

PLYMOUTH & SOUTH WEST DEVON JOINT LOCAL PLAN

CRUNCH TIME! &
HAVE YOUR SAY
SUMMARY REPORT
NOVEMBER 2016



Plymouth
Britain's Ocean City

*Thriving Towns
and Villages*

INTRODUCTION

This report sets out how people got involved with the Plymouth and South West Devon Joint Local Plan (JLP) engagement which ran from **1 July to 12 August 2016**. Across the JLP area, over **3,000** comments were received which will be used to inform the final Plan.

To view all the comments which were submitted during this consultation period please visit:
<http://plymouth.objective.co.uk/portal/planning/jlp/>

This report summarises the comments received by all three local authorities.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	1
Table of contents.....	1
What is the Plymouth and South West Devon Joint Local Plan?	2
Crunch Time!	2
Have Your Say	2
How People Got Involved.....	2
In Plymouth.....	2
In South Hams and West Devon	3
Comment Summaries for ‘At Plymouth’	3
Comment Summaries for ‘Thriving Towns and Villages’	4
Who got involved?.....	4
What happens next?	4
APPENDIX I: Summary of comments received in Plymouth by site reference number and address.....	5
APPENDIX II: List of new sites put forward within the ‘At Plymouth’ boundary.....	33
APPENDIX III: Summary of non-site specific comments in Plymouth.....	35
APPENDIX IV: Summary of comments received on the City Centre and Waterfront draft Area Vision	38
APPENDIX V: Summary of comments received on the Derriford and Northern Corridor draft Area Vision ...	43
APPENDIX VI: Summary of comments received on the Eastern Corridor draft Area Vision	45
APPENDIX VII: Thriving Towns and Villages comment summary.....	47
APPENDIX VIII: List of stakeholders who commented.....	77

WHAT IS THE PLYMOUTH AND SOUTH WEST DEVON JOINT LOCAL PLAN?

The Plymouth and South West Devon Joint Local Plan (JLP) is a joint local plan between Plymouth City, South Hams District and West Devon Borough Councils. The JLP will set out the overarching strategy for the area, setting out where development will take place, what areas should be protected, and how the area will change through to 2034.

The JLP brings together work that has already been carried out separately by the councils on the Plymouth Plan, South Ham's 'Our Plan' and West Devon's 'Our Plan'.

It will create single objectives and policies whilst retaining each Council's individual identities. The strategy and policies of the Plymouth Plan will therefore be carried forward into the JLP and the same for the vision and themes in the South Hams and West Devon Our Plans.

CRUNCH TIME!

Crunch Time! was the first phase of engagement on the JLP in Plymouth and ran from **1 July to 12 August 2016**.

In Plymouth a map with accompanying booklet was created which showed all the sites in the city which the Council was considering as a development opportunity or as a site which needs to be protected as greenspace.

As part of this engagement three draft area vision chapters were also available for comment for the three parts of the city the Council is expecting to see the most change: the City Centre and Waterfront; Derriford and the Northern Corridor and the Eastern Corridor. Also available for comment were draft City Centre and Waterfront Masterplans and other evidence base documents.

Altogether **1,879** comments were made by **1,153** consultees in Plymouth and **17** comments were made by **14** consultees specifically on the draft area vision chapters.

HAVE YOUR SAY

Similarly, in South Hams and West Devon the "Thriving Towns and Villages" booklet set out the strategy for development and clarified the role for Neighbourhood Planning in supporting the Joint Local Plan at village level. Proposed housing and employment allocations were mapped for towns (area centres) and larger villages (area centres) and a total housing allocation was proposed, to be divided between the smaller villages through their respective Neighbourhood Plans.

The booklet was supported by a number of evidence based documents; these included parish packs with SHLAA information, Green Infrastructure reports and Open Space, Sport and Recreation

Altogether, **1,141** comments were made by **975** consultees in South Hams and West Devon.

HOW PEOPLE GOT INVOLVED

In Plymouth:

- **80** community groups received training and support to run their own Plymouth Plan event from Plymouth Octopus Project in the run up to the engagement.
- **Once a week** during this process, planning officers were outside Central Library on Armada Way.
- The Plymouth Plan team attended various meetings and gave presentations to raise awareness of the plan.
- Posters advertising the consultation were put on all the buses in the city and outside the Council's First Stop shop.

- E-bulletins were sent out to **4,010** e-mail accounts.
- **2,259** letters were sent out to people who had previously been involved but do not have e-mail addresses.
- **1,000** maps were printed and distributed and were available to view in every library in the city and First Stop.

We once again teamed up with Plymouth Octopus Project (POP) who helped support the process by:

- Hosting **8** workshops to help groups run their own events with **80** attendees in the run up to the engagement.
- Sending **7** update emails to **1,261** people.
- Supporting **5** groups to host or plan their own conversation and aiding **24** to host an event as well as supplying various resources to help facilitate the events.
- Distributed **22** £50 rewards to local community groups as a thank you for hosting their own event.

In South Hams and West Devon:

- Officers gave presentations during evening events with Town and Parish Councils in each of the area centres during July and August. All Town and Parish Councils received a copy of the Joint Local Plan Thriving Towns and Villages Booklet.
- Officers organised a Neighbourhood Planning workshop event in both South Hams and West Devon for representatives on each Neighbourhood Planning Group to attend and input to the consultation.
- The SHWD Localities Team attended a varied summer events programme across both Districts to promote the consultation; examples included key agricultural shows, such as Yealmpton and Okehampton. The Localities Team also set up “pop-up stands” at supermarkets, cafes and parish halls, where they promoted the consultation by handing out flyers and answering questions from the public.
- The SHWD Communications Team advertised the consultation on dedicated webpages on the Councils’ websites, as well as via social media. An e-newsletter was sent out to all known email contacts on the Strategic Planning contacts database. Contact was made with local journalists and media outlets and Elected Members promoted the consultation in local papers, radio and television coverage.

COMMENT SUMMARIES FOR ‘AT PLYMOUTH’

In Plymouth a map with accompanying booklet was created showing all the sites in the city which the Council was proposing as a development opportunity or as a site which should be protected.

The documents also included:

- An explanation of how each site was assessed;
- Constraints for each site which will need to be considered;

A draft area vision of the three areas of the city we are expecting to see the most change was also created. These were: the City Centre and Waterfront, Derriford and the Northern Corridor and the Eastern Corridor.

Through this process **1,879** comments were received by **1,153** contributing consultees on the map and accompanying booklet and an additional **17** comments by **14** contributing consultees on the draft area visions.

- Please see **Appendix I** for a summary of the comments received by site reference number and address in Plymouth.

- Please see **Appendix II** for a list of the new sites which were put forward within the 'At Plymouth boundary.
- Please see **Appendix III** for a summary of the comments received which do not necessarily relate to specific sites which were published in Plymouth.
- Please see **Appendix IV** for a summary of the comments received on the City Centre and Waterfront draft Area Vision.
- Please see **Appendix V** for a summary of the comments received on the Derriford and Northern Corridor draft Area Vision.
- Please see **Appendix VI** for a summary of the comments received on the Eastern Corridor draft Area Vision.

COMMENT SUMMARIES FOR 'THRIVING TOWNS AND VILLAGES'

In South Hams and West Devon a booklet with illustrative maps was created showing all the sites in the area which the Council was proposing as a development opportunity. The document also included an indication of the potential use for each site, along with indicative housing numbers. The site assessments were available as part of the supporting documents to help in understanding how sites had been assessed and selected as potential allocations.

- Please see **Appendix VII** for a breakdown of the comments received by settlement or site reference number and address.

WHO GOT INVOLVED?

Overall **264** different departments, organisations, companies and local community groups got involved and submitted comments during this engagement phase. We would like to thank all who submitting representations and we look forward to working with them as we continue to develop the Plymouth and South West Devon Joint Local Plan.

- Please see **Appendix VIII** for a list of the different stakeholders who commented on the Plan.

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?

