>Suggest addition - Enhance the Historic Environment with heritage assets not previously recorded. (or, with newly discovered).</p>	All noted. NPG consider 5.2.1 and 5.2.2 are better suited to the their existing location on the history of the parish.	1.1 to be amended 2.2 amended. 3.1 amended.
					<p>5.2.3 Suggest split para 5.2.3 into two paragraphs. The first paragraph on the prehistoric and Roman periods. The second on the Saxon and medieval period. What is the evidence for the following? There are also remains of earlier Bronze Age (2300 to 700BC) artefacts just North of Galmpton. During the Roman period there is evidence that South Huish was used for mainly stock farming and this continued into the Saxon period. There are several heritage assets within the parish that indicate early settlement during the prehistoric period and include four nationally important designated sites. Two of the Scheduled Monuments comprise Late Neolithic/Bronze Age (2300 to 700BC), barrow cemeteries made up of several round barrows. One of the cemeteries is located above the cliffs at Families and the other near Graystone Lodge. The west coastline of the parish is dominated by Bolt Tail where there remain the earthworks of a scheduled Iron Age fort (700BC and 50AD), known as Bolt Tail Camp. The presence of a high ground enclosure appears to be a key component of an Iron Age trading point. The fort is barely visible from the sea but has a strong impact when approached from inland. The entrance way may be intentionally aligned to give a view of Burgh Island to the north. Severe erosion of some of the earthworks have been reported. (You could highlight this to Historic England and perhaps get a management plan in place, it is not on at risk register). Within the Iron Age camp are mounds thought to be round barrows which date to the late Neolithic - Bronze Age period. On the eastern side of the parish is another Iron Age settlement known as Burleigh Dolts. Geophysical survey of the site revealed several previously unknown archaeological features of possible prehistoric date, including two possible round houses or barrows, a segmented enclosure and structures within the circuit of the hillfort. As well as these designated sites, further evidence of prehistoric occupation in the parish is indicated in the recovery of flint tools, including a Palaeolithic hand axe. A Hadrianic Roman coin was found in the parish and the state of the coin suggest it continued in use throughout second century. A map showing the four Scheduled Monuments may be good. Scheduled monuments such as these attract visitors. It is worth noting in this section that the earliest documentary reference of South Huish is in Domesday Survey as this indicates Saxon settlement. 5.3.4 Page 21 Perhaps a good place to mention Historic Landscape Characterisation where remnants of medieval and post-medieval field systems including strip fields, Barton Fields and orchards, may still survive. These can be considered when development is proposed. Information on the Historic Landscape Characterisation can be followed via link <a href="https://new.devon.gov.uk/historic-environment/the-devon-historic-environment-record/historic-landscape-characterisation/">https://new.devon.gov.uk/historic-environment/the-devon-historic-environment-record/historic-landscape-characterisation/</a> 5.6 Page 24 There are 27 grade II listed buildings and 1 Grade I*. Images of some of the characterful listed buildings would add a bit more depth here, perhaps the ruins of the Church of St Andrew and include a sentence or two with dates. Include some of the</p>	All noted and will be used as the basis for additional text.	Add additional text based on this draft and add reference to an additional appendix covering scheduled monuments, listed buildings and non designated heritage assets.
					Further suggestions for NP or future projects. South Hams District Council as of yet do not oversee local lists for each parish and although there are a number of non-designated heritage assets already recorded on the Historic Environment Record (HER) and mention of several in the NP Policy SH HBE 1 Non-Designated Heritage Assets) there can always be further additions. Features such as cobbled pavements, decorative gates, finger posts, former fountain heads, planters, a special tree etc., anything that you think contributes towards the special character of the parish can be mentioned and these can be added to our HER as a non-designated heritage asset. This will emphasise the importance of the asset and ensure it is considered in planning. This could be a future project for school children and members of the parish as this may give a wider perspective on what features are important to the community. The ones you have listed will be added to the HER if they are not already recorded. You can also recommend non-designated heritage assets to Historic England for listing. Many towns and villages around the country are reinstating some of their orchards and creating community orchards, which a parish such as Modbury could benefit from. The Orchard Project works in partnership with communities to plant, manage, restore and harvest orchards in community areas. This link provides further information <a href="http://www.theorchardproject.org.uk/">http://www.theorchardproject.org.uk/</a> .	Noted for future reference but no changes to the NDP	No change
31	Anne Rossiter	Yes			I would like the village boundary re visited just to be sure we are not ruling out small development specifically for young people or older residents that wish to downsize, leaving their existing home for those with families. Definitely any additional houses should have a local covenant on them, possible a trust??. In filling in gardens should be purely for full time occupancy and again with covenant. No more holiday homes or accommodation. I understand from discussion at the drop in meeting that if the boundary line stays as suggested in this plan there would still be an opportunity for development for old and young as mentioned above. Will South Hams support this deviation from plan?.	Proposed settlement boundaries to be reviewed based on this and other comments. Opportunities do exist for additional affordable/ starter homes through exception sites as policy SH H3. SHDC have also commented on the Plan draft.	Figures 14 and 15 have been reviewed against this and other comments by the NPG. It is concluded that the boundary in the vicinity of Burton Farm and the East of Galmpton should be amended to more accurately reflect the historic boundary of Galmpton
					Where ever possible support should be given to local business of fishing, agriculture etc in order to maintain the character of the village, whilst providing positivity for the future.	Noted and already reflected in SH EC02 and SH ED01	No change
32	Ms J Kirkwood	No			Page 13 7.0 Concerns. This section asks us about our concerns within the parish. The parish response indicates that the main concern of our residents and second highest priority is dog fouling. 193 respondents mention this out of 254 (76%). This matter, unless I am mistaken, is not mentioned anywhere again. Should this plan not address this problem as it is such a concern for many of us? I walk the coast path regularly and have to avoid dog mess and dog mess bags every time I do. The dog bins in the village overflow and people then just throw the mess on the ground around them. A hideous sight in our beautiful village. Would any of us want the unpleasant task of clearing this up? Perhaps we should remove all the bins and replace them with signs suggesting everyone takes their rubbish home, as we always used to do? Or at least so if the bins are full? I don't think it's the responsibility of the council and I wouldn't want to see more ugly bins in the village. Perhaps we do need better signs encouraging people to clean up their mess.	Dog fouling is recognised as a problem in the plan and supporting surveys however the policies must focus on land use and issues affecting planning applications so a policy on preventing dog fouling is outside the scope of the plan	No changes
