

DRAFT STRETE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – RESPONSE REPORT Published January 2019

*This report summarises the response received to the Reg 14 consultation draft plan published in February 2018.
In October 2018 some substantive changes to the plan were published, arising as a result of the initial consultation.
Responses made to that re-consultation are dealt with at the end of this document.
It also indicates the changes proposed to be made to the plan prior to its Reg 15 submission to South Hams District Council.*

The draft Strete Neighbourhood Plan was published for consultation for 6 weeks from noon on 19th February until noon on 3rd April 2018. A wide range of comments was received, both in the form of responses to the questionnaire which accompanied the draft plan and as more detailed representations. Below are summaries of the questionnaire responses received and of the more detailed representations made, together with the response in each case.

Summary of responses to the questionnaire about the draft plan

Feedback Form Analysis

	Support	%	Do Not Support	%	No Comment	%
The Introduction to the Plan	27	57%	1	2%	19	40%
The Local Content, Vision and Objectives	28	60%		0%	19	40%
Policy SNP1: Protecting the Landscape	47	100%		0%		0%
Policy SNP2: Heritage and Conservation	46	98%	1	2%		0%
Policy SNP3: Coastal Setting and Land South of the A379	47	100%		0%		0%
Policy SNP4: Low Density Area	40	85%	6	13%	1	2%
Policy SNP5: Tranquillity and Dark Skies	44	94%	1	2%	2	4%
Policy SNP6: Development and the Settlement Boundary	39	83%	6	13%	2	4%
Policy SNP7: Village Core and A379 Corridor	42	89%	3	6%	2	4%
Policy SNP8: Design and Construction	39	83%	6	13%	2	4%
Policy SNP9: Housing Development Site at Cox's Farm Fields	33	70%	14	30%		0%
Policy SNP10: Principal Residence Requirement	43	91%	4	9%		0%
Policy SNP11: Community Facilities and Infrastructure	44	94%	2	4%	1	2%
Policy SNP12: Local Green Spaces	45	96%		0%	2	4%
Policy SNP13: Open Space at Cox's farm Fields	35	74%	11	23%	1	2%
Policy SNP14: Local Footpaths	42	89%	2	4%	3	6%
Policy SNP15: Sustainable Tourism	42	89%	3	6%	2	4%
Totals	683		60		56	
	47 Forms Returned	40.18	3.53		3.29	
	282 Forms Delivered					
	17% Return	85%		8%		7%

Summary of more detailed representations about the draft plan

Policy / para no	Name	Rep' no	Summary of Comment (The original representations are available for inspection. Summaries do not purport to be exact.)	Response
General comments				
General	South Hams District Council		The Strete Neighbourhood Plan is well presented with good illustrations and clear plans and graphics. It seeks to manage	Support welcomed.

			<p>development within a sensitive landscape, whilst enabling small-scale organic development that meets the priorities and needs of the local community first. The broad aspirations of the plan are consistent with adopted and emerging local policy.</p> <p>Review and monitoring of the plan will be required. Under-delivery of affordable housing could result in proposals on unallocated sites being approved. SHDC encourages neighbourhood plans to identify and allocate sites for specific uses to provide certainty of delivery.</p>	
General	South Hams District Council		SHDC considers that the draft Strete 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.	Dialogue with SHDC has been sought throughout the process and will continue to be welcomed.
General	South Hams District Council		<p>Neighbourhood Plans ought not to repeat local or national planning policy. Consideration should be given to whether each plan policy adds relevant and justifiable additional policy guidance for the locality.</p> <p>Care needs to be taken to ensure consistency with existing policy to avoid ambiguity over interpretation in the decision-making process.</p>	A precautionary approach has been taken in view of the status of the emerging Plymouth and South West Devon Joint Local Plan (the JLP). The inspectors' report on the JLP is still awaited. However, the content of each policy will be carefully weighed in the light of representations received and the need to avoid unnecessary duplication.
General	Nick and Barbara Shepherd	02	Thank you for the tremendous amount of hard work put into the plan. The full plan and supporting material on the website is clear and comprehensive. The summary paper provides very clear aims and the link between the policy	Support welcomed.

			<p>numbers and the map makes it very easy to understand.</p> <p>We support all policies 1-15 inclusive.</p>	
General	Jacqueline Smith	04	Appreciate the hard work and care for our village that has gone into the plan.	Support welcomed.
General	Peter Hales	08	I agree with the objectives and proposals set out in the plan.	Support welcomed.
General	Gary Lucas	10	Generally support the plan in seeking to preserve the village character and identity in a sustainable manner, and thank the Steering group for its work.	Support welcomed.
General	Mr and Mrs Rossiter	11	In general we are very much in support of the plan, but have a few comments regarding Policy SNP9 (see below).	Support welcomed.
General	Mr and Mrs Freeman	18	A big thank you to the steering group.	Support welcomed.
General	Roger Sinnott	19	Congratulate the team in the large amount of work put into the plan. It is a very polished publication. I support all policies numbered <u>except</u> SNP9 and SNP13 (see below).	Support welcomed.
General	Paul Petransky	20	Overall I support the plan. Full credit and thanks to the steering group who have worked hard to produce it.	Support welcomed.
General	Kerris Petransky	21	Thank you to those who have done the work on the plan. It is obvious that a great deal of time and effort has gone into it. However, I am rather surprised by some of the proposals put forward (see below).	Support welcomed.
General	Mr and Mrs C M L Toll - Strete Estate	22	<p>My clients do not support the majority of the policies in the draft plan and, overall, therefore do not support the plan (see below).</p> <p>My clients and I are disappointed at the failure of your group to consult and take account of my clients' views, particularly</p>	<p>See below.</p> <p>A meeting was sought with the Strete Estate and, after some</p>

			bearing in mind that my clients own the majority of the land in proximity to the village and, although my clients are not resident of the village, there has been no reasonable attempt by you to seek their views.	difficulty in finding a date, took place on 9 th August 2017. The Strete Estate has been consulted throughout the process.
General	Devon County Council Historic Environment Team	23	Thank you for providing the opportunity to comment on the plan. It appears generally well set out with a good use of photos and maps.	Support welcomed.
General	Wendy Gregory	24	<p>I would like to lodge the following comments regarding the steering group:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. there should be no more than one resident from the same household on the group. I understand that you have two from the same household. 2. when a vote is to be taken to approve the draft plan notice should be given of that item. I understand that such a vote was taken when the matter was not on the agenda and a number of the steering group were away. This calls into question the unbiased nature of the group and reeks of potential self-interest. 3. the group should be made up of villagers across the village with no clustering. Is this the case? 4. more than one day to review and discuss the draft plan should have been given to residents despite the daytime and evening slots. It is incumbent upon the group to ensure that as many people as possible can feed back. <p>I suggest that when requesting advice externally that one should always look to 2 or more suppliers before reaching a consensus. Was this done?</p>	<p>The group has been careful to operate according to proper guidelines and principles.</p> <p>Its terms of reference are clearly published on the neighbourhood plan website and the group has been properly constituted.</p> <p>Volunteers to join the group are always welcome.</p> <p>Publication of the plan was advertised in the local press, a summary leaflet was delivered to every household in the parish, two workshop events were held to launch the draft plan, and more than the statutory 6 weeks consultation was allowed.</p> <p>All statutory bodies were consulted and the level of response to the plan locally suggests that it was well known to have been published.</p>

			<p>Much work has gone into the plan and I commend the group for that, but I believe the process is suspect, the group has exceeded their remit and the wrong decision has been made and needs to be very closely scrutinised.</p>	<p>When appointing consultants proper procedures have been followed, including the receipt of more than one tender.</p>
General	Ingrid Sidell	26	<p>I understand that the original steering group from 2015 was combined with the working group as members had left both groups . This resulted in 2 members from the same household being part of the group and each having a vote on the draft plan – surely this is not acceptable?</p> <p>5 members of the group declared a non-pecuniary interest but nevertheless were able to vote on the plan whereas one member who also declared an interest did not or could not vote. What was the difference?</p> <p>The 5 people who had a non-pecuniary interest all voted for the plan and all reside around the area now designated as open space.</p> <p>A steering group should be made up of a cross section of residents prepared to look at the issues in an unbiased way, putting aside all self -interest. Was this the case?</p> <p>The vote to approve the draft plan did not feature on the agenda for the steering group meeting in December and the vote was taken when several group members were away. If they were not able to attend , perhaps members should have been able to submit their vote beforehand. I understand that one member refused to vote because correct procedures had not been followed but that their vote was put down as an abstention -not strictly the case!</p> <p>Re the Plan itself, I accept that Cox’s Farm Fields are at present the only possible area for development in the village but I am very concerned about the proposal to develop the</p>	<p>The group has been careful to operate according to proper guidelines and principles.</p> <p>Its terms of reference are clearly published on the neighbourhood plan website and the group has been properly constituted.</p> <p>Regulations regarding the declaration of interests and non-pecuniary interests have been carefully followed.</p> <p>Volunteers to join the group are always welcome.</p> <p>Comments relating to other policies (SNP2, SNP5, SNP7, SNP9, SNP11 and SNP13) are dealt with at the relevant parts of the report below.</p>

			Lower field and the Paddock as opposed to the Top Field next to the Plat (see below).	
General	Natural England	31	We welcome the development of a neighbourhood plan for Strete and its accompanying Strategic Environmental Assessment. We recognise the hard work required and welcome being consulted on this pre-submission draft. Strete parish supports a rich and diverse natural environment which is of national importance for its biodiversity and landscape interest, reflected in the Slapton Ley SSSI at the coastal margin and the South Devon AONB designation across the whole area. The plan area also has a rich variety of Priority Habitats (PH): Deciduous Woodland PH along the coastal margin, Good Quality Semi Improved Grassland PH, Maritime Cliffs and Slope PH, Reedbeds PH and a Traditional Orchard PH.	Support welcomed.
General	South Devon AONB Unit	33	The plan could take the opportunity to acknowledge the contribution of the high-quality environment of the South Devon AONB to the economic prosperity of the plan area. Advisory action – consider text inclusion.	Noted and agreed. The plan will be amended accordingly. (see below).
General	South Devon AONB Unit	33	The high-level principles of the SNP generally accord with the South Devon AONB designation. The plan references the ‘South Devon AONB Planning Guidance’ document but could align itself further. Sections 5.4, 5.5 and Checklist for plan-makers preparing Neighbourhood Plans are of particular use even at this stage of a plan submission.	Planning principles for the AONB have significantly shaped the plan and its policies aim to conserve and enhance those qualities that make the AONB special. In order to keep the plan succinct and its process proportionate not every item suggested in the South Devon AONB Guidance checklist has been covered. It is considered that the plan aligns with AONB

				principles and meets the government's requirements for neighbourhood planning. No change.
General	Historic England	34	We are impressed by the community's desire to protect and enhance its distinctive historic character and the regime of policies designed to achieve this.	Support welcomed.
	Kevin Finnegan		<p>Thanks for all the work on the plan. It is clear that it has been created in an objective, professional and unbiased manner and I trust that the village will support the plan in order to safeguard its future.</p> <p>I am sure the plan will meet the future needs of the local community, environment, green space and housing in the village while minimising any negative impact on the existing community and environment.</p> <p>The proximity of the planned development to the village amenities such as the shop and pub make the proposed location and access point the logical choice. Any impact on existing residences that alternative plans might have caused has been avoided while creating a plan sensitive to the needs of the village.</p>	Support welcomed.
Foreword				
Foreword	Simon Buckler	30	Support aims set out in para 4.	Support welcomed.
1. Introduction and Background				
2. Local Context, Vision and Objectives				

Chapter 2	Devon County Council Historic Environment Team	23	<p>Suggest insert a paragraph about the historical development of Strete. It is the history and events of the past that have shaped the parish we see today.</p> <p>According to Place Names in Devon, the name Strete is first documented in 1244. The name derived from the Old English for road suggesting that the village lies on an ancient trackway. It was formerly part of the parish of Blackawton becoming a separate parish in 1881. The parish church of St Michael was originally built as a Chapel of Ease in 1836 and became the parish church in 1881. Strete had its part to play in WWII. To the west of Strete, for example, was an artillery training area which formed part of a training ground in preparation for the Normandy landing.</p>	Noted and agreed. The plan will be amended to include reference to some of the detail provided by DCC's Historic Environment Team.
The Vision	Ms V Tanner-Tremaine	32	I am very pleased to see the Vision recognizing the area's natural beauty in recognition of its location within the South Devon AONB. The wording of the Vision could be improved to make it consistent with the statutory duty towards the South Devon AONB on the Parish Council under the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000.	Accepted. The Vision will be amended and the words "conserved and enhanced" will be substituted for "preserved".
The Vision	South Devon AONB Unit	33	The vision for development in and around the South Devon AONB set out in the statutory AONB Management Plan is that: 'Growth in AONB settlements has been achieved without compromising the integrity of the AONB.' The 'section 85 duty' applies to Parish and Town Councils, neighbourhood forums or community organisations preparing neighbourhood plans within the AONB and to those adjoining the AONB, which lie within the AONB's setting. This means that it must have regard to the conservation and enhancement of the natural beauty in the South Devon AONB during the preparation of its Neighbourhood Plan.	Accepted. The Vision will be amended and the words "conserved and enhanced" will be substituted for "preserved".