The Plymouth and South West Devon Joint Local Plan is following the timetable below:

- Engagement on housing distribution and new sites, November 2016
- Draft Joint Local Plan published March 2017
- Submission of the Joint Local Plan to the Planning Inspector, May 2017
- Public Examination, Autumn 2017
- Adoption by the three councils, Winter 2017

If you have any questions please get in touch by e-mailing Plymouth: plymouthplan@plymouth.gov.uk or by e-mailing South Hams and West Devon: strategic.planning@swdevon.gov.uk

APPENDIX I: SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RECEIVED IN PLYMOUTH BY SITE REFERENCE NUMBER AND ADDRESS

Site reference and address	No. of Comments	Key issues raised in engagement
0001 Civic Centre	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the protection and mixed use of the building, but want more information regarding the details and how it will affect the listed status. • Too much housing and students, not enough parking/community centre/play areas in the City Centre. • While change is necessary, consistency is important when changing the Abercrombie Plan in terms of its intensification and connectivity.
0003 Colin Campbell Court	14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site should stay as housing for older people. • Housing needs to be flexible, but not for students. • Heritage and the historical sites as part of this should be recognised/protected, particularly the Art Deco building • Might increase problems with parking and should be left as a car park. • Play space needed for children. • Boundary should be extended to reflect Masterplan. • Want to protect the elevation of the 1930s building and pull down the properties facing Western Approach and remove the two small access points to the car park from Western Approach and off Market Street. • While change is necessary, consistency is important when changing the Abercrombie Plan in terms of its intensification and connectivity.
0020 TAVR Centre, Prospect Place	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why is TA centre next to 0020 not shown as greenspace? • Concerns re effects of underlying pollution on health. • Housing should be appropriate to area, no high rise apartments. • Good mix of uses should be mandatory. • Site is within the FR20 plans and there is a current planning permission held for a new cadet centre on the site, so significant investment into this site is already planned.
0021 MS05 Trinity Pier	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Structures erected should be of high quality but not overbearing or overlooking of current homes. • Pier should continue use as a wharf on north side. • Cultural use hours and noise should be restricted. • Access should be along the road linking the Pier and Millbay Road or via a new junction on West Hoe Road. • Visual amenity needs to be protected. • Consider use as a live music venue for all flexible size for all audiences.
0024 Commercial, Elphinstone & Phoenix Wharfs, and land at Lambhay Hill	26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of parking facilities would impact on Barbican businesses, tourism and homes, the site should stay as a car park. • Need better facilities for fishing industry. • Risk of coastal flooding. • Emphasis needed on both residential and retail use. • Support marine and leisure use . • Object to hotel or residential use – 3 major hotels already closed. • Greater clarification needed on mixed use. • Concerns re effects of underlying pollution on health. • General character and ambience of the area should be protected. • If the area is to be increasing used, refuse services need to be sufficient. • Need to make better use of the existing empty buildings. • Need to improve links between historic and modern audiences. • Could the mixed use include an element of retail or other A class related uses? This would help promote vitality and viability of the wider City Centre as a regional destination.
0026 Exeter Street	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Want sufficient parking added for homes and businesses, need to think of leisure facilities and community areas.
0071 Land at St. Levan Gate	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could the mixed use include residential? • The masterplanning of the Goschen site is one of the deliverables within the One Public Estate: OPE3 which is to develop a mixed use site to incorporate: Housing; Retail; Employment and Community/Recreation/Leisure. Need to expand the current scope.
0078	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Special constraints must be applied to protect the heritage in the Dockyard, and to

Site reference and address	No. of Comments	Key issues raised in engagement
Princess Yachts, South Yard		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> preserve the visual amenity. • Agree, but better transport links required and additional parking.
0089 R/O Acterna Way Burrington Way	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The existing green perimeter of the site to be maintained. This site is close to bas and sensitive wild orchids.
0090 Weston Mill sports pitches and car park	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Want clarification of what is occurring on the site. • Supportive of redevelopment to improve/enhance the current facilities. • Use should be amended from “Community Sports and Leisure” to “Community Sports, Leisure & District Centre” to deliver enhanced sports and community facilities as well as enhancing neighbourhood facilities and creating employment.
0100 Former Woodlands School Site, Whitleigh	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to think about the historic setting of the nearby Woodland Fort. Has an appropriate historic environment assessment been undertaken?
0116 Embankment Boatyard, Embankment Road	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is doing ok and happy to maintain the status quo, have no interest in pushing a scheme forward on their own • Marine related employment is nonsense as the site is not suitable • Inappropriate for residential development upstream of the Laira Bridge and won't satisfy the flood risk sequential test in NPPF
0118 Mount Gould Hospital	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More detail is needed proposals are too vague • The outlined area appears to just include half of the whole site • Planned to undertake a comprehensive master planning exercise when the longer term service needs have been clarified. • May give potential for the redevelopment in health provision and possibly release of land for housing if surplus land is identified
0138 Former Western National site, Laira Bridge	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inappropriate for residential development upstream of the Laira Bridge and won't satisfy the flood risk sequential test in NPPF • Landowner welcomes redevelopment of site but not for residential purposes, commercial use such as shops/restaurants/cafes would be more appropriate
0141 Plymouth Fish Market	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Industry will suffer if leisure/mixed use is introduced into the area. The Fish Market should be protected solely for Marine Employment. • The fishing industry is already squeezed for space, lack of space already at Sutton Harbour, no other location in Plymouth could support the current fishing fleet. Don't just need space for boats but also maintenance, routine work and commercial vessels require space for spares and for other trades. • Access is already an issue in terms of parking etc. and access to facilities around the clock is essential. • Public access is a serious safety concern and there should be more security and • Whole area could do with redesigning. Merchant units in the middle of the complex are not fit for purpose as they are very fragile and far too expensive to consider renting. The design of the area was for £1mill annually and is now seeing £20mill. There's a lack of storage, buildings are outdated and not to modern standards. Needs more investment. Further curtail of space would make it impossible for the industry to continue. • Railings or barriers will stop the everyday work of fishermen. • Any development should include provision for the existing maritime sector to expand. • If market gets relocated it would be more difficult to sell the fish and additional traffic on the road network would be generated. It's a noisy industry and shouldn't be near residential. Jobs are there, just need maintaining, not creating. • Maybe a viewing area for the public? • Flood risk is a concern but possibly manageable with design. Developers will need to show how a proposal satisfies the exception test. • Endorses opportunity to explore complimentary uses as well as the retention and modernization of the fish market. • How might the proposals best be developed to enhance the setting of the conservation areas character and appearance? • Supports making parts of Fish Quay more accessible for visitors but seeks clarification in masterplan that this will be without compromising the operational and health and safety requirements.

Site reference and address	No. of Comments	Key issues raised in engagement
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposes rationalisation of former fish processing units and introduction of new uses including a specialist retail hub, hotel and residential development, food and leisure uses, car parking, student accommodation and additional moorings and pontoons. Proposal should also include improved urban realm, pop-up interventions and cultural performance space.
0146 Land East of Stenlake Terrace	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inappropriate for residential development upstream of the Laira Bridge and won't satisfy the flood risk sequential test in NPPF.
0161 Plymouth Railway Station, Intercity House and land adjacent	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add 'economic importance' to constraints. Revise boundary to match master plan. Land should be reserved in the plan to facilitate location of a major business centre at and near the Railway Station to encompass an efficient fully integrated transport system. Proposal is to consider the redevelopment for residential, education, retail and office space plus a Public Sector Business Hub rather than the railway improvements and university stated in the draft plan – need to include this extra scope. A new think needs to be given with a whole overview of access into the city. Want a bridge across into Central Park.
0171 Home Park	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Want aspirations for the site in line with the Area Action Plan, not the granted planning permission. Don't support further encroachment into Central Park. Plymouth already has sufficient hotels and cinema venues. Want small concert hall spaces. Don't agree with the intensification of mixed use which represents a dilution of the leisure and recreational purpose of the park.
0173 Land at Pennycomequick	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site should be developed in line with Area Action Plan. Should be of a high standard, preserve and provide public access to WWII air raid shelters. Receipts from the sale should be kept for CP improvement projects. Shouldn't be housing. The site is in proximity to the Ford Park Cemetery, a grade II* Registered Park and Garden. What is the harm of this site upon the significance and setting of the historic asset?
0186 Land either side of Clittaford Road	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Co-op currently anchors the Southway Shopping Centre and edge-of-centre development puts at risk that anchor role.
0186f Clittaford Road, Southway	No comments received.	
0187 Looseleigh Lane	No comments received.	
0188 Land at Cradon Close	No comments received.	
0191 Christian Mill Business Park	No comments received.	
0202 Land at Tamerton Foliot Road	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Don't agree, roads are not capable of dealing with extra traffic. Wonderful natural woodland/wildlife would be ruined. 0991, 0799 and the former airport site are more suitable. Too much overloading of housing into a small area. Site should be regarded as a green corridor linking Tamerton Lake and Warleigh Woods to the west to Bircham Wood in the east below Derriford Hospital and on to the woods along the east side of Forder Valley Road B3413. A footpath should be created through site 0202 where upon walkers can cross the A38 to Brest Road and access Bircham Wood. Already seeing a lot of development at the bottom of the village. Tamerton Foliot would be linked to Plymouth and become a suburb. Not acceptable to destroy identities of historical communities when there are other viable options of land to develop. Services are already thin on the ground in terms of the local community centre, primary school and doctors surgery. Will result in a loss of loss of greenspace and there's a lot of wildlife in the area.