33	Joe Hart	yes			<p>Policy SH Env3. Safeguarding the biodiversity and Green Infrastructure throughout the Parish. C) Page 34. Agree But should also include in item 'd', Old Devon Stone Walls and the importance of matching local stone.</p> <p>'Aspirational' Policy SH Env 7. Reduction of existing flood risk. Page 40. Disagree. Disagree not in principle, but with the detail. Other than figure 18 on page 41, you're forced to explore the appendix to establish the extent of the flood risk and understand some the detail in the Atkins report. There should be an easily understood explanation within the main text including the Environment Agency flood risk zone 3 and a 1 in 100 or greater annual probability of flooding, and that 23 vulnerable properties are in the flood plain and a number of properties have flooded. Figure 18, the flood plain map, should be accompanied by the Meadow View photograph for visual clarity.</p> <p>The policy should make it abundantly clear that no development should take place within the flood plain and any development in the vicinity must demonstrate that it will have a negative effect on the flood risk. No surface water should be discharged into the stream or the flood channel and that any surface water is appropriately managed by enhanced soakaways or SUDS areas. Many locals are disappointed by the two decades of flood risk denial by SHDC and sceptical that there will even be any positive action. Basically, the language and policy should be far more uncompromising.</p> <p>Policy SH Env 8. Drainage Impact. Page 41. Disagree. See comment for Aspirational Policy SH Env 7. Reduction of existing flood risk.</p> <p>Policy SH H1 Affordable Housing. Page 45. Agree. In the 2015 Questionnaire, a majority supported Community Led Housing (16.6%). This was confirmed at the 2019 workshop and most agreed that there would be a greater demand for affordable housing to rent rather than purchase.</p> <p>Policy SH H2 Principle Residence. Page 46. Agree. I welcome the Principle Residence Policy but there are loopholes opportunities for unprincipled developers to continue to exploit our existing homes for profit. The extension that ultimately leads to the property dividing into two flats. The large family home turned into multiple holiday letting apartments. The garden annex or development.</p> <p>Policy SH H3 at Exception Sites outside the settlement boundary. Page 46. Agree. Disagree with item 'e'. At SHDC's discretion, 40% open market homes to finance a few affordable homes is difficult for our dwindling Hope Cove residents to accept. We have 75% holiday houses, left empty for most of the year and rising at 2% a year while our local population continues to plummet. Building open market houses on AONB exception sites will just perpetuate the problem. Aspirational Policy SH T1: Improved traffic management... d. Page 47. Agree. But I disagree with part of item 'd'. We don't want our village permanently ruined by a parking solution for what is essentially a temporary seasonal parking problem. Policy SH HBE 1 Non-Designated Heritage Assets. Page 62. Agree. There is a small error with number 8. Longstone was the Parsonage not a Sea Captain's House and should be removed. For the record, there are four additional LHAs I would like to propose, the Old Coastguard Station, the Rocket House, Pigeon Post and Garden Cottage. Policy SH HBE 3: Design Quality within the Parish. Page 58. Agree. But possibly also include matching local stone.</p>	Noted On policy SH Env 7 and 8 it is standard practice to refer to evidence in appendices. Extra photos to be added it is also important not to repeat guidance from the EA who are consultees to planning applications	SH Env 3 d, Env 7, Env 8 and figure 18 to be revised. No changes to SH H1 and H2

South Huish Neighbourhood Development Plan

REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION RESPONSES : 2nd December 2019 - 20th January 2020

						There is one important policy subject missing from our Neighbourhood Plan - Climate Change. Today, even our sceptical and slow moving SHDC have recognised there's a Climate Change Emergency and have established a working group. There is only one small reference in our plan, paragraph 5.8 on page 25, referring to climate change and flooding. During the span of our plan it is likely Hope Cove will have to consider a steel gate across the Inner Hope slipway to prevent surge tide flooding and major alterations to our Harbour Breakwater. The cliff face between Inner and Outer Hope is crumbling with a real threat of collapse in front of the Lobster Pod, destroying the coastal footpath and main sewer from Inner Hope. By 2034 high tides will threaten the sewage reception tanks by Harbour Beach and there will be further coastal erosion to the north of Mouthwell Beach. There's no doubt climate change is a major threat to Hope Cove's seaward boundary, so what will our policy be, follow the usual SHDC action plan and do nothing or plan for climate change now.	Noted, the NPG to direct if an additional policy is added on Climate Change. This should be additional to the policies of the JLP e.g. Dev 32 Delivering Low Carbon Development.	Additional policy has been considered. Adding an additional policy at this stage is problematic as it could undermine the Reg 14 process and the HRA/SEA screening. It was agreed by the NPG that the existing policies of Plan the JLP on Climate Change are sufficient, therefore no change.
34	Tony & Trudy Rowe	Yes				Appendix B13 - Mariners is our permanent residence and we are on the electoral roll Questionnaire 4 - amenities There is no safe footpath between Galmpton and the sea which is an important visitor and local fitness route. In the winter, Beacon Lane is impassable because of flooding and heavy tractor ruts. I understand that Mr Rossiter used to leave a 5 metre strip along the field edge adjacent to Beacon Lane but this no longer exists. An ideal 'permissive path' would link the footpath up from the church and then down the field line to near the Coastal Footpath. It would only require breaching a couple of hedges to make a continuous path and would be a major asset to the amenities of the area. Light Pollution It is illogical to have one street light in Galmpton (which I presume was a requirement for the Ben's Close Council estate when first built and simply lingered on). Removal of this light would considerably enhance the rural ambience of the village Enhancing the environment Currently the Galmpton village green does not comply with Devon County Council and the agreed Wildlife Trust policy for 'managing road verges for wildlife' It is an unsecured for rank grass area which has been neglected and poorly managed for wildlife - it should be managed in accordance with the current best practice to encourage wild flowers and pollinators whilst maintaining traffic safety - if Kingsbridge can do it, we can! Questionnaire 6 Public Safety 6.3 The road from Galmpton to Hope Cove is narrow and unsafe. Many comments have been made that traffic is too fast in this area. The South Hams speed policy is most inconsistent - the villages to the east of Kingsbridge, which are considerably safer than our road, are 20mph for long stretches. We require the entire stretch from the entry to Galmpton and throughout the Hope Cove area to be 20mph with two speed indicators - one at the start and one half way down the road facing both ways. The speed indicators in Marlborough are most effective. Ideally, a footpath parallel to the road should be established, particularly for the narrow sections.	Appendix B13 to be updated. Policy SH13 identifies the need for a new/improved footpath between Galmpton, Hope Cove and other settlements. However as yet a route has not been identified or landowner permission given. Policy SH Env 4 promotes the avoidance of light pollution. It is beyond the scope of an NDP to remove existing lights- this needs to be referred to the PC and onwards to DCC. Similarly managing road verges is beyond the scope of an NDP but will be referred to the PC. Policy SH T1 promotes improved traffic management in the Parish however the detail and new measures are the responsibility of DCC via the PC	Update ownership schedule and refer matters beyond the scope of an NDP to the PC and DCC
35	Edwina Smart	Yes	Yes	5.2.3 & 5.2.4	Disagree	Hope Barton Farm Should be included.	Please note Hope Barton Farm is outside the parish boundary	No change
				5.2.9 & 5.6	Disagree	I don't think the Coastguard Cottages are listed Grade 2 The telephone Box (Inner Hope) is listed.	Confirm Coastguard Cottages are not listed nor included in Appendix B9. The telephone box is included and added to the text	Delete ref to Coastguard Cottages as listed and update text
				6.3.3 Fig 14	Disagree	Why does the proposed settlement boundary our right across the centre and closely around my property (Laggan)	The boundary is based on the adopted 2011 version	Figure 14 has been reviewed by the NPG however the existing boundary in the Vicinity of Laggan is based on the 2011 development boundary and Topic Paper 2 informing the JLP. It was concluded there should be no change.