			Advisory action – The vision requires modification to be consistent with legislation, national policy, local policy and published guidance. Where natural beauty is referenced terminology should be replaced with “... conserved and enhanced ...” instead of preserved.	
The Vision	South Hams District Council		The vision effectively gives an impression of what is seeking to be achieved.	Support welcomed.
The objectives	Simon Buckler	30	Support aims and objectives at para 2.4	Support welcomed.
The objectives	Ms V Tanner-Tremaine	32	I welcome the inclusion of the plan aims at para 2.4.	Support welcomed.
The objectives	Ms V Tanner-Tremaine	32	There is room for improvement in the wording to make it easier to interpret and bring in it in line with the NPPF. Objective 6 (<i>‘with new improved footpaths, particularly in the village’</i>) needs to be qualified as it has the potential to cause significant detriment to the historic and rural character of the village centre.	The objectives should be read together, they are not mutually exclusive. Historic and rural character is variously protected by objectives 1 to 5 and 7. No change.
The Objectives	South Hams District Council		These could be more prominent – perhaps shown in a box with a specific, bolder heading. They form a logical link from the Vision through to the policies and appear to be largely consistent with strategic planning.	Support welcomed. The objectives will be made more prominent in the plan.
The Objectives	Peter Hales	08	I agree with the objectives set out in the plan.	Support welcomed.
The Objectives	Peter Hales	08	There is one objective where the plan should be more forward looking, in relation to the adoption of plans to support sustainable transport. Within the timespan of the plan we can expect that that electric cars will form the majority of new car sales and there	This aspiration is laudable, but it is considered that it is beyond the plan's scope. The plan's policies must be deliverable and although it is to be hoped that electric vehicles

		<p>will be a substantial second-hand fleet. Commercial transport will follow suit as battery technology improves.</p> <p>Benefits for the village will be a reduction in emissions and reduced traffic noise. In the bigger picture lower emissions will contribute towards reducing the pressure on global warming.</p> <p>The plan should take these sustainable transport changes on board and set out some provisions to deal with the consequences.</p> <p>Three suggestions immediately come to mind:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The plan calls for a new village car park. This (and the village hall car park) should include publicly accessible electric vehicle charging stations for use by residents and visitors. 2. The plan should encourage the owners of the other car parks in the parish to install charging stations (Strete Gate, Blackpool Sands). 3. The reduction in vehicle noise will bring increased road safety risk for pedestrians as electric vehicles are nearly silent and cannot be heard when approaching. This supports the need for a proper village footpath network. 	<p>will become increasingly the norm to require charging points through plan policy would add unduly to the burden of viability for development proposals.</p> <p>No change.</p>
--	--	--	---

3. The Environment				
Policy SNP1: Protecting the Landscape	Elizabeth Buckler	29	Support.	Support welcomed.
Policy SNP1: Protecting the Landscape	Simon Buckler	30	With new housing proposed on land adjoining four listed buildings and on a field within the Conservation Area I do not support Policy SNP1.	The existence of listed buildings and the conservation area does not preclude development but does require great care and sensitivity in

				its design and layout, which the plan requires. However, there is a change to the plan proposed (see below).
Policy SNP1: Protecting the Landscape	Ms V Tanner-Tremaine	32	I welcome the overall intent on coast and countryside.	Support welcomed.
Policy SNP1: Protecting the Landscape	Ms V Tanner-Tremaine	32	Paragraph 3.1 would be better if it were to use ‘high quality natural environment and its natural beauty’ rather than ‘unspoilt beauty’ to be more in line with the recognised characteristics of the AONB designation.	Accepted. The plan will be amended to read “its high quality natural environment and unspoilt natural beauty”.
Policy SNP1: Protecting the Landscape	Ms V Tanner-Tremaine	32	Paragraph 3.2 needs clarifying. The South Devon AONB is a nationally important protected landscape, the South Devon Heritage Coast is ... ????	This comment is left incomplete. No change.
Policy SNP1: Protecting the Landscape	Ms V Tanner-Tremaine	32	I welcome and support para 3.3, but the document should be referenced as: “South Devon AONB Partnership (2017), ‘Planning for the South Devon AONB: Planning Guidance v1’ (South Devon AONB Partnership)”. There may be future updates to the guidance which ought to be taken into account.	The plan is deliberately written to enable updates to the guidance to be taken into account. No change.
Policy SNP1: Protecting the Landscape	Ms V Tanner-Tremaine	32	The map under this section (which also requires a title) does not have a legend which explains which shading is the South Devon AONB. This map will need to be replaced in the final version of the plan with an appropriately copyrighted map.	Accepted. The map will be updated accordingly.
Policy SNP1: Protecting the Landscape	Ms V Tanner-Tremaine	32	I support the policy.	Support welcomed.

<p>Policy SNP1: Protecting the Landscape</p>	<p>South Devon AONB Unit</p>	<p>33</p>	<p>Policy SNP1 gives helpful reference to the importance of the designated protected landscape. Reference to its special qualities detailed in the AONB Management Plan would further support this. The plan could be clearer in acknowledging the special qualities of the AONB and further refer to the South Devon AONB Management Plan policies and objectives.</p> <p>Advisory action – consider including a reference to special qualities.</p>	<p>Accepted. The plan will be amended to make the suggested reference.</p>
<p>Policy SNP1: Protecting the Landscape</p>	<p>South Hams District Council</p>		<p>Clause 1 only refers to other guidance and policies and should therefore be deleted. A policy cannot require adherence to guidance in other documents which is not adopted policy in its own right.</p>	<p>The plan requires that regard (not adherence) be paid to AONB guidance. It is considered that this is helpful and appropriate. However, to further clarify the policy clause 1 will be amended as follows: “having regard to the special qualities of the AONB in the area, particularly its high coastal character and sea views, and to the South Devon AONB Planning Guidance”.</p> <p>In relation to policy SNP8: Design and Construction (see below) South Hams District Council say that it is not a function of the planning system to protect private views. That is accepted. However, the high coastal setting of the village means that public views are of very great importance and merit protection. The plan will be amended by the deletion of</p>

				reference to views in clause 2 of policy SNP8 and the addition of a new clause 3 in this policy (SNP1), as follows: “protecting the high coastal setting of the parish, including public views of the village from the sea and coast and public views of the sea and coast from the village”.
Policy SNP2: Heritage and Conservation	Richard Soans	01	The Conservation Area has not been shown accurately. Two areas are not shown as being in the conservation area. These are parcels of land either side of Cox's Farm and garden.	The proposals map notation is unclear and this will be rectified.
Policy SNP2: Heritage and Conservation	Mr and Mrs C M L Toll - Strete Estate	22	Whilst my clients generally support the sentiment in this policy, they do not support designation of 2 parts of the agricultural land forming parts of Cox's Farm as “important Open Space characterised by lack of development within it”. Both of these areas are agricultural land with very few, if any, viewpoints from any public locations.	This refers to an extract from the Strete Conservation Area Appraisal of 2009, shown in the plan for information only. No change.
Policy SNP2: Heritage and Conservation	Devon County Council Historic Environment Team	23	The plan covers the whole parish, but that part dealing with Heritage and Conservation only covers the village. It should encompass other parts of the parish. Heritage assets include archaeological remains , landscape features and historic structures and features. The parish has 23 designated heritage assets in total. 21 are listed Grade II, 2 are listed Grade II*. The Church of St Michael is also on the Heritage at Risk Register. In para 3.6 suggest insert ‘listed buildings’ – ‘... are designated, listed buildings but many are not subject.... ‘ This will help make the connection that listed buildings are designated heritage assets and that unlisted buildings, which	Accepted. The plan will be amended accordingly.

			do not have statutory protection but which are nevertheless important locally, are undesignated.	
Policy SNP2: Heritage and Conservation	Devon County Council Historic Environment Team	23	Should this refer to both designated and non-designated heritage assets?	Accepted. Clause 1 of the policy will be so amended (to match clause 2).
Policy SNP2: Heritage and Conservation	Devon County Council Historic Environment Team	23	Mention could also be made of the Historic Landscape Characterisation stating where remnants of medieval and post-medieval field systems, woodlands and orchards still survive. Further information on the Historic Landscape Characterisation can be found via link https://new.devon.gov.uk/historicenvironment/the-devon-historic-environment-record/historic-landscape-characterisation/	Noted. This will be added to the evidence base for the plan.
Policy SNP2: Heritage and Conservation	Wendy Gregory	24	The plan places access to a new housing development right next to a Grade 11 listed property. How can this protect the heritage and listed buildings of our village?	The existence of listed buildings and the conservation area does not preclude development but does require great care and sensitivity in its design and layout, which the plan requires. However, there is a change to the plan proposed (see below).
Policy SNP2: Heritage and Conservation	Ingrid Sidell	26	If historic assets, the conservation area and listed buildings are to be protected how can the plan propose development adjacent to listed cottages and the historic village pump? This development would totally change the historic character of the centre of the village.	The plan's policies require that proposed developments have regard to historic assets. However, there is a change to the plan proposed (see below).
Policy SNP2:	Elizabeth	29	The plan aims to protect and conserve local heritage, so why	The plan's policies require that