Site reference and address	No. of Comments	Key issues raised in engagement
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flooding is an issue and there would be no natural soak away, all the water will run into the already full river. Flood risk is a concern but possibly manageable with design. Developers will need to show how a proposal satisfies the exception test.
0206 The White Cottage and Holtwood, Plymbridge Road, Glenholt	No comments received.	
0232 Pomphlett Industrial Estate	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Offers the potential for a small scale local needs food retailing to serve the new Saltram Meadow development.
0238 Land at Moorcroft Quarry	No comments received.	
0242 Former Nursery, Haye Road	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flood risk is a concern but possibly manageable with design. Developers will need to show how a proposal satisfies the exception test.
0258 Land off Darklake View	No comments received.	
0264 Coombe Way & Kings Tamerton Road	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proximity to existing housing gives cause for concern over the self-build nature of the development that is proposed due to longer development timescales and non-standard work times. Development should only be progressed if extensions to current greenspaces are provided in these areas.
0273 Land at Redwood Drive, Chaddlewood	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will result in a loss of open space in Chaddlewood. Already has approved planning permission but want to ensure that the infrastructure will support the expanding community and not impact on the other areas of Plympton.
0274 Turnchapel Wharves, Turnchapel	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There will be an increased risk of flooding over the lifetime of development due to climate change/sea level rise and this should be recognised. The site abuts the conservation area and is in proximity to a number of listed buildings. Has an appropriate historic environment assessment been undertaken to assess the sites suitability for development? Due to the former use of the site it is probably contaminated. There are already problems at nearby roundabout due to through traffic and nearby development.
0276 Crownhill Fort	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree that educational projects should be a priority at fort sites, especially aimed at children
0287 Motor Transport Section, North Yard	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The land is MoD owned and leased to Babcock to undertaken services in support of Naval Base outputs and there is no intention in the foreseeable future to release this land. It is strategically important to both the Naval Base and Babcock businesses. What are the implications of this site upon the significance and setting of the historic asset? Has an appropriate historic environment assessment been undertaken to assess the significance, how will harm be avoided and how may the asset be enhanced?
0297 Tamar Valley School Barne Barton	No comments received.	
0303b North Prospect redevelopment phase 3	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Houses being built are too small.
0303c North Prospect redevelopment phase 4	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Houses being built are too small.

Site reference and address	No. of Comments	Key issues raised in engagement
0303d North Prospect redevelopment phase 5	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Houses being built are too small.
0310 Douglass House, Efford	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Like, but access needs improving. Gates need removing. Bus/public transport needs improving. The proposal is to develop the site into a health and well-being hub with the potential for a small number of houses (approx. 6) or DI use if the requirements of the health and wellbeing hub does not stop this.
0311 Scout Hut, Delamere Road	No comments received.	
0325 Foot Anstey Offices, Derrys Cross	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is in the Tall building zone. Should include Peirson House development within it. This is part of a key Abercrombie grid frontage in the City Centre and should be celebrated and carefully protected. Plymouth has a recognised shortage of quality hotel provision. There has been hotel interest in the site but it needs to be allocated. Concerns re effects of underlying pollution on health. No to student accommodation, need more social housing. While change is necessary, consistency is important when changing the Abercrombie Plan in terms of its intensification and connectivity.
0327 Leaves Yard, Windsor Road	No comments received.	
0344 Plymouth Fruit Sales, Sutton Road	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flood risk is a concern but possibly manageable with design. Developers will need to show how a proposal satisfies the exception test. Would like more information and to know what the leisure use would be
0349 Land to South of Cann House, Tamerton Foliot Road	17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development considered contrary to Policy's in the Plymouth Plan. Site should be designated strategic greenspace - land is important greenspace and part of green corridor. Will remove the neighbourhood/village identity of Tamerton Foliot by merging into the built up areas of Southway. Housing development is overriding other considerations and adopted policy. It is within the Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area and will adversely affect the setting and Cann House. Will adversely affect traffic conditions in the village, which are already severely constrained and will cause major disruption. Will affect the ecology of the site – wildlife and vegetation, including several important tree specimens. Part of the site is liable to flooding, and if infilled will reduce the flood zone and cause flooding elsewhere. Current housing is already detrimental to the area. Area is home to a range of wildlife including deer and butterflies. Do not have the facilities to sustain increase in population. Have already had development on brownfield sites. Area is used a lot for walking/leisure. The areas adjoin an area designated as a County Wildlife Site and Local Nature Reserve.
0362 Land to west of Belliver Industrial Estate	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site is available for employment, disagree with some of the constraints.
0379a, (SH_04_03_08/13) Land at Woolwell	56	<p>Arts and Culture</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reference made to the strategic green infrastructure and recreation opportunities offered by the Plymouth and Dartmoor Tramway and the Plymouth and Devonport Leats – these are all very significant assets and should be considered and protected. <p>City Pride and Vision</p>

Site reference and address	No. of Comments	Key issues raised in engagement
0400 (SH_04_04_08/13) Woolwell Extension	88	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ideally located in relation to Derriford and can be developed as a sustainable community that can be strengthened and can provide sustainable transport links. Can deliver much-needed strategic infrastructure and minimize the impact on the landscape. • The site is close to Dartmoor and would have an adverse effect on its setting as it would be very visible. Sites were considered in 1999/2000 along with the Sherford urban extension, but were rejected at that time because of their proximity to the National Park and the impact on visual amenity.
0409 (SH_04_05_08/13) Woolwell	65	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The overall assessment of landscape/visual sensitivity to development scenarios are not included in the Landscape Character Assessment. Should provide a clear overview of the sensitivity of this site to housing development in respect of Dartmoor. • Need an honest and open understanding of the site's value in respect of National Park setting, and the potential impact its development may have. <p>Education and Learning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A new pre-school and primary school will be needed, and need to think of secondary education. <p>Getting Around</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will add additional traffic to the already congested A386, will need a major upgrade and new access. No further homes should be allowed until the road is duelled. • Bickleigh Down Road is not suitable for two-way traffic. • Any upgrades to Tavistock Road should include segregated cycle lanes, multiple road crossing for inbound cycles. • Could cycle lanes be extended into Woolwell utilising the current grass verges? • Woolwell roundabout is currently at capacity. • Public transport would need to be improved. • Pinewood Drive is narrow and not suitable as an access to site 409. • Need to think of public crossings. • How will public transport access site 409 as it is steep and narrow? • Parking is a problem, the Tesco car park and park and ride at the George is often full. • A new route to the A38 from Yelverton, Roborough, or even via Dark Lake View would be welcome for those that need to access it - but each of these would cause significant impact to the National Park and landscape and are therefore non-starters. • 409 will only have a limited traffic impact on the Woolwell roundabout and the A386. The site can include improved public access. • Worried about the road infrastructure already and access for emergency vehicles. <p>Greener Plymouth</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The football and rugby pitches would need to be maintained and a new clubhouse provided – should not be moved. New pitches would be needed to meet the needs of 2000 homes. Could link to the neighbouring Roborough Sports Ground and develop a Hub site for Football whilst retaining Cricket provision? • Better provision for recycling needed (current facilities are Tavistock or Ivybridge). • Ancient woodland and open space should be protected. • Roborough Green should be protected. When Lord Roborough gave consent for houses to be built he specified that the Green should be a permanent amenity space, to maintain the community and character of the Village, and its place on the edge of open countryside and in view of Dartmoor. • There are important hedgerows that should be protected - surrounding countryside is rich in wildlife. • Object to building on the playing fields adjacent to the Woolwell proposed development and Argum Rugby Club playing fields. • There needs to be open space for local recreation. • The area is used extensively for informal recreation. • The grass verges need sorting out as they are not maintained. • Provision should be made for allotments, currently there aren't any in the parish. • Existing development is shielded from Dartmoor by a tree belt to the North – will need something similar for any new development and the existing belt should be maintained. • Object to clearance of Pick Pie Plantation for housing, this is a migration route used by deer as 409 is adjacent to woods. The Plantation and tree belt provide a haven for many flora and fauna, including a bat colony and should be retained. • All the important greenspaces should be shown.