				6.3.5		Devon Walls should be included, if not in this policy then in the appropriate one.	Noted	Devon walls added to the text of SH Env 3
				6.7.3		To include: 1) Terrace & Outbuildings, Inner Hope Coastguard Cottages 2) Rocket House, Inner Hope, 3) Chapel Garden, Inner Hope, 4) Kissing Gate, Inner Hope (Bolt Tail), 5) All Cottage outbuildings if not listed 6) House Names	Noted, NPG to consider additions subject to owner's approval, a contemporary kissing gate would not satisfy the Historic England Criteria, nor house names and outbuildings in the vicinity of listed buildings or heritage assets will be considered with them. See also SH HBE 2	LHAs will be added if satisfying HE criteria and supported by the building owner. No change until landowner consent is forthcoming.
				Appen dix 3 LGS1		Spray Cottage lane should read Hope Barton (NT) Lane, visual amenity, valued open space	Inclusion of LGS1 to be reviewed together with Appendix 3	Review LGS1 and amend Appendix 3
				LGS3		There are four public seats	Inclusion of LGS 3 to be reviewed together with Appendix 3	Review LGS3 and amend Appendix 3
				Appen dix 4 V3		To include To south side entrance of the Cottage Hotel, currently obscured by a hedge (recently planted) offering extensive views (panoramic) can watch boats & ships coming in and out of Plymouth. The whole area from St Clements to Outer Hope north boundary and beyond is a continuous view taking in Bolt Tail and down to Dodhan Point in Cornwall and Ediston Lighthouse etc	Comment not clear, or if it relates to the view or the description. NPG to investigate further and if necessary re-photograph the view and amend the description.	Review V3 and amend appendix as required.
				Appen dix 5 LHAs		To include: 1. Terrace of Coastguard Cottages & Outbuildings, 2. Rocket House, 3. All cottage outbuildings (if not listed) (Inner Hope), 4. Devon Stone Walls (Inner & Outer H), 5. Kissing Gate (by old lifeboat station Inner Hope) 6. House Names Additional comments regarding the history of the above mentioned properties/walls etc also received.	Repeat of comment above/NPG to consider additions subject to owner's approval, a contemporary kissing gate would not satisfy the Historic England Criteria, nor house names and outbuildings in the vicinity of listed buildings or heritage assets will be considered with them. See also SH HBE 2	LHAs will be added if satisfying HE criteria and supported by the building owner. No change until landowner consent is forthcoming.
						It would appear that there is a track marked in a black broken line that runs through The Holt land, passed Mallards and up onto Bolt Tail southwards. I'm not sure if this is a PROW, bridleway, farm track etc but it may be relevant as a right of access	Mapping is sourced from Ordnance Survey and Parish online including PROWs. Confirm the land across the HOLT is not a PROW see figure 19	No change
36	Mark Brooks	Yes	No			SH ENV1 Settlement Boundary  DISAGREE Expand to include within the red boundary line the properties as marked on hard copy as posted to address provided. Specifically our property Eldore. These properties should not be excluded or required to be treated as an exceptional site for any future planning. There appears to be no provision within the draft proposal for any development of the local community particularly with regard to services and dwellings for young or ageing population. Thank you for taking the time to review, please confirm receipt of hard copy map. My email contact is mark@puurfloors.com	Proposed settlement boundaries to be reviewed based on this and other comments. Opportunities do exist for additional affordable / starter homes through exception sites as policy SH H3.	Figures 14 and 15 have been reviewed against this and other comments by the NPG. It is concluded that the boundary to the east of Galmpton should be amended to more accurately reflect the historic boundary of Galmpton. It is still considered that 'Eldore' is outside a logical settlement boundary and is in open countryside and the policies of the JLP should apply.
37	Steve Pearson		Yes			Policy SH H2 Point D - This refers to replacing an existing dwelling, but needs qualification, something like "A replacement dwelling is defined as a single new build dwelling replacing an existing dwelling, of equivalent size and design as the original dwelling." Policy SH H3 Point E - I think that the 40% is too high and should be around the 25% mark. Also I think it needs a clause to stop the developer turning round late and saying that the affordable properties are not selling in order to release them to open market. As the planning permission would be granted on the basis of them being affordable, then the must be sold as such, regardless of how long this takes.  The definition of affordable in relation to house prices must reflect the average salary of the parish and not a county or national figure. SHDC must be prepared to stand by the policies of this document otherwise it would all have been a waste of time!	Noted, the max of 40% open market homes to support affordable housing on Exception sites is a requirement of the JLP and can not be reduced in an NDP. Please also note SH H1 defining Affordable Housing and maintaining them in perpetuity  Affordable Housing comes in various forms for rent, starter homes for purchase and discounted market sale homes. These are all defined nationally. A copy will be made available as an Appendix to the plan and on the parish website	SH H2 to be expanded to define a replacement dwelling  Appendix B19 added showing the NPPF definition of affordable housing
38	Carol Riley		Yes			I would particularly like to agree and support the following policies SHT1 Traffic Management SHT2 Car Parking On street parking must be addressed for public safety and access for emergency vehicles. This particularly includes The Square in front of The Hope & Anchor, The Triangle, and New Road  I would also like to strongly agree to SH Env 7 With the ever changing climate and extreme weather conditions, greater emphasis of improvements & maintenance to eliminate regular flooding in the village should be a priority	Noted	No Changes
39	Thomas Windle		Yes			Please note - I submitted a test comment form early in the process - this response is my official one. I am generally content with the Plan. I would like to see a move toward a 20 mile an hour speed limit in the parish. I should also like to know how a resident's condition on any development can be enforced.	Noted, setting of speed limits is outside the scope of the NDP and policy SH T1 and should be referred to the PC and DCC. Conditions will be attached to planning consents by SHDC	No changes
40	Owen Bramley	Yes	yes			Policy SH HBE1 Makes specific reference to the Wash House as 'a rare example of this kind of building possibly the last remaining in the country as no examples can be found on listings of Heritage England'. Which qualified person is making these statements please? These are subjective statements that require qualification. There is a reason that such buildings no longer exist - they are functionally obsolete. The building is clearly economically unviable in its current layout, just as it has been since the 19th century. If of regular use in the early 20th century and certainly since it has been in the current ownership for 30 years plus. As such it requires a sympathetic approach to either refurbish and extend it to create some modern day use, or to replace it with an efficient modern building. It continues to fall into disrepair and without a planning permission to extend the facility by refurbishing/redeveloping, it will only become more derelict and an eyesore. As such, until evidence of its uniqueness to warrant such a designation is provided we object to this policy.  