Heritage and Conservation	Buckler		propose a new development next to four of the listed buildings and why propose building in the Conservation Area?	proposed developments have regard to historic assets. However, there is a change to the plan proposed (see below).
Policy SNP2: Heritage and Conservation	Simon Buckler	30	With new housing proposed on land adjoining four listed buildings and on a field within the Conservation Area I do not support Policy SNP2.	The plan's policies require that proposed developments have regard to historic assets. However, there is a change to the plan proposed (see below).
Policy SNP2: Heritage and Conservation	Ms V Tanner-Tremaine	32	Map of Strete Conservation Area boundary is incorrect. Para 3.7 states there are 7 listed buildings. However, Heritage England identify 23 in the whole parish. These errors need to be corrected.	The proposals map notation of the Conservation Area is unclear and this will be rectified. Para 3.7 refers to "several" listed buildings. However, it is agree that the plan should be changed to make things clearer.
Policy SNP2: Heritage and Conservation	South Hams District Council		Does this policy add anything to national and local policy?	A precautionary approach has been taken pending approval of the JLP. This policy has also received support locally and from Devon County Council. Clause 3 and changes suggested by DCC are locally specific and are considered to be a helpful addition to existing policy. No further change.
Policy SNP3: Coastal setting and land south	Gary Lucas	10	To allow any development south (or east) of the A379 would be to the detriment of the landscape. There should be no further development south or east of the A379.	Support welcomed. This representation suggests a degree of control which would not

of the A379				align with national policy. However, the plan affords a great degree of protection.
Policy SNP3: Coastal setting and land south of the A379	Elizabeth Buckler	29	Support.	Support welcomed.
Policy SNP3: Coastal setting and land south of the A379	Simon Buckler	30	Support.	Support welcomed.
Policy SNP3: Coastal setting and land south of the A379	South Devon AONB Unit	33	Policy SNP3 is welcomed. Would be helpful if the coastal setting map shown on Page 14 included the South Devon Heritage Coast boundary complete with its seaward limit. Available from the Natural England Open Data Geoportal via http://naturalengland-defra.opendata.arcgis.com/ Advisory action – consider amending the map	Support welcomed. The proposals map will be amended to show the Heritage Coast boundary.
Policy SNP3: Coastal setting and land south of the A379	South Hams District Council		Some parts of the village within the settlement boundary lie to the south of the A379. For these parts of the village are the requirements of Policies SNP3 and SNP6 consistent? The former's requirement that development 'must enhance that coastal setting' is perhaps too onerous and the latter's requirement that development should 'cause no significant adverse impacts' is more appropriate.	Although the policy requirements are exacting it is considered that they are an appropriate expression of the plan's aim and that they align suitably with AONB policy. No change.
SNP4: Low density area	Mr and Mrs C M L Toll - Strete Estate	22	This policy is inconsistent with many other aspects of the character of the village and the proposals in the Plan. In particular, my clients do not consider that 2 of the 3 fields forming part of Cox's Farm should be designated as "Low Density Area".	It is considered that these parts of the village are of a lower density than most of the village, that the plan is accurate in that respect and that the policy is suitable.

				<p>However, the area covered by the policy will be retracted in line with the retraction of the settlement boundary and the changes to the development proposal at Cox's Farm Fields (see below).</p>
SNP4: Low density area	Elizabeth Buckler	29	Support.	Support welcomed.
SNP4: Low density area	Simon Buckler	30	Buildings in the low density area vary from closely-spaced to widely-spread. How dense is low density? In order to prevent insensitive housing infill, I support Policy SNP4.	<p>Support welcomed.</p> <p>The plan does not need to define low density. The policy's aim is to protect the area's character.</p>
SNP4: Low density area	Ms V Tanner-Tremaine	32	This policy is insufficiently clear in terms of how it would be applied to any development proposals.	The policy's aim, to protect the area's low density character, is clear.
SNP4: Low density area	South Devon AONB Unit	33	<p>The rationale and evidence for the low density area is not sound. Density throughout the defined area varies significantly from single properties in large grounds to recent properties with modest grounds. If the policy is retained, then a tighter boundary should be drawn, however the use of other policies relating to scale, design and character should be sufficient to address this matter.</p> <p>Advisory action – Re-consider boundary of proposed low density area or remove the policy.</p>	<p>Although the density of buildings varies across the defined area it is considered that there is a clear distinction between it and most of the rest of the village and that the policy is a helpful guide for the area's future planning.</p> <p>However, the area covered by the policy will be retracted in line with the retraction of the settlement boundary and the changes to the development proposal at Cox's Farm Fields (see below).</p>

<p>SNP4: Low density area</p>	<p>South Hams District Council</p>		<p>A policy seeking to retain the character of part of a settlement is acceptable in principle, but needs to be evidenced (is density in the proposed area significantly different to that in other parts of the village?) and justified (why is the character within the area important and what is being protected against?).</p> <p>The lower field of Cox's Farm is an open agricultural field and has no development on it. As such it is not appropriate for inclusion within the low density area.</p> <p>In the policy itself, it is difficult to see how development could 'enhance' the low density character. 'Development which would alter the low density character within the Policy Area will not be permitted' could be a better expression of what is being sought.</p>	<p>It is considered that the difference in character of the area is very clear and that it derives in large measure from the lower density that generally prevails there. Most of the rest of the village is of a higher density and of a different character.</p> <p>However, the area covered by the policy will be retracted in line with the retraction of the settlement boundary and the changes to the development proposal at Cox's Farm Fields (see below).</p>
<p>Policy SNP5: Tranquillity and Dark Skies</p>	<p>Nick and Barbara Shepherd</p>	<p>02</p>	<p>Support SNP 5 and would like to see steps taken to further reduce existing light pollution.</p>	<p>Support welcomed.</p>
<p>Policy SNP5: Tranquillity and Dark Skies</p>	<p>Jacqueline Smith</p>	<p>04</p>	<p>Stress how much the tranquillity and lack of light pollution are valued. The dark starry skies on a clear night are a real asset.</p>	<p>Support welcomed.</p>
<p>Policy SNP5: Tranquillity and Dark Skies</p>	<p>Ingrid Sidell</p>	<p>26</p>	<p>Fully endorse this policy, but the proposed development in the historic centre of the village will cause more light pollution ... is this really acceptable?</p>	<p>Support welcomed.</p> <p>There is a need for some development in the village and the plan aims to ensure that its impact will be acceptable.</p>
<p>Policy SNP5: Tranquillity and Dark Skies</p>	<p>Andrea Phillips</p>	<p>28</p>	<p>SNP5 – low light pollution in parts is acceptable, but street lighting needs to be sensitively placed in any new developments for residents. Timed, modern low level lighting could be considered.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Any street lights will need to be very carefully designed to minimise light pollution.</p>

Policy SNP5: Tranquillity and Dark Skies	Elizabeth Buckler	29	Support.	Support welcomed.
Policy SNP5: Tranquillity and Dark Skies	Simon Buckler	30	Strongly support.	Support welcomed.
Policy SNP5: Tranquillity and Dark Skies	Ms V Tanner- Tremaine	32	I welcome this policy, but its worded could be strengthened. Light pollution is one of the most easily <i>avoidable</i> forms of pollution as well as being easy to reverse. No increase in light pollution would be stronger wording for this policy. Tranquillity includes more than just noise, particularly in the context of the reasons for the designation of the South Devon AONB.	Support welcomed. The detailed points raised are noted and the change below will help to address them.
Policy SNP5: Tranquillity and Dark Skies	South Hams District Council		It is not clear how ‘no undue noise or light pollution’ will be measured and assessed i.e. what will be acceptable and unacceptable? ‘Development shall be designed so that it will minimise noise and light pollution’ could be better. It would be better to include this issue in Policy SNP8: Design and Construction clause 5 – currently they duplicate each other.	The wording suggested by SHDC is considered to be an improvement and the policy will be so amended. It is considered that the matter merits being treated separately and not subsumed in policy SNP8.
4. Development and Homes				
Policy SNP6: Development and the Settlement Boundary	Andrew Hollis	07	A field to the north east of the village, which had been outside the settlement boundary in earlier plans, ought not to have been drawn inside that boundary in the plan. The previous designation was as agricultural land outside the village boundary and within the AONB, the Coastal Preservation Area and the South Devon Heritage Coast giving the field a high degree of protection. Placing it inside the	This comment is accepted and the settlement boundary will be redrawn to exclude the field.

			<p>settlement boundary makes it highly likely to be developed.</p> <p>The field ought to be removed from the settlement boundary because (i) development there would be very visible from the A379 and from the coast path, (ii) the field has long been recognised as a particular feature of the village, and (iii) the field has high landscape merit, perhaps more than the field preserved as an open space which is above and therefore scarcely visible from the coast road.</p>	
Policy SNP6: Development and the Settlement Boundary	Mr and Mrs C M L Toll - Strete Estate	22	My clients do not agree that there should be a hard defined development and settlement boundary. This is inconsistent with modern planning approaches. The development boundary should remain flexible to the differing needs and requirements of the settlement in the future.	<p>This is not accepted. Settlement boundaries are a well known planning tool, and are well established in the South Hams.</p> <p>No change.</p>
Policy SNP6: Development and the Settlement Boundary	Andrea Phillips	28	The village needs a development boundary but should exclude the Start Bay Caravan site (which should be maintained as a part-year occupancy holiday site in line with policy SNP15) and the barn conversions south of the A379 (to fit in with policy SNP3).	Accepted. The boundary will be retracted to exclude these areas.
Policy SNP6: Development and the Settlement Boundary	Elizabeth Buckler	29	The proposed development will have significant adverse impact on natural and historic environment, amenity, traffic, parking and safety. In 2002 Devon Highways deemed an exit onto the A379 too dangerous.	This is dealt with in the response to the similar objection to SNP9 below.
Policy SNP6: Development and the Settlement Boundary	Simon Buckler	30	Policy SNP6 is disingenuous - it seeks to protect the environment whereas proposals determine the contrary. The policies ignore advice from Devon County Highways that access/egress from Cox's Farm Fields onto the A379 was unsafe. Stone walls in the vicinity would also be adversely affected.	The settlement boundary is considered to be an effective way to help guide needed development to the right places. Traffic and conservation considerations have not been overlooked. This is dealt

				with in more detail in the response to the similar objection to SNP9 below.
Policy SNP6: Development and the Settlement Boundary	Natural England	31	<p>The settlement boundary appears to be very generous and includes considerable areas of undeveloped land. Whilst some of this is proposed for housing and there are also three allocations of Local Green Space, a sizeable undeveloped area to the north of the village is not allocated but is included within the boundary. The caravan park is also included as is a field off Vicarage Lane and an open area north of 'The Lodge'. We also have concerns about the low density sites that extend to the south west of the village yet are included within the development boundary.</p> <p>Development pressure on these sites will be enormous and we consider that policies SNP4 and SNP7 of the plan are less effective than if the sites were to be located outside the boundary. The most robust way to safeguard against unsuitable development at this prominent coastal location in the AONB is to exclude the areas from the settlement boundary.</p> <p>The SEA should also deal with the options and decision making process for including or excluding areas from the development boundary. This will increase transparency and help withstand future challenges to the plan.</p>	<p>Accepted in part.</p> <p>The settlement boundary will be retracted to exclude most of these sites, much of the area covered by policy SNP4 and almost all of the area covered by policy SNP7, and to align more closely with that shown in earlier plans. Policy SNP7 will be deleted (see below).</p> <p>However, policy SNP4 is considered still to add value and will be retained in relation to most of its area within the retracted settlement boundary.</p>
Policy SNP7: Village Core and A379 corridor	Gary Lucas	10	<p>The policy should also consider access, ensure that density is in keeping with that of surrounding properties and respect their privacy.</p>	<p>The policy aims to safeguard the particular character of the area. Access and privacy are dealt with by other policies.</p> <p>However, the retraction of the settlement boundary (see above)</p>

				<p>means that very little of the area covered by policy SNP7 remains unprotected and the policy will therefore be deleted from the plan.</p>
<p>Policy SNP7: Village Core and A379 corridor</p>	<p>Ingrid Sidell</p>	<p>26</p>	<p>If historic assets, the conservation area and listed buildings are to be protected how can the plan propose development adjacent to listed cottages and the historic village pump? This development would totally change the historic character of the centre of the village.</p>	<p>The plan's policies require that proposed developments have regard to historic assets.</p> <p>However, the retraction of the settlement boundary (see above) means that very little of the area covered by policy SNP7 remains unprotected and policy SNP7 will therefore be deleted from the plan.</p> <p>There is also a further change to the plan proposed (see SNP9).</p>
<p>Policy SNP7: Village Core and A379 corridor</p>	<p>Elizabeth Buckler</p>	<p>29</p>	<p>Plan on page 16 incorrect. Conservation Area incorrectly drawn. Proposed development is inside the Conservation Area. Plan states it will protect heritage but it is not doing so.</p>	<p>This representation is made against SNP7 but largely relates to those made against SNP2 (see above) and SNP9, where a change to the plan is proposed (see below).</p> <p>In addition, the retraction of the settlement boundary (see above) means that very little of the area covered by policy SNP7 remains unprotected and the policy will therefore be deleted from the plan.</p>