Site reference and address	No. of Comments	Key issues raised in engagement
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential impacts of the proposal on the setting of the AONB have not been properly assessed, need a fuller understanding of the impacts of: additional traffic flow; light pollution and the impact of more pressure for recreation. Without such an understanding then the LPA cannot demonstrate that they have sought to address para. 154 of the NPPF, the primary purpose of the AONB as required under Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way (CROW) Act 2000 and the adopted TVAONB Management Plan 2014-2019. The development should not destroy the rural character of Roborough/Woolwell. Landscaping can ameliorate the landscape impact. The site is a logical extension of Woolwell. How will drainage be managed? <p>Health and Wellbeing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A new health centre would be needed and dental surgery. Existing play provision needs improving plus need for new provision. <p>Living and Housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The slope at site 409 is steep, how would the houses fit with the current development? Need to provide a range of housing including higher end properties. Housing should go on the former Plymouth City Airport site instead or other brownfield sites. The 'eco' homes adjacent to Tesco's are bad enough, don't need more housing. Don't turn Woolwell into a city, or Roborough. Could there be some self-build houses? There is a need for a mix of housing, including for elderly people and self-build. <p>Local Community</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The local community is already poorly served by services, how will it cope if more houses are built? Additional local shops. A Masterplan is needed to set out the proposals more clearly to residents. <p>Other</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the allocation but would like to see the boundary extended as proposed for the SHELAA. The western side of the site should extend to the north of Road. It is important that the proposed area is reflected to enable a northern connection to the A386. A wider boundary would also help delivery of open space and landscaping. The site allocation should include the small parcel of land off Pick Pie Drive.
0381 Plymouth Science Park Phase 6	No comments received.	
0387 Bath Street West	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extend the site boundary of this allocation to Union Street to reflect the attached master plan Shekinah are concerned about the road developments around Barn Road. Homeless people need to have a physical hub/facility in the city. <p>What are the hazardous risks?</p>
0393 Parkway Sports & Social Club, Ernesettle	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the implications on the significance and setting of the historic assets to the south, which include the Ernsettle Battery and Church of St Budeaux (both of which are highly graded designations)? This would appear to cause harm to these historic assets.
0395 (SH_49_09_14) Stoggy Lane	13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for housing development. Premature for a draft LP to identify the site as also suitable for a primary school without further investigation, similar to mixed use, should be in general terms, rather than seeking on site. Will be able to address the identified constraints within the development. There are opportunities to optimise non-car transport linkages and connections with existing foot and cycleways and public transport provision will be considered through a Travel Plan for new residents. The site is available for development and a specialist developer is working in partnership with the Council to bring the site forward for housing development. Support but ask for flood mitigation, additional play and leisure facilities. Not suitable for high density housing due to lack of local infrastructure, people will use rural roads as rat runs. With Sherford the roads won't cope, already major problems in the area.

Site reference and address	No. of Comments	Key issues raised in engagement
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should redevelop empty sites in the city first. Site is home to a huge amount of wildlife. • Drainage will be a problem. • The current public bus service is rural in nature and won't be able to support fringe developments as a viable alternative to private cars. • Roads into Plympton are already congested – will cause issues of pollution. • There's a high level of risk due to the use of scooters by young people which will be made worse by cyclists. • The improvements needed would be beyond any Section 106 agreement. • An alternative site is the undesignated land at the south east of Deep Lane adjacent to Tuxton Farm adjoining the Sherford development. • A wider spatial strategy should be considered to encompass the area.
0403 Cann Lodge, Tamerton Foliot	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local GP and school services are already stretched to breaking point. • The land is within a Conservation Area. • It lies in a flood zone. • It is next to a Nature Reserve and is the last greenspace between Plymouth and the village of Tamerton Foliot. • The ground slopes and adjacent houses are already on private pumping stations. • Providing the various utilities for the site will be problematic and expensive. • Access to the site will be via Cheshire Drive onto Tamerton Foliot Road which is already very busy and traffic will increase with the houses being built on the Tamerton Vale School site. • Should be kept as greenspace. • Will lose the character of Tamerton Foliot if developed. • Will adversely affect the ecology of the site. • Goes against policies in PP Part One. • Don't want to merge Tamerton Foliot with Whitleigh and Southway. • Nothing for children locally. • Traffic is already an issue. • Vehicles mount the pavement which is dangerous for pedestrians. • Area already has a lot of development happening. • Hasn't considered the proximity to the National Park enough. • Area is considered as part of the green corridor.
0406 BT Depot, Tamerton Foliot Road	No comments received.	
0411 Valley Field East of Broadley Industrial Park, Roborough	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The impact on the AONB hasn't been considered enough. Existing employment land/industrialisation has already had a detrimental impact. • Because Lukes Lane has been maintained however it is not as bad as it could have been but proposed allocation here and adjacent will erode the character not only through the development of each site, but also through increased levels of traffic flow, noise, potential visual impacts and potential for light pollution. Impacts will be hard to mitigate and the proposed use is harmful to the AONB. • Question how it can be regarded as sustainable. • The allocation and those adjacent are not compliant with the NPPF the primary purpose of the AONB as required under Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way (CROW) Act 2000 and the adopted TVAONB Management Plan 2014-2019. • Forms a complete dislocation between the Strategic Greenspace of Coombe Valley, passage from the Tamar via Tamerton Lake and Dartmoor National Park.
0412 (SH_04_10_08/1 3/16) Field East of Roborough Farm	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land should be considered for housing, ideally self-build. Site is in a good location for housing. • The impact on the AONB hasn't been considered enough. Existing employment land/industrialisation has already had a detrimental impact. • Because Lukes Lane has been maintained however it is not as bad as it could have been but proposed allocation here and adjacent will erode the character not only through the development of each site, but also through increased levels of traffic flow, noise, potential visual impacts and potential for light pollution. Impacts will be hard to mitigate and the proposed use is harmful to the AONB. • Question how it can be regarded as sustainable.