Policy SH ENV4 We feel that we regretfully we must object, in particular the LGS1 designation and the associated Appendix B12. The land south of the Coastguard Cottages Inner Hope (Streamside Plots). This is neither particularly beautiful, as it is currently unmanicured, nor can it be a significant wildlife site as it is too small and contrary to the general claims of Appendix B17, it is not home to a multitude of significant species. Whilst we are not experts, we are country people, and are fairly certain that amphibians, for instance, would have great difficulty making home in the relatively fast flowing stream. It seems to us that this wildlife report is general in nature and could be applied to any piece of undeveloped land in the locality. The statement that "The site has remained undeveloped and unutilised due to regular flooding from the stream and coastal flooding on high spring tides" is untrue. Since it has been in our ownership it has never flooded, given its proximity to the outflow direct onto the beach just a short distance away. 'The proximity to the sea and a NIT CWS upstream, makes the site a significant green corridor' we would also contend is not correct. At the meeting with the Parish council that we attended asking for suggestions as to how best use the land, we were informed that the village would like this area to be used for the benefit of the local community, and we were vilified for leaving it unmanicured. The neighbourhood plan is now suggesting, to the contrary, that it should be protected as is. We would also like to point out that the footpath running between Spray Cottage Lane and Bobbery Road is a private pedestrian right of way.  Para 6.7.5 Whilst this is not a policy, we would like to challenge this statement and ask on what basis the designation has been proposed, that 'the area of open land south of Spray cottage, the Old Outy Room and the Coastguard cottages is important to the village setting and should not be compromised'. We contend that the land, given its proximity to the slipway, sympathetically improved, could be better used to enhance access to and enjoyment of the coast, (whilst also improving emergency access for the lifeboat), as infill land it could be used for social improvements in-line with ENV1, thus improving the locality for both local residents and tourists, which is, as we understand it, the overriding aim of the Plan. We would however like to know why our private land is subject to so many specific policies and what appears to be unvalued scrutiny. Are anyone else's gardens subject to the same scrutiny? Whilst we understand that the land in question is central to the village we feel that the proposed restrictions are inequitable.	Noted  Noted however the text has been sourced from a previous Local Plan for the period 1989-2001 supporting the village setting and Conservation Area designation so is not new or in the view of the NPG contentious.	NPG reviewed designation of the Wash House as a NDHA and have deleted at the request of the owner.  NPG reviewed the inclusion of LGS 1. The community consider it an important asset however are reluctant to proceed without land owner consent and have reluctantly agreed to withdraw the designation of LGS 1.  No change to text proposed
41	Mr David Goodrum		No			With reference to Appendix 3 Local Green Space 5: We own Yabsley Cottage and the substantial part of the grassy area in front of the property. This garden area is both owned and registered with the Land Registry under our names. We entirely object to the misplaced assumption of the authors of the plan, that our land can be used by any local or visiting community at anytime, or especially at high tide or when the beach is limited. There has been a sign for a number of years stating that this area is a private garden and that no dogs are allowed. The only people who have right of access across our land are the owners and visitors of Quay Cottage. We would expect you to amend the plan and totally exclude our land as forming any part of the South Huish Neighbourhood Plan. 1. This is our garden and is not available for public use. 2. We will not accept or agree to our land being used in the manner suggested by the South Huish Neighbourhood Plan. 3. We would expect confirmation of this objection, at least by email, as we have replied within the stated time course before noon on the 20th January 2020. Yours faithfully, David and Elissa Goodrum  Whilst we support the need for a thoughtful plan for the village as a whole, we would wish to dispel any ideas or notions that our garden should become a communal area	Noted  Noted	NPG have reviewed the inclusion of LGS 5 and the land under the ownership of Yabsley Cottage. It was agreed that all land under the ownership of Yabsley Cottage will be removed from LGS 5 however the remaining land will be retained as an LGS.  No change
42	Richard Brown		Yes			I think it is an impressive and well researched document, well done to all involved!	Noted	No change
43	Caroline Pulle		Yes			2.1 Due to the poor mobile reception and broadband, I could not move my small business to Hope Cove, if these improved, I could move permanently to my house in Inner Hope Cove. Also 2:1 Due to the insufficient public transport in Hope Cove, I have to use my car but I would prefer to be 'green'. To run my business I need access to Totnes railway station. The property which I now own, has passed through four generations with my Great Grandmother being the village midwife. I aim to pass this cottage onto the next generation.	Noted, the improvement of mobile phone and broadband coverage is highlighted in the weaknesses expressed by the community on page 7 however policies to improve these is beyond the scope of a NDP	No change No change

South Huish Neighbourhood Development Plan

REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION RESPONSES : 2nd December 2019 - 20th January 2020

44	Nick and Davina Stoop		no			Policy SH Env4 Local Green Spaces - LGS 3 New Road by St Clements - Disagree - This is our private domestic land, it is not publicly accessible and without exception should not be designated as a local green space. It is private property and land and absolutely should not be land that is regarded as publicly viewable. Please remove LGS 3 from Appendix 3 and any/all other references to West View and its surrounding private land from this document with immediate effect and confirm in writing that this has been done.	Noted	NPG have reviewed the designation of LGS 3 and have deleted it at the request of the owner.
						Policy SH Env5 Locally Important Views - V4 New Road by West View- Disagree - the scope of this view as described in Appendix A4 and as highlighted in Figure 17 on Page 38 has already been significantly reduced from the tree benches as a result of the recent Cottage Hotel extension. The photo V4 on Page 39 does not match the full scope of the acute angle of V4 within the map on Page 38. Neither the photo nor the map accurately reflect the significant reduction in the scope of this view as a result of the Cottage Hotel's extension which was granted permission by the South Hams District Council on 24th August 2015, and for which the first phase of the development is now nearing completion. V4 is clearly not a protected view given the precedent set by the South Hams Council when granting permission for The Cottage Hotel undertake a major extension into this space and significantly reduce it. Phases 2, 3, and 4 of the Cottage Hotel's extension will only continue to greatly reduce the panoramic view from the benches towards Thurlestone and Burgh Island, again demonstrating this clearly is not considered a locally important view by the South Hams District Council. The photo V4 on Page 39 also wrongly assumes that there is a public right to look into our private land and into the land owned privately by the owners of the Colonial House. Please remove V4 from Appendix 4 and any/all other references to it.	Noted, NPG to review the photo and viewpoint of V4 since the extension of the hotel. Please note the presence of a Locally Important View does not prevent development, it only informs it (see text of SH Env 5) and can be across privately owned land.	The extent and inclusion of V4 to be reviewed by the NPG. The view is considered important and generally supported by the community therefore they wish to maintain it however the exact viewpoint will be reviewed and re-mapped and photographed.