<p>Policy SNP7: Village Core and A379 corridor</p>	<p>Simon Buckler</p>	<p>30</p>	<p>The rationale for delineating the "Village Core" as shown on the map accompanying Policy SNP7 is inconsistent. The inference is that the Village Core is coterminous with the CA, with the addition of other parts which merit protection. Why, then, have fields to the east of the CA been added to the Village Core but two other areas - The Paddock and part of the northernmost of Cox's Farm Fields - both within the CA, been excluded?</p>	<p>The retraction of the settlement boundary (see above) means that very little of the area covered by policy SNP7 remains unprotected and the policy will therefore be deleted from the plan.</p> <p>Conservation Area policies, at national level, in the JLP and in this plan, will continue to afford protection to it.</p>
<p>Policy SNP7: Village Core and A379 corridor</p>	<p>Ms V Tanner-Tremaine</p>	<p>32</p>	<p>I cannot support this policy in its current form. The boundary of the 'village core and A379 corridor' should reflect the Conservation Area boundary, including the areas behind Cox's Farm which are part of the setting of the historic core and the listed buildings.</p>	<p>The retraction of the settlement boundary (see above) means that very little of the area covered by policy SNP7 remains unprotected and the policy will therefore be deleted from the plan.</p> <p>Conservation Area policies, at national level, in the JLP and in this plan, will continue to afford protection to it.</p>
<p>Policy SNP7: Village Core and A379 corridor</p>	<p>South Devon AONB Unit</p>	<p>33</p>	<p>Policy SNP7 is welcomed but the area must align with the conservation area boundary as a minimum with additional areas of value added.</p> <p>Advisory action - SNP7 policy area should include the two parts of Cox's field that lie inside the Conservation Area.</p>	<p>The retraction of the settlement boundary (see above) means that very little of the area covered by policy SNP7 remains unprotected and the policy will therefore be deleted from the plan.</p> <p>Conservation Area policies, at national level, in the JLP and in this plan, will continue to afford protection to it.</p>

Policy SNP8: Design and Construction	Mr and Mrs C M L Toll - Strete Estate	22	Paragraph 3 of the policy requires that new development provide car parking based on 2 spaces per dwelling, plus an additional space for every bedroom. This seems excessive and is not supported.	It is considered that this is an appropriate requirement for this rural area. No change.
Policy SNP8: Design and Construction	Elizabeth Buckler	29	Support.	Support welcomed.
Policy SNP8: Design and Construction	Simon Buckler	30	Support.	Support welcomed.
Policy SNP8: Design and Construction	Ms V Tanner- Tremaine	32	The inclusion of a policy on design and construction is welcomed as are the matters which the policy seeks to address.	Support welcomed.
Policy SNP8: Design and Construction	South Hams District Council		<p>Para. 4.5 second sentence. The current wording could be interpreted to mean that the design of 'private areas' of new development must 'ensure' that they are 'accessible for all'. It is assumed that this isn't what is meant, but what is being sought? Is it that new development should be designed to the latest access standards?</p> <p>Policy clause 2. It is not a function of the planning system to protect views, especially private views. If there are some especially significant views from publicly accessible points, these should be identified in the plan and an appropriate safeguarding policy introduced.</p> <p>Policy clause 3. The requirement that all new development shall be 'attractive' – this is highly subjective, how will it be assessed? Re. car parking requirements – does this mean that a one-bedroom flat would have to provide three car parking spaces?</p>	<p>The plan aims to assure that development will at least meet required access standards. Para 4.5 will be amended to make this clear.</p> <p>It is accepted that it is not a function of the planning system to protect private views. However, the high coastal setting of the village means that public views are of very great importance and merit protection. The plan will be amended by the deletion of reference to views from clause 2 of this policy and the addition of a new clause 3 in policy SNP1:</p>

				<p>Protecting the Landscape, as follows: “protecting the high coastal setting of the parish, including public views of the village from the sea and coast and public views of the sea and coast from the village”.</p> <p>It is accepted that the word “attractive” is highly subjective. It will be deleted from clause 3 of the policy. Clause 1 deals with the requirement for good design.</p> <p>The parking requirement in clause 3 will be clarified as follows: “... including for residential development one car parking space per bedroom with a minimum of two spaces per dwelling”, so that a one or two bedroom home would have to provide two spaces, a three bedroom home three spaces, four bedrooms four spaces, and so on.</p>
<p>Policy SNP9: Housing development site at Cox’s Farm Field</p>	<p>Mr and Mrs D Poole</p>	<p>03</p>	<p>We have no objection to the site being built but are concerned with access off the busy A379, which would be outrageously dangerous for vehicles and pedestrians, particularly as there are no footpaths.</p> <p>Another access route is available and should be used, namely The Plat. This is the sensible and safest place for the extra traffic to pass through.</p>	<p>Support welcomed.</p> <p>Concerns regarding access are noted, but Devon County Highways has confirmed that a safe access can be achieved from the A379.</p> <p>However, for other reasons the site proposal is changed (see below).</p>

<p>Policy SNP9: Housing development site at Cox's Farm Field</p>	<p>Sandi Marshall</p>	<p>06</p>	<p>I am concerned by the way Strete is being pushed into housing development for the open market in a protected landscape when there does not appear to be a real need.</p> <p>The plan says that there is a "definite" need for four affordable homes - how has that figure has come about?</p> <p>The maths then seems to say that if Street "needs" four affordable homes there must be 12 homes built in order to force the developer to build 4 that are (so called) affordable. This is a specious argument.</p> <p>The problem is that house prices are pushed up because of the desire of people from outside the area to have a second home. This is a national issue and should be addressed more firmly in the plan and by government nationally.</p> <p>There are other ways of achieving four affordable homes if they are needed: council housing, community projects, self-build or the huge reserves held by SHDC.</p>	<p>The need for four affordable homes was evidenced by the 2015 Housing Needs Survey, as the plan says, and the need is likely to have grown since then.</p> <p>The thresholds for affordable housing provision are set through national and local strategic planning policy. The plan must abide by and conform with them.</p> <p>The plan addresses the issue of second homes.</p> <p>Other ways of enabling affordable homes are not precluded by the plan. Indeed, they may have a part to play in enabling the affordable homes proposed.</p>
<p>Policy SNP9: Housing development site at Cox's Farm Field</p>	<p>Mr and Mrs Goldring</p>	<p>09</p>	<p>Cox's Farm Field is a viable place for new housing but this should be at the top of the field where infrastructure is already in place. This would keep new housing together and leave open space at the bottom of the field. Access to the site should not be directly onto the A379. This would be dangerous and on a blind bend.</p>	<p>Concerns regarding layout and access are noted and the site proposal is changed (see below).</p>
<p>Policy SNP9: Housing development site at Cox's Farm Field</p>	<p>Gary Lucas</p>	<p>10</p>	<p>The allocation of open space and development at Cox's Field should be revisited to provide a "buffer zone" to the conservation area. Access via Totnes Road and the Plat would exacerbate difficulties that already exist at the Totnes Road/ A379 junction and so access should be from the A379 directly with an improvement to the road layout.</p>	<p>Support welcomed.</p> <p>The site proposal is changed (see below) and this will include a requirement to pay regard to the conservation area.</p>

Policy SNP9: Housing development site at Cox's Farm Field	Mr and Mrs Rossiter	11	Generally very much in support of the plan and agree that more housing is needed in Strete. However it is illogical to build new homes on the lower part of Cox's Farm. The homes built on The Plat mean that this already has the infrastructure needed. The proposed access onto the main road would mean a lot more traffic through the centre of the village and a dangerous entrance to the site. The new homes should be an extension to The Plat.	Support welcomed and comments noted. The site proposal is changed (see below).
Policy SNP9: Housing development site at Cox's Farm Field	Trudy Andrews	12	The whole of Cox's Farm Field should be included for development, with the road extending from the Plat to the pub car park and through to Hynetown Road. No more recreational space is needed. The whole site should be used to provide housing for all, particularly sheltered housing and a mix of 1, 2 and 3 bedroom properties.	Comments noted. The site proposal is changed (see below).
Policy SNP9: Housing development site at Cox's Farm Field	Karen Hales	14	Endorse the need for affordable housing. Support the aspiration for a village car park and footpath. Concerned that these requirements, coupled with Policy SNP10, may mean that housing is not economically viable for a developer but, since we either propose development acceptable to most of the community in the plan or leave the village at the whim of developers, I support the plan.	Support welcomed. The site proposal is changed (see below).
Policy SNP9: Housing development site at Cox's Farm Field	Philip Green	15	Access onto the A379 needs to be safe especially for those exiting right. Endorse the requirement for a car park, especially for residents living adjacent to the A379.	Agreed, the access design must meet safety requirements. Support welcomed. The site proposal is changed (see below).
Policy SNP9: Housing development site at Cox's	Joan Kendall	16	Both the higher and lower fields should be developed, with the first phase being the higher field where two suitable entrances are in place, from The Plat and from the lane between Weatherly and Mellstock. Entry directly onto the	Support welcomed and comments noted. The site proposal is changed (see below).

Farm Field			<p>A379 would be very dangerous. A footpath from The Plat to the A379 would make sense.</p> <p>We do need more housing in the centre of the village to encourage young people to stay.</p>	
Policy SNP9: Housing development site at Cox's Farm Field	Roy Kendall	17	<p>Entry to the top field from The Plat already exists. Vehicle access direct to the A379 would be very dangerous, although a footpath link from The Plat to the A379 would be sensible. We do need more affordable housing in the village. We also need two workshop units, possibly under to Blindwells.</p>	Support welcomed and comments noted. The site proposal is changed (see below).
Policy SNP9: Housing development site at Cox's Farm Field	Mr and Mrs Freeman	18	<p>The siting of the proposed 12 dwellings will be out of keeping so close to the A379. Access from the A379 would be unsafe.</p> <p>Access from The Plat would mean that residents of the new houses could disperse more safely in three directions.</p>	Comments noted. The site proposal is changed (see below).
Policy SNP9: Housing development site at Cox's Farm Field	Roger Sinnott	19	<p>To attract younger people to the village the number of new houses should be increased so that a developer will be able to increase the number of 'affordable' homes. I suggest that 20 new homes should be proposed.</p> <p>The most suitable area for new housing is Cox's Farm Fields, but access to the site off the A379 should be restricted to footpath access only. Vehicular access should be from The Platt which already has provision for such, and it may be better to develop the north part of the site for housing with the remainder retained in agriculture.</p>	Support welcomed and comments noted. The site proposal is changed (see below).
Policy SNP9: Housing development site at Cox's Farm Field	Paul Petransky	20	<p>Cox's Farm Fields is the right place for any new housing development, but not the lower part as proposed. The proposal encroaches on the Conservation Area which is protected by SNP2; any developer would find this a bar to profitability. The traffic would debouch onto the A379 at a</p>	<p>Support welcomed and comments noted. The site proposal is changed (see below).</p> <p>Devon County Highways' view is that access can be safely achieved</p>