Site reference and address	No. of Comments	Key issues raised in engagement
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The allocation and those adjacent are not compliant with the NPPF the primary purpose of the AONB as required under Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way (CROW) Act 2000 and the adopted TVAONB Management Plan 2014-2019. Forms a complete dislocation between the Strategic Greenspace of Coombe Valley, passage from the Tamar via Tamerton Lake and Dartmoor National Park.
0413 (SH_04_02_13) Field East of Haxter Lodge	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The impact on the AONB hasn't been considered enough. Existing employment land/industrialisation has already had a detrimental impact. Because Lukes Lane has been maintained however it is not as bad as it could have been but proposed allocation here and adjacent will erode the character not only through the development of each site, but also through increased levels of traffic flow, noise, potential visual impacts and potential for light pollution. Impacts will be hard to mitigate and the proposed use is harmful to the AONB. Question how it can be regarded as sustainable. The allocation and those adjacent are not compliant with the NPPF the primary purpose of the AONB as required under Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way (CROW) Act 2000 and the adopted TVAONB Management Plan 2014-2019. Forms a complete dislocation between the Strategic Greenspace of Coombe Valley, passage from the Tamar via Tamerton Lake and Dartmoor National Park. Luke's Lane is too narrow for the new traffic it will generate. Increased human activity will have a detrimental impact on wildlife. Large number of brownfield sites in Plymouth which could be used.
0414 (SH_04_18_16) Field North of Roborough Farm	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The impact on the AONB hasn't been considered enough. Existing employment land/industrialisation has already had a detrimental impact. Because Lukes Lane has been maintained however it is not as bad as it could have been but proposed allocation here and adjacent will erode the character not only through the development of each site, but also through increased levels of traffic flow, noise, potential visual impacts and potential for light pollution. Impacts will be hard to mitigate and the proposed use is harmful to the AONB. Question how it can be regarded as sustainable. The allocation and those adjacent are not compliant with the NPPF the primary purpose of the AONB as required under Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way (CROW) Act 2000 and the adopted TVAONB Management Plan 2014-2019. Forms a complete dislocation between the Strategic Greenspace of Coombe Valley, passage from the Tamar via Tamerton Lake and Dartmoor National Park. Increased human activity will have a detrimental impact on wildlife. Large number of brownfield sites in Plymouth which could be used.
0421 Downham School	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access will be problematic during construction. Will be disruptive due to loss of parking and disruption to Age Concern. Worried about parking and the traffic on Horn Lane. Supports retention of greenspace adjacent and open greenspace behind the building should be protected. Good for housing for older people. Concerned about the Public Path Diversion Order and Public Right of Way. Has this been re-routed to made it easier to develop the brownfield site behind the Downham school site in the future? Site should be used for a Plymstock swimming pool. Site should be a children's playing field.
0442 Land north of Hazeldene Quarry	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any development would need to provide for the protection of both the countryside park and the setting of Saltram. It is critical that the importance of green wedge to west of Sherford as a key cultural and environmental asset is fully recognised. Agricultural grazing is important. There is a limit, stemming from size of the area annexed by Sherford, and the pressures from increased urbanisation, at which agricultural grazing is no longer viable. This will become another characterless dormitory along a trunk road with no centre or identity at all. The site is immediately deliverable. The constraints identified can be easily accommodated. No biodiversity issues and the agricultural value of the land is poor. Access will be dealt with and noise/air pollution can be surveyed and mitigated.

Site reference and address	No. of Comments	Key issues raised in engagement
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A lot of brownfield sites have been omitted due to the 0.25ha threshold and should be included. • Laira Bridge and other transport networks are already at full capacity. • No further development in Plymstock should be considered until realistic proposals to stop traffic congestion are demonstrated. • Shouldn't be started until Sherford has been built.
0587a Former Plymouth Airport	97	<p>Support for aviation:</p> <p>Arts and Culture</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider organising flying events to encourage its use and make it easy for people to visit and see the local area. • Lack of an airport is bad for the well-being of tourism and wellbeing of the city. • An airport will promote tourism. • Important in encouraging international tourists to the city and to events such as the Mayflower celebrations. <p>City Pride and Vision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Previous evidence published on the future of Plymouth Airport is unreliable. • Travelling to and from Plymouth using the airport, puts Plymouth on the map. • Plymouth is a centre of excellence for swimming and diving it should have an airport. • The morale of the City is not good with the closing of the airport, it produced local despondency and sent a strong signal to the world that the City is content as is. • Plymouth Airport is on the government's agenda and ongoing talks should be recognised and reflected within the timeframe of the Plan. • Needs to remain in situ until a replacement air service is fully implemented. Aviation experts and planning professionals are in the process of surveying and then reporting back to government. • Strong feelings and support to keep the airport in Plymouth. People have been fighting with the support of politicians. • It is important to have a local regional airport for young people. • Need to take back the lease. • Plymouth Airport is good for the city and the whole of the South West. • The life of the city depends on us having an airport. • Land should be reserved for airport purposes only. • When the site is gone, it is gone. • Plymouth is geographically remote and should retain its airport, there is currently no viable airport/heliport in Plymouth. • Plymouth is the regional capital and its population justifies this level of infrastructure. • Air traffic at Newquay Airport shows the benefits of having a fast, cost effective link to London and the rest of Europe. • It would be great to have flights to European cities as well. • With Brexit new opportunities will be opened up and Plymouth needs to be in a position to take full advantage. • Exeter and Newquay Airports are not practical alternatives to Plymouth Airport. • Plymouth is cut off from the rest of the UK in aviation terms. <p>Economy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical advancements within the aviation industry create great opportunities. • Need to look at the national picture for aviation and the increasing emphasis on both regional and general aviation i.e. Aviation Policy Framework (2013), General Aviation Strategy (2015), General Aviation Economic Value (2015) and further information from UN/ICAO. • Need to think of the impact of Brexit as UK finds its place in the world. • An airport is a great amenity for any city, a recreational amenity for people to fly for pleasure, view the aircraft and also for others flying for pleasure to visit the city. Consider providing a restaurant on site, with access to the airfield and good views for people in the restaurant, this has proved very popular at other airfields. • Transport links are vital to Plymouth's prosperity. • Airport would make Plymouth a sensible location for businesses to be established. • The use of this land for airport purposes is important for the city's future economic development, local employment, the convenience of its citizens and, not least, it is an important ecological greenspace.

Site reference and address	No. of Comments	Key issues raised in engagement
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aviation has enabled wealth growth in the past and it will be essential in the future. • Resilience and economic viability of Plymouth and the region are dependent on good public transport and private transport links. • The commercial ramifications for Plymouth of having an operating airport cannot be overstated. • Plymouth Airport is a site of major economic importance. • Reopen the airport and lobby Westminster to set up an enterprise zone to encourage inward investment and support local business and tourism. • If Plymouth is to expand and attract business, we need fast transport to London. • Now the airport is closed I do less business in Devon. • Create long term jobs, not short term construction jobs. • Since the end of WWII Plymouth has missed out on taking advantage of the economic opportunities a thriving airport can bring. • Airports provide jobs and it puts the region on the map and in people's minds. Long term, it directly affects the affluence of the area. • So many businesses have left since the airport was closed and have relocated. • Plymouth's prosperity and future growth depends upon having strong transportation links and a clear message that we are 'open for business'. • Allowing the airport to be lost to developers will produce a poor image for potential businesses needing a strong and local transportation link. • Airports provide employment for a number of people such as those involved in the upkeep and maintenance of the site and those involved directly with aviation. • Flying light aircraft as opposed to driving or using commercial air carriers allows for efficient use of a business' limited time resource. • An airport is of paramount importance if national and international companies are to be encouraged to invest in the local economy, in order to secure the long term prospects of young people. • There's a lack of meaningful investment by industry to provide quality well paid jobs to the area. It's too far from the major hubs in the UK and can only be offset by regular consistent domestic flight connections. • Many of the major companies in the Plymouth area are USA based multi-nationals. They (and others) need the airport to be able to fly to major hub airports for onward flights to the USA, Europe and other parts of the world. • The loss of the airport has had an adverse impact on the ability to recruit and retain high calibre researchers. • Impedes the ability to work collaboratively with other researchers in the UK. • General aviation to the UK economy is £3bn GVA and supports over 38,000 jobs. • All evidence points to communications with the rest of the World and the UK as a major limiting or positive factor in economic expansion of a city or region. <p>Education and Learning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re-opening the airport (and improved rail) is a key step in maintaining the growth and development of the university, Plymouth and the surrounding area generally. <p>Getting Around</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan needs strengthening to facilitate all necessary infrastructure to support a fully functioning airport. • Growing evidence shows it is to be expected that we will see sustainable private sector-led aviation operations resume at Plymouth. • Current connectivity is unreliable and recent disruptions on road and rail due to weather demonstrate this. Airport would help mitigate such incidents. • Any other use of the site would cause massive traffic problems in a problematic area. • Journey times to London and other airports are too high. Exeter Airport is expensive and not that accessible. • Expansion of London airports will lead to much greater access for cities such as Plymouth. • Vital for the future to retain the site and the space necessary for efficient interchange with bus, rail, taxi and, possibly, tram services. • Airports whether they provide commercial scheduled or General Aviation services are essential and irreplaceable infrastructure. • Aviation as part of the transport mix represents a low cost and reasonable means of addressing the vulnerable road and rail network within the lifetime of the Plan.