						Policy SH H2 Principal Residence - Disagree - the University of Exeter Study referenced on Page 44 and Page 45 clearly highlights the positive economic benefits of second/holiday homes to a local economy in Devon. South Huish's local economy would be significantly weaker if these second/holiday homes had not been allowed permission to be built in the past and we believe it would be short sighted of the local community, and detrimental to the growth of the local economy, to put in place this proposed measure. It is also worth noting that second/holiday homes in AONB areas often provide a path for the owner to relocate to the area and turn such properties into prey supporting the growth of the local population. It is also worth noting that to limit any new development to principal residence only would stifle this natural economic growth trajectory and new additions to the community. In conclusion, we don't believe restricting property ownership to principal residence serves to enhance or protect the local economy and wellbeing of the local community; if anything it might limit it. The perceived need for 6 or 7 affordable homes within the entire Parish need not effect the housing development policy in this manner.	The NPG do not dispute the positive economic benefits of second/holiday homes as outlined in the Exeter University study they also make negative contributions. Policy SH H2 sets out to restrict the development of new homes for this purpose against a backdrop of 67% second/holiday homes in the parish (75% in Hope Cove) This approach is supported by many of the community and SHDC (see 6.4.5)	No change proposed
						Policy SH T2 Car Parking - Disagree - Part C of this policy proposal sets out the onsite parking standards for any new residential development. The proposed requirement of two spaces for two bedroom properties and three spaces for three bedroom properties would only encourage greater vehicle use of the already limited and overcrowded road infrastructure network within South Huish. It would also likely result in a further unnecessary reduction of green spaces surrounding new residential development properties to allow for what would primarily be underutilised private car parking space. The summation that three bedrooms automatically assumes the ownership of three vehicles is unrealistic and unsustainable. Average households have one to two vehicles.	Noted	Policy SH T2 to be revised based on this and other responses
						While we are in agreement with much of what is proposed within the South Huish Neighbourhood Plan, we cannot support it in its current form on the basis of the proposed Policies contained upon in our feedback where we strongly disagree with their intention; particularly on the proposed designation of our private land as a Local Green Space.  We hope this feedback of ours will be well considered particularly as my wife and I fall absolutely into the demographic both in our 50s, with a newborn baby daughter! South Huish is wishing to attract and retain within the community as part of its vision for the future. We have provided below a summary of where we feel the proposed South Huish Neighbourhood Plan limits the scope for economic growth and the related attractiveness for young families looking at potentially relocating into the Parish.  We find a number of contradictions embedded within this proposed South Huish Neighbourhood Plan, while believing its findings and conclusions restrictive of potential enterprise and therefore likely to inhibit future population and economic growth of this Parish in comparison with neighbouring Parishes in the South Hams. Within the 'Threats to Avoid' section on Page 7 of the proposed Plan, one of the stated threats to avoid reads derogatorily 'Salcombe overspill and attitude (Salcombeisation)'. Salcombe is a national standard bearer for a thriving coastal settlement, economy and community. Salcombe has a dynamic and thriving high street, is home to a growing number of successful enterprises that are recognised nationally (e.g. Jack Wills, Salcombe Gin, Salcombe Brewery, Salcombe Dairy etc), and Salcombe continues to maintain a thriving fishing community. We recognise that Salcombe partook in a very similar Neighbourhood Planning Process recently but would argue that many of the more constraining conclusions of that plan are not as applicable to South Huish Parish given the significantly denser existing infrastructure in Salcombe which has arguably led to the successful ongoing achievements and therefore thriving, sustainable infrastructure and community covering and enabling much of the vision that the South Huish Neighbourhood Plan lays out; namely within the themes of the Local Economy, Housing and Homes, Health and Wellbeing.	Noted	No change proposed
						Within Hope Cove in particular, there is a broadly held local view that opposes existing second/holiday home owners and is often cited to improvements that some home owners make to their respective properties. We'd agree wholeheartedly with the aspiration written within the 'Housing and Homes' section on Page 6 that states 'But don't be anti existing second homes' as this clearly highlights the existing prejudice. More emphasis should be placed within the South Huish Neighbourhood Plan on the benefit that second/holiday home ownership brings to the local economy, which include and are not limited to positive impacts on the following: local holiday letting companies, local cleaning and laundry companies, local construction companies and builders, local gardening companies, local leisure, health and wellbeing companies, local architecture companies and planning consultants, local shops, pubs and restaurants. Second/holiday home owners in South Huish help to promote and grow tourism revenue to the Parish over and above that already provided by local hotels and B&Bs. The proliferation and accessibility of websites such as Airbnb over the past five years provide second/holiday home owners with the ability to significantly increase occupancy of such properties resulting in a further boost to the local economy than might have been previously possible. Second/holiday home ownership within an AONB often forms the natural path to the relocation of that owner to a Parish such as South Huish, particularly if it is welcoming, encouraging and supportive of enterprise. Finally, second/holiday home owners all pay the full rate of Council Tax which supports the upkeep of the Parish and often with less demand on its resources than in the case with permanent residents. We hope that a fair, balanced and considered view is taken with regard to our deep concerns around the policies we have outlined and look forward to hearing from you.	Noted, however it is incorrect to suggest that the Plan is anti second/holiday homes. The aim is to create a balanced community for residents, visitors, space for employment and boosting the rural economy. To achieve this balance the NPG believe a limit must be placed on further growth of second/holiday homes in new development.	Introduction to be expanded to make clearer that the plan is not Anti Second/holiday homes
45	Mrs Amanda Saxon	Yes				If free parking on the roadside is to be taken away, it will put locals off coming to Hope Cove. When my children lived at home, we often drove down after school for an hour or two, and used to park on the roadside near the church. If I had to pay or walk the mile, we wouldn't have gone, and my children wouldn't have had such a fantastic childhood. The Galmpton locals need to be able to park for free to encourage community integration.	Noted	No change, but comment will be taken on board when considering the management plan for South Huish
46	Mrs Janet Carter	Yes				Excellent plan - everyone involved in producing it is to be congratulated. Thanks.	Noted	No change
47	DR DAVID JOHN MORRIS	Yes				CONFLICTING tone between places for young families and workers able to live in affordable/rentable housing VERSUS the appalling statistics in all the areas of residential anti-non-residential, even Galmpton. Bodes ill for core residents, aging populations, requiring local neighbouring families and friends, but putting pressure on statutory services. Also, visitors and second homes have several cars per house in holiday season, traffic and parking issues.  we live here all the time. I was, until last year, a medical practitioner, covering Plymouth Community Trust (Medical Director 1992-98. Helped maintain/develop South Hams Hospital. GPs at Salcombe are great but under pressure. Future health care of our population, elderly residents year-round and temp residents in holiday months.	Noted and accept the plan should be reinforced to address the needs of young families. Traffic issues are covered in policy SH T1	Policy SH H1 to be expanded to cover the needs of young families which can be accommodated in Exception sites as SH H3
							Noted	No change
48	Marian Morris	Yes				Appendix A5 no mention of the Hill Fort, Easton's Mine. The 'Danish' quay, and the Wayside Cross, (though it is a listed structure) or Burleigh Dolts All significant. Appendix V10 No mention of the huge (and rare) Elm trees in various sites in Galmpton which are resistant to Dutch Elm disease. Over All there must be NO MORE second homes. The community is total off balance, already, we do not want to maintain this state.	Noted, Hill Fort, Easton's Mine. The 'Danish' quay, Wayside Cross and Burleigh Dolts are already recorded in a database held by DCC Historic Env team. This comprehensive list of heritage assets will be included in an appendix. Text to be reviewed re rare Elm trees.	App A5 and LHA designations to be reviewed and text on rare trees to be added. A more comprehensive list of Non Designated Heritage Assets included in Appendix B10.