			<p>pinch point/blind bend. This exit would be dangerous and the view of the Highways Authority should have been sought. Infrastructure is in place in the upper area of Cox's Farm Fields, adjacent to The Platt, where development was previously proposed. Any proposed development should take place in the upper area of Cox's Farm Fields.</p>	<p>from the A379 and from The Plat.</p>
<p>Policy SNP9: Housing development site at Cox's Farm Field</p>	<p>Kerris Petransky</p>	<p>21</p>	<p>A part of the Conservation Area recognised as "important open space characterised by lack of development within it" is included in the development proposal and lies adjacent to several listed properties. This area should not be developed.</p> <p>There is infrastructure available to serve development in Cox's Farm Fields at The Plat. This suggests that new development should be in the north part of the site.</p> <p>Access onto the A379 would be dangerous. Policy SNP11 says that development should "not lead to traffic danger etc.". Access from The Plat would be much safer. The view of the Highways Authority should have been sought.</p> <p>The new development should be in the north part of the area linked to access from The Plat.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The site proposal is changed (see below).</p> <p>Devon County Highways' view is that access can be safely achieved from the A379 and from The Plat.</p>
<p>Policy SNP9: Housing development site at Cox's Farm Field</p>	<p>Mr and Mrs C M L Toll - Strete Estate</p>	<p>22</p>	<p>The draft plan proposes development in 2 of the 3 fields forming part of Cox's Farm which are currently surrounded by development in the centre of the village. My clients do not support the proposal. They are willing to consider that development be situated in all, or part of the 3 Cox's Farm fields. However, this must be based on a viable proposal.</p> <p>My clients do not wish to see the plan take a definitive position on the location of the development and would like to see all 3 fields designated. They also prefer to see the development on the north end of the Cox's farm land with access off the Plat.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The site proposal is changed (see below).</p> <p>It is considered to be helpful to all concerned for the plan to set out the community's aspirations for the development site, including affordable homes, car parking, open space and footpath links.</p>

			<p>Proposals for the provision of car parking, footpaths, open space, etc. should be considered at a detailed stage based on viability and not as conditions in the plan proposal.</p> <p>My clients have asked me to state that they were assured by SHDC Forward Planning that the next significant development in Strete would be on the land forming part of Cox's Farm and accessed off the Plat.</p>	
Policy SNP9: Housing development site at Cox's Farm Field	Wendy Gregory	24	<p>I object to this site. It breaks the commitment to preserve heritage, historic ambience and protect listed buildings and on the grounds of road safety.</p> <p>The alternative site to the north should be proposed, which has drainage and an access road already in place.</p>	Comments noted. The site proposal is changed (see below).
Policy SNP9: Housing development site at Cox's Farm Field	Ann Seymour	25	<p>With the development of 40 houses in Blackawton and the huge development proposed for Dartmouth is there a need for affordable housing in Strete? Employment and housing should go side by side and the employment situation is very poor with little chance of it improving.</p> <p>The sewerage system could not cope with another housing development.</p>	<p>The 2015 Housing Needs Survey showed a clear need for affordable housing in Strete.</p> <p>There is understood to be adequate sewerage capacity.</p>
Policy SNP9: Housing development site at Cox's Farm Field	Ingrid Sidell	26	<p>Object to siting new housing on the lower field and the Paddock . The area proposed as open space in the plan has in the past been viewed as the most appropriate next area for development. The infrastructure for access, drainage, sewage , water and electricity is all there. It will surely be far more expensive to develop the lower fields.</p> <p>Object to access onto the busy A379 at a point where there is a bus stop , the pub car park, an electric substation, the old village pump , a narrow section of road and a dangerous blind bend.</p>	Comments noted. The site proposal is changed (see below).

			My house backs onto the Paddock of Cox's Farm Fields. Any houses built there are likely to overlook my property and the listed buildings next door and would be visible from the centre of the village. This needs to be taken into account.	
Policy SNP9: Housing development site at Cox's Farm Field	Ian and Deborah Cunningham	27	<p>We think that the lower field is more suitable for open space and the upper field for development - the reverse to what is suggested. This is because:</p> <p>The lower field adjacent to the pub car park would be a more accessible open space for locals and tourists - helping to promote policy SNP 15 - sustainable tourism. It is visible from the coast road, has a bus stop at the current entrance, is close to the post office and the pub and the coast path runs nearby.</p>	Comments noted. The site proposal is changed (see below).
Policy SNP9: Housing development site at Cox's Farm Field	Andrea Phillips	28	Support development at Cox's Fields but not access onto the A379. This area gives an attractive rural appearance for the approaches into the village but is a busy road, especially in the summer. Visibility is not good. Other entrances to the field are safer and fit with the objectives of 'protecting local landscape character' and 'natural beauty' and SNP2. The positioning of development should be organic; be the choice of the landowner /developer / architect or the village as a whole and have good planning reasons which preclude other options.	Support welcomed and comments noted. The site proposal is changed (see below).
Policy SNP9: Housing development site at Cox's Farm Field	Elizabeth Buckler	29	The draft Local Plan of 2002 proposed a development to be situated to the north of Cox's Farm Fields where drains are already in place and there is access via The Plat. This was preferred by Devon Highways, who deemed the A379 too dangerous. Why has part of the conservation area next to four listed buildings now been chosen for development? The plan is supposed to recognise, value, protect and conserve	<p>Comments noted. The site proposal is changed (see below).</p> <p>Devon County Highways' view is that access can be safely achieved from the A379 and from The Plat.</p>

			our heritage.	
Policy SNP9: Housing development site at Cox's Farm Field	Simon Buckler	30	<p>It is hard to understand how the proposed site could have been chosen. It requires development of The Paddock, which is inside the conservation area, and will have a harmful effect on the four adjacent listed buildings and their settings. Access onto the A379 is proposed which Devon County Council Highways has previously deemed unsafe. The walk between the site and the village shop, post office, pub and public transport would be along an A-road with no pavement.</p> <p>If any of Cox's Farm Fields were to be chosen as a development site, the northern field (minus the parcel within the conservation area) is the rational choice. The Plat was constructed to allow future road access and services to any further development at Cox's Farm Fields. The sewer drain was constructed for some distance beyond The Plat and into the northernmost field.</p> <p>In the 2002 Draft Local Plan for Strete the preferred access to proposed development at Cox's Farm Fields was via The Plat.</p>	<p>Support welcomed and comments noted. The site proposal is changed (see below).</p> <p>Devon County Highways' view is that access can be safely achieved from the A379 and from The Plat.</p>
Policy SNP9: Housing development site at Cox's Farm Field	Ms V Tanner-Tremaine	32	<p>I cannot support this policy. The site selection has not been carried out appropriately and decision-making has not been appropriately informed by environmental information as is required by SEA law. Allocation of the site is in conflict with many of the protective policies within this plan, in particular those on landscape and heritage.</p> <p>Development at this site will lead to negative impacts on the historic core of the village. The Environmental Report says this policy could be <i>'strengthened further through specifically seeking to ensure that development proposals demonstrate how impacts on the fabric and setting of Strete Conservation Area will be limited, and enhancements secured'</i>.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The site proposal is changed (see below).</p> <p>It is considered that the site selection process meets EU requirements and that the Sites Assessment is sound.</p> <p>Changes to the site proposal include more specific reference to the need to have careful regard to landscape and heritage.</p>

<p>Policy SNP9: Housing development site at Cox’s Farm Field</p>	<p>South Devon AONB Unit</p>	<p>33</p>	<p>We acknowledge the need for appropriate housing, community facilities and employment sites to foster the social and economic wellbeing of the area, and recognise the challenges faced in identifying sites.</p> <p>The amount and type of proposed housing is supported, but the selected site conflicts with most of the other plan policies, is inconsistent with the evidence base and AONB Guidance, and would compromise the conservation area, historic environment and landscape.</p> <p>There is no assessment of the environmental impacts of the south part of Cox's Farm Fields as compared with the northern part to support the final site selection. Different environmental effects would have been identified for each site with the northern site having less impact.</p> <p>The Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) has not identified and assessed the reasonable alternatives presented in the draft plan, in particular it does not differentiate between the different parts of Cox’s Farm Fields. The Plan appears to jump from analysis of the whole of Cox’s Farm Fields to selection of the southern part of the site without reasoned justification.</p> <p>Whilst there is much to be welcomed in the draft plan, we have reservations about it in its current form.</p> <p>Advisory action – Re-visit the evidence base to consider site assessments, SEA and SA on two distinct alternatives within Cox’s farm fields, then follow SEA conclusions and select the site with least environmental impacts.</p> <p>We would expect the northern part of the site to be clearly identified as having least environmental impact.</p>	<p>Support welcomed and comments noted. The site proposal is changed (see below).</p> <p>It is considered that the Sites Assessment and SEA are sufficient and that the plan as amended (see below) meets the appropriate requirements.</p>
<p>Policy SNP9:</p>	<p>Historic</p>	<p>34</p>	<p>The site lies partly within and largely adjacent to the</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>

<p>Housing development site at Cox's Farm Field</p>	<p>England</p>	<p>Conservation Area, and forms part of its setting. The 2009 Conservation Area Appraisal and the SEA both refer to fields coming right up to join the conservation area. Development of the site therefore has the potential to impact significantly on the setting of the conservation area and related Listed Buildings.</p> <p>We do not consider that the Site Assessment, the SEA report or the Sustainability Appraisal are sufficient to substantiate this policy. If not available we advise that evidence be produced to address the following:</p> <p>What role does the site play in defining the setting of the conservation area and thereby its heritage significance?</p> <p>What will the effect of its allocation in principle be on that significance in terms of scale and nature of any harm?</p> <p>How can that harm be avoided or suitably mitigated?</p> <p>How does an understanding of that significance inform the number of housing units which the site is able to accommodate?</p>	<p>It is considered that the extent of analysis suggested is not proportionate to the plan or its policies.</p> <p>In any case, the site proposal is changed (see below) and it is considered that the changes provide satisfactory safeguards.</p>
<p>Policy SNP9: Housing development site at Cox's Farm Field</p>	<p>Simon Buckler</p>	<p>35</p> <p>The decision by the Steering Group to choose the lower section of Cox's Farm Fields, including The Paddock, as the development site is fundamentally flawed.</p> <p>It was not based on the evidence; no regard was given to the 2009 Strete Conservation Area Appraisal or the plans own policies. Notice of the vote to choose the site was not published on the December 2017 meeting's agenda, all six steering group members who voted 6:2 in favour of the site live either directly adjacent to or within 20 metres of the upper part of Cox's Farm Fields which the plan proposes will remain as open space.</p> <p>I consider the decision is flawed and could give rise to legal</p>	<p>The group has been careful to operate according to proper guidelines and principles.</p> <p>Its terms of reference are clearly published on the neighbourhood plan website and the group has been properly constituted.</p> <p>Volunteers to join the group are always welcome.</p>

		challenge.	
Policy SNP9: Housing development site at Cox's Farm Field	South Hams District Council	<p>The statement at para 4.8 that 'The JLP anticipates that, as a guideline, about 10 new houses are likely to be built in the parish over the plan period 2014-34' is a misinterpretation. The indicative 10 dwellings should be regarded as a minimum and relates to a site or sites to be identified and proposed in the neighbourhood plan. Other dwellings constructed during the plan period by means of 'windfalls', either in the main village or elsewhere in the parish, do not count towards this indicative number of 10.</p> <p>Para. 4.9 refers to a Housing Needs Survey that 'identified a definite need for four homes to meet local needs for housing – the true figure is probably a little higher.' The Council agrees with this last point, as a HNS has a timescale of about 3-5 years and the plan covers a 20 year period. It would therefore be reasonable to plan for the provision of at least 5 affordable houses. Based on the JLP requirement for on-site affordable housing provision at a level of 30% (on sites of 11 dwellings or more), the plan should be seeking to deliver at least 15 dwellings on the proposed site.</p> <p>The two fields at Cox's Farm in the centre of the village provide adequate scope to accommodate this scale of housing development in a way that would be in keeping with adjoining areas of the village and sympathetic to the Conservation Area and wider AONB landscape. The plan acknowledges that this is 'the most suitable and best located site for housing development'.</p> <p>The plan also expresses community wishes to see provision of a public car park (a long-held aspiration), a footpath connection between The Plat and A379 and for some open space for recreational use. The Council considers that all of</p>	<p>The guidance and suggestions made by SHDC are welcomed.</p> <p>Clarification of the ambiguity contained in the JLP is noted and Para 4.8 will be amended to reflect the JLP's true intent.</p> <p>The housing development site proposal at Cox's Farm Field will be amended, largely in line with SHDC's suggestions and to also address many of the concerns expressed by others, to include both the northern and southern (upper and lower) fields and to read as follows:</p> <p>"Policy SNP9: Development Site at Cox's Farm Field.</p> <p>Development is proposed at the site known as Cox's Farm Field. The development shall include:</p> <p>a) 17 new homes, designed to enable home working and built to high eco-standards, including at least 5 affordable homes,</p> <p>b) a public car park and open space to serve the needs of the village,</p> <p>c) vehicular access from the A379 and The Plat, and</p>