Site reference and address	No. of Comments	Key issues raised in engagement
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substantial improvements to the major road and rail infrastructure will cost billions. Delivery of these is beyond the control of the Local Authority and while desirable cannot be guaranteed within the lifetime Plan. Reinstated air links will support employment, inward investment, tourism, growth and productivity objectives in the Plymouth Plan. • Desperately need to re-instate a reliable air connection. We are the largest city in the UK without an airport. <p>Living and Housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would be expensive to develop this land due to contamination. • Policy 4 should be strengthened to show a clear commitment that the airport will be retained, maintained and enhanced during the lifetime of the Plan. Should be robust to resist any attempt to secure planning consent through use of new measures. • Poor communications with the rest of the UK and outside are a factor when it comes to companies who need ready access for their personal and executives. • The area north of the NW/SE runway could be used for Hangar Homes with access from the roundabout. There would also be enough space for a clubhouse and park for residents, visiting pilots and local residents. Hangar Homes are sustainable and would guarantee the airport's continued use for operational flying. • There are plenty of other sites that are suitable for development within the City. • Any jobs and economic growth that may be associated with building on the airport are transferable to other housing developments across the city. • Airport site has no special value as housing land. <p>Object to aviation:</p> <p>Arts and Culture</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no listed buildings or scheduled monuments on the appraisal site, nor within its immediate vicinity. <p>City Pride and Vision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For practical, statutory, and economic reasons the site will not be used for fixed-wing passenger or general aviation again. • The chance of rotary-wing (helicopter) operations ever resuming at this site are vanishingly small. • The runways are too short and potentially dangerous if there was an engine failure on take-off with insufficient runway to land. • Safeguarding is short-sighted given the availability of other airports in close proximity. • Despite the size of the site, it has not been considered in terms of its suitability for redevelopment. • There is an inaccurate assertion that the Council is the freehold owner of the site, but 11 acres are owned by PCAL. • The site could accommodate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Approx. 1500 new residential units. ○ Approx. 400 student accommodation bed spaces. ○ A new rehabilitation village for veterans and their families. ○ New complimentary facilities for Marjons plus a new performance arena and potential for a velodrome. ○ 150 bed hotel. ○ 25,000sq.ft of commercial/employment space. ○ A local centre with 16ecogni. 25,000sq.ft of Class A1 and 15,000sq.ft of Class A3/A4/A5. ○ New Primary School. ○ A new community hall. • The site has the potential to become a centrepiece of the Plan, a new garden suburb that could deliver in the region of 10% of the city's housing needs, 440 permanent jobs and 340 construction jobs, it could attract £195m construction investment, generate £14m annually in household spend, supporting a further 170 jobs generate an income of around £15m in business rates and council tax over 10 years and generate one-off council receipts of a further £15m from the New Homes Bonus and Community Infrastructure Levy. <p>Economy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No economically viable fixed-wing passenger aircraft types exist at present capable of using the former airport. • Remaining aviation features on site have been depleted far beyond revival.

Site reference and address	No. of Comments	Key issues raised in engagement
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Major financial interests favour increased housing and exclusion of aviation in terms of transport, services and utilities. • The Plan fails to properly consider a strategy for all modes of transport and alternatives. Consequently, the physical constraints of the site and the unlikelihood of air service provision from the site with affordable ticket pricing have not been properly considered. Had this been done it would quickly become evident that safeguarding is unjustified for the stated purposes. • Financial analysis indicates that annual losses would be circa £1 million – no prospect of financial viability even in the long term. • Based on Plymouth's historical performance and trends in regional airports more generally across the UK the site could never sustain a profitable airport operation. <p>Education and Learning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As the site becomes more derelict the negative impact on the presentation of the Marjons campus to potential students and business partners increases, which could damage the University's growth strategy. <p>Getting Around</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Redevelopment provides the opportunity to facilitate connectivity with – and between – the surrounding residential neighbourhoods, employment areas and University of St Mark and St John. • No scenarios whereby the site could operate profitably as a general aviation only, licensed airfield. • Site is not needed due to availability of alternatives in close proximity. • New links can be made between the University, Hospital and the Park and Ride facilities. Potential to reinforce the site as a gateway to the city. • Site benefits from excellent connectivity to the primary road network, the park and ride, cycle routes and the forthcoming Forder Valley link road. • The scale of development could help support future investment in strategic infrastructure alongside other planned strategic sites in the north of Plymouth. <p>Greener Plymouth</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Short haul flights are severely polluting and detrimental to the climate. The site should be released for redevelopment allowing space for social housing, small businesses and allotments. • The subject site is not located within Green Belt, Conservation Area, World Heritage Site, National Park, Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) or an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. • The site is located in Flood Zone 1. This is land assessed as having a less than 1 in 1,000 annual probability of river or sea flooding (<0.1%), which means the site has the lowest risk of flooding. <p>Living and Housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All of the additional housing presently proposed for green-field sites at Woolwell should instead be added to this site. • This brownfield site is vacant and suitable, available and deliverable for residential development. • Safeguarding is inappropriate and contrary to the NPPF requirement for local authorities positively to seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area on sustainably located previously developed land. • The proposed safeguarding is considered inappropriate and contrary to the NPPF requirement for local authorities to positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of the area and would render the Plan unsound. • Safeguarding no longer has any support within the NPPF. Safeguarding is only referred to in order to protect land for very clear and well established land use planning reasons. • Safeguarding of the site prevents assessment of alternative options when considering how best to meet the development needs of Plymouth over the Plan period. • Consideration has not been given to potential needs for land acquisition beyond the existing site to enable extension of the existing airport facility. This would result in the loss of existing homes and employment space and will likely require Compulsory Purchase. It could also give rise to blight of land around the site. • Brownfield sites have long been identified as the starting point for new development. <p>Local Community</p>

Site reference and address	No. of Comments	Key issues raised in engagement
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is well located, within the existing urban area, within a sustainable location, adjacent to neighbouring residential areas and close to major strategic employers, health/educational institutions and a major transport interchange. • Would expose nearby residents to unacceptable noise levels. • There are opportunities to deliver a wide range of possible uses including: education; housing; community; retail; commercial; leisure and recreational space to meet local needs in addition to a variety of regional and sub-regional developments. • If the safeguarding is short term, the site would provide opportunity for the development of the much needed housing (including student accommodation) social, business and sporting facilities referred to in the plan in a more connected way to the 'heart' referred to in the vision than other alternatives such as the expansion of Woolwell.
0588 Former Environ Factory, Ernesettle	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is of historic importance (monument no. 1162461) and an archaeological investigation should take place. • What type of employment? • Will there be heavy traffic/large lorries?
0590c Melville Building, Royal William Yard	71	<p><i>NB: Most of the comments received on this site were not in relation to the proposed use of the hotel but to the objection of using Devil's Point Reservoir as a car park. This is because during the consultation a planning application proposing this was submitted to the Council.</i></p> <p>Arts and Culture</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Melville is a Grade I listed building • The reservoir was built in 1830, is Grade II listed and within a conservation area. It has important historic significance as the source of water for naval ships. It is the last remaining facility of this kind and workings could be restored as an integral part of the history behind Royal William Yard. • Food markets could be held in the reservoir or film nights. • Devils Point could become an open air theatre. <p>City Pride and Vision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devils point is the jewel in the crown of Plymouth. <p>Economy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strongly support the redevelopment of Melville to accommodate a 4-5* hotel. <p>Education and Learning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site has a lot of historic value which is used as an educational tool. <p>Getting Around</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The existing car parking at Devil's Point should include restricted use times to prevent people parking there for more than a few hours at a time. • Adding more parking spaces in this location would increase significantly the traffic in both directions and the associated risk to pedestrians walking along Admiralty Road from the existing carpark to the beach and pool. • Devils Point is not big enough to support a significant influx of vehicles if developed. • The site should not be considered as a site for additional parking to meet the needs of Royal William Yard. There are opportunities to rationalise the existing parking available in the yard and further support the use of public transport use. • The reservoir area should be dug out to the level of Royal William Yard and a multi-storey car park should be built there to reduce car parking problems. • With limited space, the reservoir is the most suitable land for parking spaces. • Royal William Yard currently only provides 46% of the parking spaces that could be expected from the range of uses within the existing buildings, this doesn't account for Melville being brought forward. • The Plymouth Waterfront Masterplan identifies opportunities to explore additional parking in the reservoir to support further regeneration of Royal William Yard, the Plymouth Plan designation is at odds with the masterplan. • Once Melville is developed and occupied, the ratio of spaces provided vs Plymouths adopted standards will be far less and there will be a far greater demand with less spaces being provided. Although there are alternative means of transport to the car, these options are not open to everyone. <p>Greener Plymouth</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The risk of coastal flooding will increase over the lifetime of the plan due to climate change and sea level rise. • Devil's Point borders a Marine Site that is part of a Special Area of Conservation.