49	Sylvia Barnett	Yes				And again, this dying community cannot support the numbers of second homes we have, let alone any more.	Noted support for policy SH H2	No change
50	Mrs Lynda Reeves	Yes				To all who were involved in putting together this Neighbourhood Plan, Well Done! A very thorough and in-depth Plan, and a very interesting read.	Noted	No change
51	John Stevenson	Yes				Firstly, I would very much like to thank all those involved, as clearly a huge amount of effort has gone into the draft plan. For the most part, I think that it is very well thought out and presents a clear view for the future. Its key aims of minimising development and protecting the environment I am strongly supportive of. I do believe, however, that there are three key areas that may benefit further consideration. Mention is given to both issues regarding traffic and also the provision of improved parking. These are mutually exclusive. With an ever-growing population density in the area, improved parking is synonymous with an increased number of vehicles using the surrounding roads. By restricting the amount of available parking, people are encouraged to employ more environmentally friendly means of transport (car sharing, cycling, walking, etc.). I do, needless to say, entirely support the intention/requirement for better controls over parking. My second issue relates to the apparent inconsistency of trying to encourage younger people into the area and at the same time looking to provide more accommodation for older people. Housing will always be market driven and, hence, popular areas will inevitably become dominated by the wealthier generations. Currently, the wealthy demographic are the retired. Hence, it is unsurprising that the average age of the neighbourhood is so high. Noting the number of bungalows, etc. already available, I would suggest that by actively supporting further accommodation for the elderly, the average age of the neighbourhood will only continue to rise. My final concern, which I appreciate cannot readily be addressed in a Neighbourhood Plan, is that of affordable housing. There is little mention as to how this housing would be funded. Potential development land in the South Hams is at a premium price and building material costs continue to rise. Hence, there is always likely to be a significant trade-off between building "low-cost" housing and maintaining the character of the area. Furthermore, preventing once affordable housing from becoming open market housing is extremely difficult. A lot of local affordable housing has been provided through housing agencies which, I do not believe, are under any legal obligation to retain that stock. I personally am in favour of supporting limited self build by local individuals demonstrating a requirement for housing. Although this is unlikely to be maintained as affordable in perpetuity, it does nevertheless offer a realistic means for young people to own their own homes within the area. many thanks once again for all of the effort that has gone into this work!	Noted, future controls on car parking will be the remit of forthcoming local traffic management plan and we would welcome your future input on this. We accept that insufficient reference to young people and families has been made in the plan and we will correct this. The delivery of affordable housing is addressed in policy SH H1 and H3 however we accept further work is needed with the community and landowners to facilitate the delivery, we will also look at self build initiatives.	Policies SH H1 to be reviewed and revised
52	andrew					Planning for the future. None There seems to be a lack of compassion for future development in the Galmpton/Hope Cove area. I've currently been living here since 2008 and I will be looking to retire here, so accepting small planning application will allow people like myself to continue living here. There looks to be a small minority getting new planning and others getting declined. Now I'm aware of this parish council, it will be good to attend future meet, also question boundaries.	Policy SH H1 and H3 addresses the need for more affordable housing particularly older people. However the needs for young families/ starter homes should be developed further.	Policy SH H1 to be reviewed and revised
53	laura oregan	Yes						No change
54	ROB & STEPHANIE CHRISTMAS	Yes						No change
55	Katie Daniels	Yes				As a resident with young children, we would really appreciate speed bumps on the road from Galmpton to Hope Cove.	Noted, detailed traffic controls / speed bumps is outside the scope of this plan and the responsibility of Devon CC/highways. However such discussions will be the remit of forthcoming local traffic management plan as outlined in policy SH T1 and we would welcome your future input on this.	No change
56	Jon Cox					SH Env 7 and flooding - the leaf is functional and whilst it could do with a little upkeep above that locals give it is wrong to suggest this is the main issue for flooding. The main issue is the old river bed lays in meadow view field (the clue is in the name). The water that collects here doesn't come from the leaf falling but the huge valley sloping up. The more important flood consideration is there should be no development at all in the meadow view field.  SH T1 - I strongly contest that there is no hard evidence that there is a lack of parking. The car park can provide figures to show we only full 3 days in the year. Hope Cove weekend and this time the field is expected. The village at this time of the year is the right people not using the right parking. Tourists will of course take the free on road parking rather than the pay parking. We rely on parking on new road as we only have one parking space but need 2 vehicles - I work in Exeter and my wife in Plymouth. In summer there is no parking for residents The solution is to make New Road residents permits April to September.	Noted however Policy SH Env 8 addresses this condition e.g. 'no adverse impact on local streams, leaf, flood channels, and neighbouring properties' Also please note that the Meadow View Field is outside the proposed settlement boundary illustrated in figure 14. Discussions on the parking capacity will be the remit of forthcoming local traffic management plan as outlined in policy SH T1 and we would welcome your future input on this.	No change
						Thanks to all who have put a lot of effort into getting us to this place - whilst I have come to meetings and answered questionnaires I recognise the significant time others have committed.	Noted	No change
57	Peter Dunscombe	Yes	Yes	6.3.6	Disagree	Our family own the above cottage. On page 36 of the plan it shows LGS13 Coastguard Station Gardens which includes a finger of land running along the rear of 5 Coastguard Cottages. This section is in fact part of our garden, which will be very obvious on a site inspection. email: peterdunscombe@gmail.com	Noted, the boundary of LGS 13 will be modified as you suggest	Modify LGS 13 to cover only the coastguard station gardens

# South Huish Neighbourhood Development Plan

## REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION RESPONSES : 2nd December 2019 - 20th January 2020

58	Trevor & Pauline Rendle	Yes	T	SH ENV 1	Disagree	We request the settlement boundary be altered to include all the Garden of The Holt. (amended plan was attached to letter along with letters of April & June from David Sheppard, RIBA	Fig 14 accurately shows the previously adopted (2011) settlement boundary in the vicinity of the Holt. The red line is not arbitrary. The matter of the extent consent is not an issue the NPG can make a judgement on. We have referred this matter to SHDC - who are the appropriate authority who we have asked to judge whether the extended boundary should be considered consented development.	Figures 14 to be reviewed against this and other comments and the representations to SHDC concerning the Extant consent for land at the Holt. The NPG and Parish Council will await a judgement from SHDC and respect their decision in the final mapping of the boundary in the vicinity of the Holt.
				SHB E2		There is no mention of using sustainable materials to reduce CO2	Please refer to Policy SH HBE 3 d) and SH Env 6 which both refer to low carbon design	No change
						ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: We would like to refer to David Sheppard's letter of the 4th June 2019 stating our reasons for the amendment to the settlement boundary. You may be aware the SHDC refused consent for our proposal, we are appealing this planning refusal and believe irrespective of the outcome the settlement boundary should be moved to include "all" of the property known as The Holt (Re the enclosed letter). In addition it should be recognised beyond your arbitrary red line that we have domestic paraphernalia on the site, sheds, working area's, parking, boat area, roads going through from end to end, green house, gardens, lawns with constructed pathways, walling spread throughout the area, with pathways through the trees. There is fencing on the perimeter and various retaining walls. Perhaps if you would like to visit The Holt I would be pleased to show you around so that you will have first hand knowledge of our reasons for requesting this change to the settlement boundary.	Noted, see response above	Noted, see response above
59	Devon County Council Planning					For information - Devon County Council has a role as Waste & Mineral Planning Authority, and consequently has produced the 'Devon Waste Plan', and the 'Devon Minerals Plan' which function as the 'local plan' for mineral and waste development in Devon. The Neighbourhood Plan powers are limited in dealing with Mineral and Waste development.	Noted	No change but will be covered in the Basic Conditions Statement
	Flood Risk					Flood Risk: 6.3.9 - Policy SH Env 7 Reduction of existing flood risk (page 40) Localised flooding is a regular hazard at various locations within the Parish... this could be overcome by a programme of remedial works and periodic regular maintenance. The Parish Council will negotiate improvements with Devon County Council, and where possible will seek funding to enable such work to be carried out at its discretion.  This policy requires further clarity. Will the Parish Council carry out the improvements and maintenance for the sites identified as suggested? This is normally a County Council function. It might be more appropriate to say the Plan would support any improvements and maintenance of the areas that are noted to flood. The Plan cannot be used to exercise powers of another authority. The DCC Flood Risk Management team have stated they are open to having conversations about flood alleviation works within the Parish. However, the Parish Council should be aware that all flood risk management works in communities are prioritised in line with the Council's limited budgets, and numerous other priority locations across Devon, as per the annual Flood Risk Management Action Plan. <a href="https://www.devon.gov.uk/foodriskmanagement/local-flood-risk-management-strategy/rfmp">https://www.devon.gov.uk/foodriskmanagement/local-flood-risk-management-strategy/rfmp</a> . 6.3.10 - Policy SH Env 8 It would be worth clarifying what is meant by 'proposal' and 'minor alterations' in this case. As neighbourhood plans only have powers to influence what is considered to be 'development' in relation to changes that require a planning application.	Noted	SH Env 7 to be revised as suggested making it clear that the improvements are a DCC function. SH Env 8 to be revised removing the word 'proposal' and minor alterations and replace with 'development requiring planning permission' Following advice from another examination and Mader Plan (Kerton TDC). Aspirational is removed from SH Env 7 and the text revised accordingly.