			<p>these elements could be delivered by a comprehensive proposal covering both parcels of land.</p> <p>Such a comprehensive approach could result in the residential element being accommodated in a more acceptable way across both parcels of land rather than being concentrated just in the southern parcel. It could also enable greater 'set-back' from the Conservation Area and a form of development that would be more easily assimilated into the sensitive landscape.</p> <p>Taking such a comprehensive approach would improve scope to secure the 'community gain' elements. Why not take a long-term, comprehensive view, planning for the whole of this central area and seeking to make the development of the housing conditional on the provision of the other elements that would benefit the local community? A phased approach to the delivery of the housing could potentially be included.</p>	<p>d) footpath links between the A379, The Plat and Blackbird Wood.</p> <p>A masterplan shall be prepared for the whole site, including consultation with and involvement of the local community, showing how the whole of the development can be safely and satisfactorily laid out and delivered, and how the setting of the Conservation Area will be protected.</p> <p>Development shall not commence until that masterplan has been approved by the local planning authority."</p>
Policy SNP10: Principal Residence requirement	Jacqueline Smith	04	Support. It does not enhance the village to build for non-main residence investors, making property unaffordable for younger local population.	Support welcomed.
Policy SNP10: Principal Residence requirement	Mr and Mrs Baldock	05	Support. Housing should not be for second homes. Most should be affordable.	Support welcomed.
Policy SNP10: Principal Residence requirement	Sandi Marshall	06	Concerned by the term "principal residence". The policy needs to be more tightly written if it is not to be abused. I understand South Hams recognise that figures on holiday homes are a gross underestimate. I hope that Strete did its own count on the ground. You might consider the term "in	Support welcomed. The policy and the term "principal residence" are the same as has been so successfully applied in St

			permanent occupation " instead, along the lines of the St Ives model.	Ives.
Policy SNP10: Principal Residence requirement	Mr and Mrs C M L Toll - Strete Estate	22	As discussed at the meeting to which you invited me, my clients do not support this policy. It is too blunt an instrument and almost certainly makes any development in Strete unviable. The objectives which it is intended to achieve are better achieved by the District Council applying policies on Council Tax on second dwellings.	Not accepted. Council Tax measures are largely ineffective in halting the growth in numbers of second homes.
Policy SNP10: Principal Residence requirement	Elizabeth Buckler	29	Support.	Support welcomed.
Policy SNP10: Principal Residence requirement	Simon Buckler	30	Support.	Support welcomed.
Policy SNP10: Principal Residence requirement	Ms V Tanner-Tremaine	32	This policy is welcomed.	Support welcomed.
Policy SNP10: Principal Residence requirement	South Hams District Council		The NP states that the level of second home ownership in the parish has risen recently to about 20%. Is this sufficiently high enough to warrant a principal residence requirement? Such an approach will need to be well evidenced to stand chance of becoming adopted policy.	It is considered, in view of the small scale of the community and the clear need for more homes available and affordable for locals, that the policy is justified.
5. People and Community				
Policy SNP11: Community	Ingrid Sidell	26	More car parking facilities are essential, especially for residents in the centre of the village on the A379 and for	Support welcomed.

facilities and infrastructure			visitors. If we want to attract more tourists to the area, as stated in SNP15, then adequate parking needs to be a priority. There needs to be a definite proposal to provide more parking.	The change to policy SNP9 (above) specifically requires that a car park be provided.
Policy SNP11: Community facilities and infrastructure	Andrea Phillips	28	For what reason is additional open space required? It would need to be maintained and managed at a cost, and would probably not be used. The open spaces currently in the village (three in total) are very under used.	The community has expressed a desire for additional open space.
Policy SNP11: Community facilities and infrastructure	Elizabeth Buckler	29	Support.	Support welcomed.
Policy SNP11: Community facilities and infrastructure	Simon Buckler	30	Support.	Support welcomed.
Policy SNP11: Community facilities and infrastructure	Ms V Tanner-Tremaine	32	This policy is welcomed.	Support welcomed.
Policy SNP11: Community facilities and infrastructure	South Hams District Council		Clause 2. It is not necessary to include 'provided it complies with national and local strategic policies and the other policies of this plan'. This is a well- established principle that doesn't need to be stated in policy.	Accepted. The phrase will be deleted from the policy.
Policy SNP12: Local Green Space	Elizabeth Buckler	29	Support.	Support welcomed.

Policy SNP12: Local Green Space	Simon Buckler	30	Support.	Support welcomed.
Policy SNP12: Local Green Space	Ms V Tanner- Tremaine	32	This policy is welcomed.	Support welcomed.
Policy SNP12: Local Green Space	South Hams District Council		This appears to be a measured and justifiable approach to LGS designation. It would be logical to flip the order of clauses 1 and 2 in the policy.	Accepted. The order of the two clauses will be reversed.
Policy SNP13: Open Space at Cox's Farm Fields	Gary Lucas	10	I recognise the rationale for development on Cox's field, but the allocation of open space and development might be revisited, not to change the proportions of land allocated to each use, but to provide a "buffer zone" between development and the conservation area and to clarify access arrangements, with access directly from the A379 seeming to be sensible.	Support welcomed. In view of the changes to Policy SNP9 (above) it is appropriate to delete Policy SNP13 from the plan.
Policy SNP13: Open Space at Cox's Farm Fields	Mr and Mrs Tuck	13	This area is a natural phase 2 of any development. The door should be left open for this in 10-15 years, protecting current interests while signalling future intentions.	Comments noted. In view of the changes to Policy SNP9 (above) it is appropriate to delete Policy SNP13 from the plan.
Policy SNP13: Open Space at Cox's Farm Fields	Mr and Mrs Freeman	18	We recognise the need for housing in the village, but the new housing development should be more centrally positioned, north east to south east, with landscaping, footpaths and car parking around the surrounding area.	Support welcomed. See the changes to Policy SNP9 (above) in view of which it is appropriate to delete Policy SNP13 from the plan.
Policy SNP13: Open Space at Cox's Farm	Roger Sinnott	19	I agree that the most suitable area for new housing is Cox's Farm Fields but access (apart from pedestrian access) should not be directly off the A379 but from The Plat. This being so	Support welcomed. See the changes to Policy SNP9 (above) in view of which it is appropriate to

Fields			the new housing should be built in the upper field with the remainder of the area retained for agriculture.	delete Policy SNP13 from the plan.
Policy SNP13: Open Space at Cox's Farm Fields	Paul Petransky	20	Cox's Farm Fields is the right place for any new housing development, but not the lower part as proposed. The proposal encroaches on the Conservation Area which is protected by SNP2; any developer would find this a bar to profitability. The traffic would debouch onto the A379 at a pinch point/blind bend. This exit would be dangerous and the view of the Highways Authority should have been sought. Infrastructure is in place in the upper area of Cox's Farm Fields, adjacent to The Plat, where development was previously proposed. Any proposed development should take place in the upper area of Cox's Farm Fields.	Support welcomed. See the changes to Policy SNP9 (above) in view of which it is appropriate to delete Policy SNP13 from the plan.
Policy SNP13: Open Space at Cox's Farm Fields	Kerris Petransky	21	A part of the Conservation Area recognised as "important open space characterised by lack of development within it" is included in the development proposal and lies adjacent to several listed properties. This area should not be developed. There is infrastructure available to serve development in Cox's Farm Fields at The Plat. This suggests that new development should be in the north part of the site. Access onto the A379 would be dangerous. Policy SNP11 says that development should "not lead to traffic danger etc.". Access from The Plat would be much safer. The view of the Highways Authority should have been sought. The new development should be in the north part of the area linked to access from The Plat.	Comments noted. See the changes to Policy SNP9 (above) in view of which it is appropriate to delete Policy SNP13 from the plan.
Policy SNP13: Open Space at Cox's Farm	Mr and Mrs C M L Toll - Strete Estate	22	My clients object to this policy which is unnecessary. The land in question is presently in agriculture and, as indicated above, is my client's preferred location for the next phase of development in Strete served off the Plat. The land in	Comments noted. See the changes to Policy SNP9 (above). In view of the changes to Policy

Fields			question is protected by its current use status and needs no further protection. Furthermore, the land is not visible from many public locations. The land is entirely private and has no public access and, therefore, does not qualify to be designated an Open or Green Space.	SNP9 it is appropriate to delete Policy SNP13 from the plan.
Policy SNP13: Open Space at Cox's Farm Fields	Ingrid Sidell	26	I agree to having an area of open space in principle but not to where it is placed on the plan – it should be on the lower field in the heart of the village and could be used for Village Day, for example . It is not clear from the plan how the area of open space would be used for the benefit of the whole community. It should be available to all and offer something different from the other open spaces in the village.	Support welcomed. See the changes to Policy SNP9 (above) in view of which it is appropriate to delete Policy SNP13 from the plan.
Policy SNP13: Open Space at Cox's Farm Fields	Ian and Deborah Cunningham	27	We think that the lower field is more suitable for open space and the upper field for development - the reverse to what is suggested. This is because: The lower field adjacent to the pub car park would be a more accessible open space for locals and tourists - helping to promote policy SNP 15 - sustainable tourism. It is visible from the coast road, has a bus stop at the current entrance, is close to the post office and the pub and the coast path runs nearby.	Comments noted. See the changes to Policy SNP9 (above) in view of which it is appropriate to delete Policy SNP13 from the plan.
Policy SNP13: Open Space at Cox's Farm Fields	Andrea Phillips	28	Do not consider that additional open space is required. It would need to be maintained and managed at a cost, and the existing open spaces in the village are under used.	The community has expressed a desire for additional open space. See the changes to Policy SNP9 (above) in view of which it is appropriate to delete Policy SNP13 from the plan.
Policy SNP13: Open Space at	Elizabeth Buckler	29	I do not support this policy, see my comments on SNP9. The draft Local Plan of 2002 proposed a development to be	Comments noted, but the community has expressed a desire