Site reference and address	No. of Comments	Key issues raised in engagement
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the designation of greenspaces and the site should remain as greenspace, it's a special area of natural beauty overlooking Plymouth Sound, the views are unrivalled and enjoyed by many people. • The area includes a mixture of SSSI grassland, scrub (important to birds) and well used mown grass. • Keep this precious beauty spot preserved as a greenspace for future generations. • It is only one of two of its kind in the country and there are many ways that the reservoir could be enhanced without spoiling it by using it to deliver alternative uses. • The site could be developed with ecological biomes that sensitively respond to the setting. • The Reservoir should not be included in the proposed local plan as greenspace. Unlike the rest of Western King, the reservoir is composed of granite sets and in order to support the success of Royal William Yard, more parking will be required. This extra parking has always been identified as being located within the Reservoir. • Support for the inclusion of Western King as a protected greenspace. <p>Health and Wellbeing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The lanes leading to this site are very narrow and development of this site would add to the congestion and pollution experienced in the area. <p>Local Community</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The constraints listed need amending; there is space for children to play less than 600m away. Parking should be considered a constraint and there is a need to establish sustainable transport. • Should be protected as per Core Strategy Policy CS03. • Devil's Point is a much used, safe children's playspace and recreation area. There is no other location on the Point that could replace this use. • The reservoir area is sheltered and enclosed, providing an excellent safe environment for children and it is used for ball games. • The reservoir should be converted into a children's play space, dog park or dog agility facility. • The site could become a skate park. • There are existing problems relating to parking at Royal William Yard, which have caused noise and parking disruption for local residents, however, the reservoir is part of the history of the Royal William Yard and is a designated greenspace; it should not be used for parking cars.
0728 South West Water Site, Glacis Park	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roads leading into this area are not capable of dealing with extra traffic. • Some wonderful natural woodland/wildlife would be ruined. • Too much overloading of housing into a small area. • Site includes Crownhill Fort. If the site should not come forward at this time, might it be appropriate to consider a policy response in the plan to provide clarity to applicants? • Site should be allocated for the new district centre, not for housing.
0729 Former Plympton Hospital	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the site for housing, want to improve access from Market Road. • St Marys Bridge roundabout is already operating at or near to capacity. • The site is in proximity to Plympton Priory. Has an appropriate assessment been undertaken to determine what, if any, harm there is to the heritage asset? • Could be developed for elderly/affordable housing. • Design should have a 'village feel'. • Falls within the Colebrook flood plain, has flooded in the past and has sewerage problems.
0742 Land at Riga Terrace	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land use for housing is sensible. • Access considerations needed as roads leading to Riga Terrace are very narrow. • Disturbance to local residents in clearing the site will be substantial and care needs to be taken to keep residents on side/informed.
0744 Former Southway Primary School and Playing Fields	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a S77 agreement in place to provide playing pitches, access, car parking and a pavilion on the Southway/Bond Street site which needs to be included in future plans. • Proposal for playing field improvements should not be confused with the proposed housing, split the allocation into two. New housing will also need to provide new pitches and sports facilities to meet the needs of the new residents. • No – not enough schools

Site reference and address	No. of Comments	Key issues raised in engagement
0746 St Levan Road	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site is down for development, but polluted and houses would not be within 400yards of a greenspace. Should this be a community greenspace – there are a lot of houses in this part of Stoke which could use a calm greenspace, and play areas.
0798 UCP Marjon	No comments received.	
0799 Plymouth International Medical and Technology Park	No comments received.	
0824 Mount Wise, Devonport	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should be a specific constraint prohibiting the felling of any more mature trees, as well as the protection of the natural environment and greenspaces in the site. Where exactly is development to go? Area on map is in green. Greenspace is already encroached upon. Site lies within the conservation area and is adjacent a number of listed buildings whose setting may be impacted upon. Has an appropriate historic environment assessment been undertaken to assess the sites suitability for development? In Devonport, quality of new build dwellings for private sale needs to be raised and accelerated. No demand for commercial units. Sites should be residential, mixed use will not be achieved. Site is not suitable for LGS
0824a Mount Wise, Devonport	5	
0839 Registry office, Lockyer Street	18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support if a new site for the Registry Office is found, ideally within the Waterfront area. Limited to height of Windsor Villas with garden. What protection with Plymouth Plan offer the Conservation area? Any developments in height and design should be sympathetic to surrounding greenspace, listed buildings. Want clarification. Don't need more housing/student accommodation on the Hoe. Mixed use of these sites to include office or live/work space should be mandatory. Don't want the registry office to move. Already not enough parking. Plymouth has a 20ecognized shortage of quality hotel provision – site site has been identified by our Hotel property consultant Colliers as suitable for hotel development as it is strategically located between the city centre and the Hoe on Armada Way with sea views above second storey. Furthermore there is 20ecognized demand from hotel operators and developers as evidenced from our marketing of the Quality Hotel site. Want the current site allocation to change from Housing/Housing Led Mixed Use to Mixed Use (hotel/housing).
0840 Land at Staddiscombe Road/Goosewell Road	14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should remain as green, particularly with Sherford, enough disruption already. Site is green and a welcome contrast to dense development of Staddiscombe. Field is used for recreation. The petrol station (a vital service) requires a viable retail outlet to remain operational thus careful consideration is needed of the impact of a new local store. Plymstock has already expanded enough and a strain on local services. It is for all intents and purposes a public park but lacks a name. Only flat site for children to play on with a path. Artificial turf should be explored. If it takes place the nearby junction needs to be improved. Need to think of the height of the building. If the store cannot be let then hot food takeaways should be prohibited. Height of the buildings need to be taken into consideration. Strain on local services i.e. GP, primary schools etc. More community facilities needed rather than housing.
0842 Stirling House, Honicknowle	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The One Public Estate Programme proposal is to develop the land at Stirling House plus the adjacent NHS clinic for potential redevelopment should this be included?