	Highways					6.3.9 - Policy SH T1 Improved traffic management plan for South Huish (page 47) It is positive that the Plan is aiming to be aspirational in what it wants to achieve. Again, the policy could support any of the proposals set out including reducing road speeds, and in the supporting text, say it will work with the authority to try and help achieve these. However the Plan cannot be used to require a local authority to exercise its powers to deliver the plan.	Noted	Aspirational management issues to be removed from the policy and included as supporting text. Modified policy SH T1 'Traffic Calming to be added covering para a) and d)
	Highways					6.5.4 SH T2 Car parking (page 48) On street parking can form a positive part of new development if designed as part of an overall parking strategy that incorporates different types of parking. The Manual for Streets Guidance sets out ways to achieve this and good parking design. <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/manual-for-streets">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/manual-for-streets</a> As these parking standards are relatively high, it would be positive to see provision of spaces and charging points for electric cars and other ultra low emission vehicles.	Noted	Text to SH T2 revised as suggested including provision for electric and ultra low emission cars
	Public Rights of Way					6.5.5 Policy SH T3 Footpaths and cycleways (page 48) The parish's aspirations contained in Policy SH T3 - Footpaths and Cycleways are welcomed. However, it should be noted that due legal process and the consent of landowners, and the Highway Authority, would be required to make any changes in the status of existing public rights of way within the parish, and also for changes to the management of surfaces and structures. New routes proposed to assist with connectivity within the parish, and to lead from and to any new development, would again require due legal process.  Please find a link to the Devon Countryside Access Forum position statement on Neighbourhood Plans for general advice about recreation and access.  Devon Countryside Access Forum Position Statement on Neighbourhood Plans	Noted	Extra clause added to SH T3 to highlight the need for due legal process and landowner consent.
	Public health					The Public Health team support the Neighbourhood Plan as it incorporates many aspects that will benefit the health and wellbeing of the local population. The Neighbourhood Plan could be strengthened by considering the following: Need for adaptable homes to enable the ageing population to remain independent. Wheelchair users often find it difficult to visit their friends as homes are not always built with wheelchair access in mind so we would recommend the design of new homes takes this into consideration. In order to attract a more diverse population, the need for high speed digital technology will attract school and working age families. Inclusion of any aspirations for future development to contribute towards mitigating against the impacts of climate change, and insure homes are built with the known impacts of climate change in mind.	Noted however carbon reduction and impacts of climate change already addressed	Text 6.4.7 supporting housing for older people expanded and provision for high speed digital technology added to policy SH H1
	Local Economy					To assist in ensuring the document is up to date, please see link to the latest data :- JSNA (Join Strategic Needs Assessment) at the very local level: <a href="https://www.devonhealthandwellbeing.org.uk/jsna/profiles/community-profile/area-code-ED1020172">https://www.devonhealthandwellbeing.org.uk/jsna/profiles/community-profile/area-code-ED1020172</a> JSNA for the electoral division (County level ward): <a href="https://www.devonhealthandwellbeing.org.uk/jsna/profiles/community-profile/area-code-DIV411">https://www.devonhealthandwellbeing.org.uk/jsna/profiles/community-profile/area-code-DIV411</a> Please see attached the following :-	Noted	Additional evidence to be added as appendices to the Plan and referenced in the text at 5.9.2
						Unemployment claimant count data up to October 2019 (Salcombe and surrounding area ward).	Noted	No change
						The Lower Super Output Area population (not parish) estimates up to 2018	Noted	No change
						Indices of multiple deprivation 2019 vs 2015 analysis. There has been a small RELATIVE change downwards in terms of income and skills, but it's so small as to have been unlikely to have been an actual decline and levels are better than the national average. Deprivation overall, in this case is less of a concern for the area.	Noted	Extra information added on Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD)
60	Regulation 14 consultation response on behalf of South Hams District Council					The Draft South Huish Neighbourhood Plan has been published for a formal 6 week public consultation. This represents the plan reaching Regulation 14 stage of the plan preparation process, and offers the first formal opportunity for all stakeholders to comment on the emerging plan. The Local Planning Authority, South Hams District Council (SHDC) has a statutory duty to support the preparation of neighbourhood plans. As well as its statutory duty, SHDC has an obligation to ensure that any planning document that sits within the suite of Development Plan Documents (DPDs) is consistent with its corporate objectives, and will make a positive contribution to the long term health, wellbeing and resilience of the district's communities. Advice and guidance provided to neighbourhood plan groups will reflect this wider remit. Advice and guidance at Regulation 14 stage is most usefully focused on: Advice and guidance at Regulation 14 stage is most usefully focused on:  1) The Draft Neighbourhood Plan: Vision, and Objectives 2) The Draft Neighbourhood Plan: Policies 3) The Draft Neighbourhood Plan: Housing Issues 4) The Draft Neighbourhood Plan: Evidence Base	Noted	No change
						1) The Draft South Huish Neighbourhood Plan: Vision and Objectives	Noted	No change
						The South Huish Draft Neighbourhood Plan (the Plan) sets out policies and approaches which will add local detail to policies in the Plymouth and South West Devon Joint Local Plan. The Plan sets out a vision for South Huish as follows: A Vision for South Huish The parish and each individual settlement lie within the South Devon Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Our vision sets out to respect this natural setting, the environment, its ecology, history and people. There should be limited change, new development must promote design quality, and be sensitive to the delicate balance between the needs of local residents, businesses and visitors. Our aim is to promote a thriving, sustainable, safe, viable, vital and close knit parish which has more control over future change  The vision effectively provides a good summary of what is seeking to be achieved.	Noted	No change
						Section 2 of the Plan sets out a list of objectives that are drawn from a SWOT analysis. These objectives relate well to the Vision and are consistent with the strategic objectives of the NP.	Noted	No change
						2) The Draft South Huish Neighbourhood Plan: The Policies SHDC considers that alongside the detailed comments below, the South Huish NP group considers whether each policy is necessary for inclusion in future drafts of their plan. If policies remain that are already the subject of local and/or national policies, care needs to be taken to ensure consistency with existing policy to avoid ambiguity over interpretation in the decision-making process. The Plan contains 19 policies as annotated in the table below. A commentary is provided for each policy that looks at the level of conformity with locally adopted policy and national guidance, as well as considering how each policy will be implemented in order to achieve the aims and objectives of the plan. NB: As indicated in the comments on Policy SH H3 the Income JLP Policy is referred to. Policies in the JLP were renumbered in certain instances before adoption of the Plan. It is suggested that all cross references to JLP Policies are checked to ensure the correct numbering.	Noted	SH H3 revised reference to JLP