Cox's Farm Fields			situated to the north of Cox's Farm Fields where drains are already in place and there is access via The Plat. This was preferred by Devon Highways, who deemed the A379 too dangerous. Why has part of the conservation area next to four listed buildings now been chosen for development? The plan is supposed to recognise, value, protect and conserve our heritage.	for additional open space. See the changes to Policy SNP9 (above) in view of which it is appropriate to delete Policy SNP13 from the plan.
Policy SNP13: Open Space at Cox's Farm Fields	Simon Buckler	30	In view of the questionable choice process in SNP9, I cannot support SNP13 as it stands. If the housing development and open space sites were reversed, then I would change my decision.	Comments noted. See the changes to Policy SNP9 (above) in view of which it is appropriate to delete Policy SNP13 from the plan.
Policy SNP13: Open Space at Cox's Farm Fields	Ms V Tanner-Tremaine	32	I cannot support this policy in its current form. Whilst I support <i>in principle</i> the allocation of open space I cannot support this mapped allocation because I cannot support the housing allocation site for reasons explained elsewhere in my response.	Comments noted. See the changes to Policy SNP9 (above) in view of which it is appropriate to delete Policy SNP13 from the plan.
Policy SNP13: Open Space at Cox's Farm Fields	South Hams District Council		This site is within the proposed settlement boundary, where development is acceptable in principle. Given the housing needs of the parish and that the plan itself acknowledges that 'It is clear that the most suitable and best located site is at Cox's Farm Field near the centre of the village' (para.4.10), the Council considers that there is little justification or evidence to support the retention of agricultural use of this parcel of land. The alternative use proposed in the plan is recreational, but given that the field is in private ownership it seems unlikely that the field might come forward for such use. The Council considers the field should be included in a comprehensive proposal along with the adjoining field to the south (see response to Policy SNP9, above). This could potentially secure an appropriate element of open space and	Comments noted. See the changes to Policy SNP9 (above) in view of which it is appropriate to delete Policy SNP13 from the plan.

			provide a pedestrian link to Blackbird Wood.	
Policy SNP14: Local footpaths	Mr and Mrs Baldock	05	Greatly concerned about pedestrian danger on the stretch of the A379 between Prideaux lane and Southwood Lane, commending use of an off-road path instead.	Comment noted. This is a matter for the Parish Council to consider but the policy will be changed (see below).
Policy SNP14: Local footpaths	Elizabeth Buckler	29	Do not support.	Noted, but there is no detail to respond to.
Policy SNP14: Local footpaths	Simon Buckler	30	Footpaths have long been a topic of discussion in Strete, particularly the A379 and Church Hill. If pavements were added to these roads, existing car parking along the routes would be denied. Parked cars act to slow traffic and provide a refuge for pedestrians to walk behind. I prefer to leave the roads as they are and do not support Policy SNP14.	Comments noted. The policy will be changed (see below).
Policy SNP14: Local footpaths	Ms V Tanner-Tremaine	32	I cannot support this policy as currently worded. It conflicts with the Vision of the plan and other policies, in particular those on historic environment.	Comments noted. The policy will be changed (see below).
Policy SNP14: Local footpaths	South Hams District Council		It is unlikely that many forms of development will ‘involve the improvement of existing footpaths or the provision of new ones’. It might be more fruitful to re-phrase the policy along these lines – ‘Where the opportunity exists, development will be required to provide for new footpaths where there is a lack of provision or improve existing footpaths, in order to enhance pedestrian connectivity.’ Again, there is no need for the policy to refer to compliance with other policies.	Accepted. It is considered that the suggested wording is an improvement to the policy.
Policy SNP15: Sustainable tourism	Elizabeth Buckler	29	Support.	Support welcomed.

	Simon Buckler	30	Support.	Support welcomed.
	Ms V Tanner-Tremaine	32	This policy is welcomed. But it must be noted that any proposals must also meet the requirements of the other policies, in particular SNP1 and SNP2.	Support welcomed. Plan policies are not mutually exclusive.
	South Devon AONB Unit	33	<p>Policy SNP15 – welcomed in principle but in practice any proposal must in particular also comply with policies SNP1 and SNP2.</p> <p>The Devon Landscape Policy Group has produced Advice note 4, Using Landscape Character Assessments in Neighbourhood Planning.</p> <p>Action required - update SNP to ensure consistency with county landscape character types.</p>	<p>Support welcomed. Plan policies are not mutually exclusive.</p> <p>It is considered that the policy as changed (below) responds appropriately to landscape character and that a detailed assessment as suggested would be disproportionate to the scale of the plan and its policies.</p>
Policy SNP15: Sustainable tourism	South Hams District Council		<p>The plan's positive approach to sustainable tourism is supported in principle. However, the policy's approach to tourism development outside the settlement boundary appears to be in conflict with JLP Policy DEV15 Supporting the Rural Economy which does not permit camping, caravan, chalet or similar facilities within the Undeveloped Coast.</p> <p>The JLP provides strategic policy guidance on the Countryside, Nationally Protected Landscapes (incl. the South Devon AONB), the Undeveloped Coast and Heritage Coast and on Supporting the Rural Economy (clause 7 of which deals with tourism development). It is not clear what additional local policy guidance the NP is seeking to provide.</p>	<p>The plan's policies are required to conform with the strategic content of the emerging JLP. Although the JLP has yet to be finally approved and adopted it is important to seek to ensure conformity with it.</p> <p>The policy is considered to add some local interpretation of the JLP's strategic content, describing a distinction between the way proposals will be treated inside and outside the settlement boundary.</p> <p>The first sentence of the policy will remain unaltered, minor changes will be made to the second sentence to add clarity, as follows: "Outside the boundary tourism</p>

				development will be acceptable if it improves an existing tourism business, is part of a farm diversification scheme, is based in an existing dwelling or re-uses a traditional farm building which is no longer required for farming”, and reference to “the undeveloped coast” will be added to the third sentence (just before the word “amenity”).
6. Delivery and Monitoring				
The Proposals Map	Ms V Tanner-Tremaine	32	The Proposals map is an integral and important statutory part of the Strete NP and for clarity it should be located in the policies section of the plan. Currently, it is located in the Section ‘6 Delivery and Monitoring’ under the subsection ‘Monitoring Framework’ which is both inappropriate and misleading. This is a simple change to make before submission.	The Proposals Map is deliberately placed on the last page of the plan where it can easily be found. The plan will be amended to make this clear.
Supporting documents	Ms V Tanner-Tremaine	32	The Sustainability Appraisal Report required under section 19(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and the Environmental Report required under section 12(1) of The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 have been carried out separately. Each report is addressed separately in this lengthy and detailed representation which also refers to the Sites Assessment. The main thrusts of the representation are that assessment of the chosen development site is inaccurate and that assessment of reasonable alternative development sites has not adequately been carried out.	Not all of the supporting documents produced to accompany the plan are strictly necessary. However, they have been provided to help evidence and support the plan's policies. Only the SEA is statutorily required. It is considered that this report provides a sound, suitable and proportionate assessment of the plan and its policies.

The original representation should be referred to for the full details.

Other documents referred to in this representation (the Sites Assessment and the Sustainability Appraisal) provide supplementary details to assist the reader if required. Each follows good practice guidelines.

The Re-consultation

*This part of the report summarises the response received to the Reg 14 re-consultation published in October 2018
There are no further changes to the plan as a result of this re-consultation*

Some substantive changes to the draft Strete Neighbourhood Plan were published for further consultation for 6 weeks from 22nd October to 3rd December 2018. Once again, a wide range of comments was received, both in the form of responses to the questionnaire which accompanied the proposed changes and as more detailed representations. Below are summaries of the questionnaire responses received and of the more detailed representations made, together with the response in each case.

Summary of responses to the questionnaire about the re-consultation

Feedback Form Analysis

	Support	%	Do Not Support	%	Don't Know	%
The Revised (Retracted) Settlement Boundary	54	92%	5	8%		0%
The Revised Policy for Cox's Farm Fields	49	83%	9	15%	1	2%
The Revised Low Density Policy Area Boundary	49	83%	9	15%	1	2%
Totals	152		23		2	
	59 Forms Returned	50.67	7.67		0.67	
	282 Forms Delivered					
	20% return	86%	13%		1%	

60 Bodies & Organisations Contacted

11 acknowledged receipt
7 standard reply received
4 responses received

20 Comments Received

8 supporting
9 not supporting CFF
1 not supporting LD
2 seeking clarification

Summary of more detailed representations about the re-consultation

Topic / policy	Name	Rep' no	Summary of Comment (The original representations are available for inspection. Summaries do not purport to be exact.)	Response
General	Mrs V Tanner Tremaine and R English		The document is not helpful in showing exactly what the changes are. There is no accompanying environmental report and no sustainability appraisal. The proposals map remains unclear with regards to the Conservation Area boundary. Changes arising from the SEA findings have not been incorporated in the re-consultation.	The re-consultation document was deliberately kept succinct in order to enable non-professionals to engage with the process. Full supporting documentary evidence in support of the plan, including SEA and sustainability appraisal of the proposed changes forms part of the submission package. The SEA supports the plan and its findings have been incorporated where possible and appropriate.
	Environment Agency		We are generally supportive of the draft plan, particularly policies SNP1 (landscape), SNP6 (design and construction) and SNP12 (green spaces).	Support welcomed. (Policies SNP1, 6 and 12 were not a part of the re-consultation).
Settlement Boundary (retractions)	Joan Hacon	34	Pleased to note that The Village Green has been removed to outside the settlement boundary.	Support welcomed.
	Andrew Hollis	35	Delighted that the open fields north of the village have been removed to outside the settlement boundary.	Support welcomed
	Sara Dixon	37	Support on condition that The Village Green now lies outside the settlement boundary.	The Village Green does indeed now lie outside the settlement boundary. Support welcomed.
	Nigel and Gill Backwith	38	Very pleased to see the revised settlement boundary more tightly coupled to the natural boundary of the village.	Support welcomed.

Linda Hearn	48	The proposal for 17 new houses is well beyond the expressed wishes of the community. If such a number is truly required then the settlement boundary should remain unaltered and another site ought to be proposed as well as Cox's Farm Fields.	This is not accepted. Key statutory bodies in their responses to the draft plan made clear that in their opinion the settlement boundary had been drawn too widely and that it afforded undue scope for large scale development. It is also considered that Cox's Farm Fields is the most sustainable site for development by a significant margin.
J Park	52	Retracting the settlement boundary reduces land for alternatives to Cox's Farm Fields.	This is not accepted. Key statutory bodies in their responses to the draft plan made clear that in their opinion the settlement boundary had been drawn too widely and that it afforded undue scope for large scale development. It is also considered that the development of many sites around the village would be detrimental to its character and appearance.
W Park	53	Retracting the settlement boundary forces new development onto Cox's Farm Fields and does not allow for alternative possible sites to be offered.	This is not accepted. Key statutory bodies in their responses to the draft plan made clear that in their opinion the settlement boundary had been drawn too widely and that it afforded undue scope for large scale development. It is also considered that the development of many sites around the village would be detrimental to its

				character and appearance.
	Mrs V Tanner Tremaine and R English		Support. Development outside the settlement boundary will be subject to development plan policies on the AONB, landscape character, Heritage Coast, countryside, south of the A379 and undeveloped coast.	Support welcomed.
	Devon County Council Historic Environment Team		No comments	Noted.
	Natural England		Our comments on the draft plan in relation to the proposed settlement boundary do not appear to have been addressed and still stand.	The comments made by Natural England have been fully taken into account. Indeed, Natural England was one of those bodies advocating exactly those retractions to the settlement boundary which are proposed in the re-consultation.
Development proposals at Cox's Farm Fields (changes)	Andrew Hollis	35	The village does need to shoulder some of the need for new homes.	Noted.
	Sara Dixon	37	The proposed footpath access to the A379 and car park will benefit the village.	Support welcomed.
	Nigel and Gill Backwith	38	To be sustainable a village needs a boost from time to time. New homes alone would not do this but a package of new amenities seems a good way to inject new life.	Support welcomed.
	Roy Kendall	40	We must respect that Cox's Farm land belongs to Mr Toll.	Agreed.
	Anon	43	It is not realistic to expect car parking away from homes because of the risk of vandalism to vehicles.	The proposed car park is not primarily intended to serve as a car

		<p>What is the purpose of the proposed open space – Village Day? Will there be other facilities such as toilets, power and water and, if so, who will manage them?</p>	<p>park for local residents to park their cars long-term, but rather to serve visitors to the village and those needing access to the village centre and its facilities.</p> <p>The proposed open space is intended to serve a range of purposes. This may include Village Day, but it is considered unreasonable to expect the proposed housing development to provide for public toilets, power and water.</p>
Maurice Watson	45	<p>There are no valid reasons to support a development of 17 homes: (a) parish council minutes record a view from SHDC in 2015 that Strete had too few facilities to support anything more than a very small development; (b) the JLP refers to Strete as a sustainable village with scope for “around 10 dwellings”; (c) community consultation favours a development of between 5 – 10 homes; (d) there have been recent approvals for 5 new homes in the village; (e) 11 properties are currently for sale in the village; and (f) new homes recently built in nearby Blackawton are failing to sell.</p> <p>If there is a need for 5 affordable homes in the village then these could be accommodated in the lower part of Cox's farm Fields.</p> <p>SHDC is overriding the wishes of the local community.</p> <p>Question the need for a footpath link from The Plat to the post office and pub.</p> <p>We wish this representation to be recorded as separate</p>	<p>The need for 17 homes arises primarily from the JLP policy approach to the provision of affordable housing and also to help enable the provision of the proposed car park, open space and footpaths. The JLP requires that in any development of 11 or more homes 30% shall be affordable. It is estimated that it is reasonable to aim to provide at least 5 affordable homes in the village over the plan period. To achieve this therefore requires a total of at least 17 homes. That increase in numbers (from 12 to 17) will also help to enable the provision of the proposed community infrastructure. The plan will make</p>

		objections, one from each of us.	<p>increased reference to and explain the case for the scale of development now proposed.</p> <p>New footpath links are proposed in the interests of pedestrian safety.</p>
Susan Watson	45	Ditto	Ditto
Anon	47	<p>More housing will dilute an already inadequate broadband speed and increase traffic on the A379 which is already too busy and dangerous in places.</p> <p>There is no school and there are no employment opportunities to support new homes.</p> <p>Green spaces such as Cox's Farm Fields ought to be left undeveloped to support tranquillity and feed mental health.</p>	<p>It is considered that the need for and merits of the proposed development outweigh these considerations, and that the proposal requires safe access to the highway network.</p> <p>In a rural area not every village can offer all facilities but many villages, including Strete, benefit from some development in order to maintain and enhance their sustainability.</p> <p>The plan protects other green spaces in the village, which also provide public access.</p>
Linda Hearn	48	The proposal for 17 new houses is well beyond the expressed wishes of the community. If such a number is truly required then another site ought to be proposed as well as Cox's Farm Fields (see above). Reducing development density on the site will increase the scope for car parking, open space and higher quality housing (including low cost homes).	The scale of development proposed is necessary to secure provision of the number of affordable homes considered to be needed (see above). It is considered that there are clear benefits to providing the homes on a single site, both in terms of impact on the character and setting of the village and in order to enable a package of

			needed community infrastructure (car park, open space and footpaths) to be integrated with the development. The masterplan will help to ensure that an appropriate density of development comes forward.
J Park	52	Far more houses than the community voted for would change the character of the village. Green space and open aspect would be lost.	It is considered that the proposed development will enable local needs to be met in a way which will minimise any impact on the village character and will enable the wider village setting to be protected.
W Park	53	This appears to have been driven by SHDC's desire to increase the number of houses and will destroy the character of a central feature of the village.	It is not considered that this is driven by a desire for more houses other than in order to enable local needs to be met and that the character and setting of the village will be better protected than could be the case for any other available site (see above).
Elizabeth Buckler	54	<p>The proposals map is inaccurate and confusing; it does not show part of the Conservation Area (adjacent to the proposed site access from the A379).</p> <p>There is no evidence to support the increased number of homes proposed. In any case, Cox's Farm Fields is a large, open, valuable space. Ad hoc infill sites ought to be developed instead.</p> <p>The car park and other non-housing infrastructure will only be provided if a developer can be persuaded to construct it.</p>	<p>The proposals map will be amended to make it clearer where the Conservation Area boundary falls and where the development site lies.</p> <p>The case for the site as proposed is outlined above.</p> <p>The policy and the requirement for a masterplan are aimed at helping</p>

		<p>Access to the A379 is wrong: DCC have previously deemed it unsafe, it would destroy a cottage garden and walls in the Conservation Area and the village pump is likely to be lost.</p> <p>I support the proposal for a masterplan.</p>	<p>to ensure that the development will only proceed if the provision of the needed infrastructure is assured.</p> <p>The plan requires that access to the site must be safe. It will also require the approval of DCC Highways.</p> <p>The plan will be amended to make it clear that any planning application submitted should ensure the Conservation Area and designated heritage assets are protected.</p> <p>Support for the masterplan welcomed.</p>
Simon Buckler	55	<p>The proposals map is flawed, failing to show the garden and walls immediately north of the proposed site access to the A379 as being in the Conservation Area.</p> <p>There is no evidence to support the need for 17 new dwellings or to suggest that this number is required in order to enable 5 affordable homes.</p> <p>Cox's Farm Fields is too large a site for just 17 homes and the proposal is therefore a waste of an invaluable land resource.</p> <p>The proposed car park and footpaths cannot be guaranteed, they will be in the gift of the developer.</p> <p>The proposed access from the A379 has previously been deemed unsafe by DCC (because of potential numbers of vehicle movements and inadequate visibility), would involve damage to and/or the loss of stone walls and the village pump, both of which are cited as valuable in the Strete</p>	<p>The proposals map will be amended to make it clearer where the Conservation Area boundary falls and where the development site lies.</p> <p>The case for the site as proposed is outlined above.</p> <p>The masterplan should be a means to ensure that the site is appropriately developed.</p> <p>The plan requires that access to the site must be safe. It will also require the approval of DCC Highways.</p> <p>The policy and the requirement for a masterplan are aimed at helping to ensure that the development will</p>

		<p>Conservation Area Appraisal.</p> <p>I support the proposal for a masterplan.</p>	<p>only proceed if the provision of the needed infrastructure is assured.</p> <p>The plan will be amended to make it clear that any planning application submitted should ensure the Conservation Area and designated heritage assets are protected.</p> <p>Support for the masterplan welcomed.</p>
<p>Mrs V Tanner Tremaine and R English</p>		<p>We support parts of the revised policy but strongly object to others.</p> <p>We cannot see the evidence to support 17 homes. The increase is at odds with NPPF advice that development in AONBs should be limited to that required to meet local needs. In addition, the JLP no longer allocates an indicative housing figure for Strete following advice from the JLP inspectors. 17 homes is likely to be considered as major development in the AONB, which should be refused except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be shown to be in the public interest.</p> <p>We support the inclusion of the proposed car park and open space in the proposed masterplan approach.</p> <p>The proposed development site boundary ought not to include part of the Conservation Area. This is adjacent to the proposed A379 access which we cannot support since it would be bound to adversely affect the Conservation Area.</p> <p>There appears to be a missing clause (d) in the policy.</p> <p>We support the footpath links proposed between The Plat and the A379 but not Blackbird Wood since this would be</p>	<p>The case to support the proposal for 17 homes is outlined above.</p> <p>It is considered that this is not at odds with NPPF policy guidance since it responds to identified local needs and aspirations and it has been demonstrated in the sites assessments, SEA and sustainability appraisal that the development will not cause undue impact on the AONB.</p> <p>Support for the inclusion of the proposed car park and open space in the required masterplan welcomed.</p> <p>The plan will be amended to make it clear that any planning application submitted should ensure the Conservation Area and designated heritage assets are</p>

		<p>likely to disturb a badger sett there.</p> <p>We welcome and support the merging of policies SNP9 and SNP13 and the requirement for a masterplan for the site as a whole. However, this should go further and, in line with the Environmental Report (SEA), the masterplan should be required to set out how harm to the Conservation Area and AONB will be minimised and enhancements secured, and how a net gain in biodiversity will be delivered. The policy should also require that the masterplan be approved <i>in writing</i> by the local planning authority.</p> <p>We support exclusion of the paddock from the proposed site, but not the inclusion of that part of the Conservation Area adjoining the proposed A379 access.</p>	<p>protected.</p> <p>Clause numbers will be corrected.</p> <p>Support welcomed. Reservations about a link to Blackbird Wood are noted, but it is considered that development plan policies will ensure that the link is designed to avoid disturbance to the badger sett.</p> <p>The suggested extension of the masterplan in relation to the Conservation Area and AONB are accepted and the policy will be amended accordingly. Also the suggestion that the masterplan must be approved in writing.</p> <p>The proposals map will be amended to make it clearer where the Conservation Area boundary falls and where the development site lies.</p>
Historic England		<p>We consider that, although the revised development site proposal constitutes an improvement on the initial one, its likely effect on the Conservation Area is still too great and that the plan should require that the development be set back in order to protect those parts of the Area which would be likely to be adversely affected and to enable the development to be more easily assimilated into the sensitive landscape. If there is evidence to support the plan's proposals it should be included, otherwise the proposal should be amended to ensure that designated heritage assets</p>	<p>The plan and policy will be amended to make it clear that any planning application submitted should ensure the Conservation Area and designated heritage assets are protected.</p> <p>The proposals map will be amended to make it clearer where the Conservation Area boundary</p>

			are suitably protected.	falls and where the development site lies.
	Devon County Council Historic Environment Team		No comments	Noted.
	South Hams District Council		<p>It might be helpful to include reference to the scale of the proposed car park in the supporting text.</p> <p>It remains necessary to obtain DCC Highways approval for access onto the A379. If any physical changes are necessary in order to implement that access then full account must be taken of impacts on the adjacent Conservation Area.</p> <p>If the plan is intended to seek joined-up vehicular access through the site to help connectivity this should be made clear (probably in the policy).</p>	<p>The plan will be amended to include reference in the supporting text to the scale of the car park.</p> <p>It is understood and accepted that DCC Highways approval will be required for the access to the A379.</p> <p>The proposals map will be amended to make it clear where the Conservation Area boundary falls and where the development site lies. The plan and policy will be amended to make it clear that that any planning application submitted should ensure the Conservation Area and designated heritage assets are protected.</p> <p>The plan and will be amended to make it clear that joined-up access through the site is intended.</p>
Low density policy area (retraction)	Anon	36	Why is the farm track included in the Low Density Policy Area?	This is a drafting error. The proposals map will be amended to exclude the farm track.

Nigel and Gill Backwith	38	This makes good sense, protecting a very attractive part of the village from speculative development.	Support welcomed.
Peter and Karen Hales	39	Why aren't other parts of the village also covered by a low density policy?	The policy relates to those parts of the village particularly characterised by lower densities. It is considered that it would be unreasonable, inappropriate and ineffectual to also include other parts of the village.
John Baron	46	The farm track between Falloden and Greylands ought not to be included in the policy area.	This is a drafting error. The proposals map will be amended to exclude the farm track.
J Park	52	The low density policy should cover the whole village centre.	The policy relates to those parts of the village particularly characterised by lower densities. It is considered that it would be unreasonable, inappropriate and ineffectual to also include the more tightly knit village centre.
W Park	53	Any new build in the village centre should be low density.	The policy relates to those parts of the village particularly characterised by lower densities. It is considered that it would be unreasonable, inappropriate and ineffectual to also include the more tightly knit village centre.
Mrs V Tanner Tremaine and R English		A map comparing the revised area with the area as originally proposed would have been helpful, but we do support the removal of Blackbird Wood and areas within the	Support welcomed.

		Conservation Area and within the settings of listed buildings.	
	Devon County Council Historic Environment Team	No comments	Noted.