						Policy SH EC 01 Tourism related employment and retention of hotels	No Comment.	No change
						Policy SH EC 02-Local Rural Employment	No Comment.	No change
						Policy SH Env 1 Settlement Boundaries and avoidance of coalescence	Hope Cove was identified in earlier versions of the JLP as a Sustainable Village (SV) and therefore warrants a settlement boundary. I would suggest the evidence base of the JLP is used to provide a basis for the NP confirming Hope Cove's status as a SV.	A settlement boundary is proposed for Galampton because it is a functional and recognised village and settlement even if it does not fit the sustainable criteria of the JLP. It is used to define the edge of the existing settlement using the criteria of JLP Evidence Base TP2
						Policy SH Env2 Impact on the South Devon Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)	Galampton was not identified in the JLP as a SV. I would, therefore question the reason for identifying a settlement boundary. If retained an explanation should be given for why a settlement boundary is required at this location	See above
						Policy SH Env3 Safeguarding the biodiversity and Green Infrastructure throughout the Parish	I would question the need for landscape appraisals set out on criteria f). This exceeds Development Management(DM) requirements when planning applications are submitted. Such requirements have been removed by Examiners from other NPs that I have been involved with.	Para f) revised to remove the need for an appraisal
						Policy SH Env4 Local Green Spaces	No Comment.	Para b revised
								No change

South Huish Neighbourhood Development Plan

REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION RESPONSES : 2nd December 2019 - 20th January 2020

			Policy SH Env5 Locally Important Views	No Comment.		No change
			Policy SH Env 6, Encouraging renewable energy and low carbon development	No Comment.		No change
			Aspirational Policy SH Env 7, Reduction of existing flood risk	I can understand why this Policy has been included. I would suggest its content is reviewed in the light of SW Water's comments. If they have not commented I would suggest they are contacted specifically in regards of this Policy.	Noted, South West Water have responded but have no specific comments to make however DCC have made comments which have been accommodated	SH Env 7 revised responding to DCC's comments
			Policy SH Env 8, Drainage Impact	As above SW Water should be specifically contacted in terms of the content of this Policy.	As above	SH Env 7 revised responding to DCC's comments
			Policy SH Env 9, Dark Skies and the avoidance of light pollution	No comment.		No change
				I would suggest the criteria that apply to the provision of affordable housing are refined. I suggest the reference to Devon Homes is removed from the Policy and placed in the justification of this Policy.	Noted	Extra justification text added and q) simplified
			Policy SH H1 Affordable Housing	Criteria c) add in "where required and evidenced" Criteria d) remove: this is simply repeating what is required by overall Planning Policy. Criteria e) remove: any planning application will be accompanied by the necessary viability appraisal. Criteria g) remove: since this is simply repeating the requirement of Policy SH H2.	Noted Noted Noted Noted however SH2 would not always apply e.g. if it were a replacement dwelling	c) revised d) removed e) removed No change
			Policy SH H2 Principal Residence	No Comment.		No change
			Policy SH H3 Exception Sites outside the settlement boundary	JLP Policy TTV 31 is now Policy TTV 27.	Noted	Policy revised
			Aspirational Policy SH T1: Improved traffic management plan for South Huish	An aspirational Policy along these lines was removed by the Examiner from the Salcombe NP. The text can be included at an appropriate location in the NP but not in a Policy.	Noted	Some of the text to be moved to support text / justification and this policy changed to simply cover traffic calming which is considered on other Plans as acceptable and comments of DCC included
			Policy SH T2: Car Parking	No Comment.		No change
			Policy SH T3: Footpaths and cycleways	No Comment.		No change
			Policy SH HW 1, Community Facilities	No Comment.		No change
			Policy SH HW2 Local Shops and Services	No Comment.		No change
			Policy SH HBE 1 Non- Designated Heritage Assets	No comment.		No change
			Policy SH HBE 2: Safeguarding Heritage Assets and the Conservation Area	No Comment.		No change
			Policy SH HBE 3: Design Quality within the Parish	No Comment		No change
			Policy SH ED 1 Promotion of local skills	No Comment.		No change
				3) The Draft South Huish Plan: Housing Issues In my Pre Regulation 14 comments and at the meeting I attended with the South Huish Group (5th August 2019) following issuing the comments the following advice was given:-  "The Housing Needs survey concludes there is a need for affordable housing in the Parish. No sites are allocated for housing in the Plan to address this need. It appears that reliance is being placed upon Policy SH H3 (Exception Sites Outside the Settlement Boundary) to be instrumental in fulfilling this need. Whilst this is an acceptable approach to the issue there are risks. Given the proven housing need then it is presumed developer led proposals will potentially arise that may not be acceptable locally but acceptable in planning terms. My suggestion is the NPG looks to fulfil this need through its own selected allocation(s)."  I reiterate the comments made and suggest the NPG reconsider their approach to the provision of housing in South Huish.  It is further suggested that the results of the HNS, both in terms of need and types of dwelling required, is incorporated into the text supporting the Theme 3: Housing and Homes. Furthermore a statement explaining why no housing allocations have been made in the NP should be made linked to a statement expressing how the identified need will be met in the context of the overall housing strategy for South Huish.	Noted	Extra text to be added referring to Housing Needs and how the need will be met.
				4) The Draft South Huish Neighbourhood Plan: Evidence Base Apart from the issues relating to the HNS identified above the Evidence Base submitted with the NP is comprehensive and well put together.	Noted	Changes as above
				Conclusion  The South Huish Neighbourhood Plan seeks to manage development within a sensitive landscape, whilst enabling small-scale organic development that meets the priorities and needs of the local community, however, as detailed below, the NP needs to explain more fully how this will be achieved. The broad aspirations of the plan are consistent with adopted and emerging local policy.  The key issue raised relates to the evidenced need for affordable housing in the Parish and how this is met. It is suggested that housing sites are considered and a site selected for inclusion that meets that need. Whilst the reliance on an Exceptions Policy is acceptable it is not without risks. In any event the content of the Housing section of the NP should contain the evidence accumulated in the HNS and explain fully the Plan strategy to meet the identified housing need.  For the most part, this consultation response poses questions or proposes amendments that are designed to make a positive contribution to the next iteration of the neighbourhood plan.  It is clear that a great deal of work has been undertaken to bring the Plan to this stage of the Neighbourhood Planning process. The draft plan is well presented with good illustrations and clear plans and graphics. SHDC considers that the draft South Huish Neighbourhood Plan can be brought into compliance with local policy and national guidance subject to the advice and guidance provided being followed and would welcome dialogue with the NP group to help achieve this.  January 2020	Noted Noted	Changes as above