Site reference and address	No. of Comments	Key issues raised in engagement
Green		
0844 Devonport, land at Paradise Road	230	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It has been a greenspace for the enjoyment of the City for a long time. • Why has the site not been given a Local green space designation as it meets all of the criteria? It got more nominations than any other site in Plymouth. • It shouldn't be allowed to become a housing site. It forms part of the green arc through Devonport. • There is already a lack of greenspace in this part of Plymouth and the loss will make it worse. • The council has obstructed the residents' application to apply for Village Green status. • It is of historic significance, being within the conservation area and surrounded by historic buildings. • Albermarle Villas were built by John Foulston for retired Royal Navy Captains and the field allowed for a clear view to the Sound and all the ships coming and going. It is part of Plymouth's heritage landscape. • It is within a Conservation Area. • It was given to the community by Stoke Damerel Church in the 19th century. • Enjoyed by many different groups of people, including students from City College which is expanding. • Used by schools for sport and by children, although the Council has taken away the sports facilities for children. • Devonport park is fine when they are toddlers but not suitable for informal teenage sport. • Local people would be willing to take on management of it. • It could become a wildflower meadow, an orchard for the community or playing field. • It has biodiversity value and an original hedgerow. • The site has drainage problems and could be a flood risk. Paradise Road regularly floods and last winter the road had to be closed. • There are many more suitable sites that could be put forward for development. • It was identified as a greenspace to be improved in the LDF Stoke Neighbourhood Development Plan consultation leaflet (2011). • The site lies in the Stoke Damerel Conservation area which in the Local Plan 1995-2011 stated that the 'conservation area be maintained' and 'green areas should be protected and enhanced'. • If houses were built on this land it would conflict with the aim of the Plymouth Plan that "everyone will have access to high quality natural space within 400m of where they live". A significant area of Stoke already fails this criteria. Page 04 in the toolkit identifies a "lack of greenspace" as an issue or challenge in Stoke. • The field provides an oasis of calm right in the centre of the city. Because of the hedge and walls surrounding the field, it is surprisingly quiet. • Other greenspaces have already been lost in the area (e.g. Cumberland Centre). • Housing here would add to traffic congestion and parking pressures in the area. • Development should be on brownfield land. • Development of this site would be irreversible. • We need greenspace to keep our city clean. • The Land and Property department put it up for sale for housing, even before it had conducted a "land surplus to use" process. This was carried out retrospectively – revealing a presumption to build from the outset. The land had not been identified for housing in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment Review 2014. The notification of sale for housing produced nearly 200 objections – an unprecedented number. • Any development on this site will need to mitigate loss in the form of sports pitches elsewhere, plus new provision to meet needs of new residents. • With the shortage of community homes especially for the elderly the site should be developed and the scheme could have better development attached to it for the church park.
0845 Fort Austin Depot	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thai community would like to use this site as an official Thai Temple. They would use this site as a place of worship and for a minimum of two Thai Buddhist monks to live in the Temple, want to redevelop and allow visitors. • Could become a place for the whole community. • Site sits within the Scheduled Monument of Fort Austin. How might this inform any

Site reference and address	No. of Comments	Key issues raised in engagement
		proposals?
0846 Woodland Fort	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Like the proposals.
0852 Estover Industrial Estate	No comments received.	
0854 Adj. Drake Circus	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Want clarification. Too many pubs already in the city centre resulting in anti-social behaviour. The site has been put forward as part of a wider development site with the Money Centre etc. – site would be suitable for a mix of uses including residential; student accommodation; and / or hotel use. (0854/0977) Could broaden to include the possibility of a City Centre hotel.
0855 Toshiba Site, Northolt Road, Ernesettle	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Like, but no incinerator, building height needs to be below tree height.
0858 Quality Hotel, land north of Cliff Road	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If a hotel, needs to be 5*. The building line on the seaward side of the site should be aligned with the other principal buildings on the Hoe. Design should be of highest standard. Height should not exceed Azure and Elliot Terrace or the Old Grant Hotel. Ideally it should keep the same line frontage with the present buildings on the Grand Parade. Concerns re effects of underlying pollution on health. How will this be addressed? Should become a car park.
0863 Land south of Langley Crescent	No comments received.	
0864 Land at Little Dock Lane, West Park	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If housing, a replacement park would be appreciated at Wollaton Grove. A lot of deprivation in the area. Greenspace is seen as invaluable. Want the site as LGS. Outdoor play space is important to preserve for health and wellbeing.
0865 Southway Campus, Clifford Road	No comments received.	
0866 The Ship	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Historic assessment should be undertaken for any redevelopment Need to think of the setting on adjacent buildings Need to think of potential harm of Bowden Battery to the South
0876 Ham Drive, Pennycross	No comments received.	
0897 Elburton East Edge	29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Worried about hospital/school provision, will become oversubscribed. Laira Bridge already can't cope and Exeter Street is already over capacity. Not within 400m of local green space or services. Space should be linked to Sherford greenspace. Will have access problems. Should be kept as greenspace, can't afford to lose anymore. Several developments have been granted planning permission since the approval of Sherford contrary to statements given at the time of the Sherford application. Represents the last area of green belt separating Elburton from the South Hams. Brookwood Road is currently a quiet street and additional houses will bring noise and light pollution. Everyone will need to own a car as the bus route is only one per hour. Roundabouts are small and already at capacity.
0899 Royal Parade and Old Town Street	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should not externally change. No addition height. Key Abercrombie grid frontages in the City Centre should be celebrated and carefully

Site reference and address	No. of Comments	Key issues raised in engagement
		<p>protected.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Food retail use is acceptable in-principle as part of any refurbishment/extension. Support the provision of mixed use development. Focus on A1-A4 ground floor uses and C3, student accommodation, C2 and B1 above. Historic Environment should be a constraint. Why does only one of the blocks have the 'economic importance' constraint? While change is necessary, consistency is important when changing the Abercrombie Plan in terms of its intensification and connectivity.
0900 Royal Parade and East of Armada Way	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should not externally change. No addition height. Key Abercrombie grid frontages in the City Centre should be celebrated and carefully protected. Food retail use is acceptable in-principle as part of any refurbishment/extension. Support the provision of mixed use development. Focus on A1-A4 ground floor uses and C3, student accommodation, C2 and B1 above. Historic Environment should be a constraint. Why does only one of the blocks have the 'economic importance' constraint? While change is necessary, consistency is important when changing the Abercrombie Plan in terms of its intensification and connectivity.
0903 Charlton Crescent	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the implications of this site upon the significance and setting of the historic asset to the south, the Bowden Battery? Has an appropriate historic environment assessment been undertaken to assess the sites suitability for development?
0906 South Yard	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree on the basis that the land use will remain unchanged. There is no intention in the foreseeable future neither to change this land use nor to release this land. Special constraints should be applied to protect the heritage in the Dockyard, and to preserve the visual amenity. Must protect the view towards them. Forms part of the continued operation of the Devonport Dockyard and Naval Base and feature in the future strategy for the operation of the site for the foreseeable future. Site includes a number of highly graded designated assets. Agree, but better transport links required and additional parking.
0908 Drakes Island	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to recognize the nature conservation constraints Flooding could be managed with the design of the development and the developer will need to show how a proposal satisfies the exception test. Needs to be brought back into the city as an attraction/destination. Want partnership working with environmental organisations. How can site not be close to a local population (reason for LGS rejection). A specific policy should be included which clearly sets out the Council's support for the regeneration of the site. No confidence anything will happen. What will controlled community access look like? The site is in full view of large tracts of the waterfrontage around Plymouth Sound and potentially has a considerable impact on visual amenity affecting thousands of people. The rejection argument that it is not close to a local population (for local green space) therefore seems especially inappropriate in this case. Any development on the island should be limited in height and density so as to be similar to the existing buildings there, and limited to replacement or refurbishment of those existing buildings.
0909 Richmond Walk	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Abuts the conservation area and is adjacent a number of listed buildings who's setting may be impacted upon. Want clarification on the site. Flood risk is a concern but possibly manageable with design. Developers will need to show how a proposal satisfies the exception test.
0912 Land East of Ernesettle Lane	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No tall unsightly buildings. Site is essential green corridors to ham woods. Is a requirement to protect existing local nature reserves.
0913 Woodvale	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the implications of this site upon the significance and setting of the historic asset to the south, the Knowle Battery?

Site reference and address	No. of Comments	Key issues raised in engagement
Nurseries, Truro Drive		
0916 Stonehouse Car Park	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Want it as parking instead of Devil's Point reservoir. • Will help support the growth and success of businesses in Royal William Yard without causing problems for residents. • Like this to become a park and ride. • Will relieve traffic and air pollution. • Not close enough to Royal William Yard. • Will people who work have protected parking? • What about the city centre? • This is already well used for people working in the area, but especially for events like the car boot sale on Sunday. What will happen to the activities/people displaced if this too becomes a car park for Royal William Yard?
0917 Land North of Lake View Close	158	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This area of the city is currently a tranquil and verdant greenspace and should remain as greenspace. It was identified as a strategic greenspace in the LDF. It should be designated as a local green space in accordance with policy 6 of the Plymouth Plan Part I. It should also be designated as a Local Nature Reserve. • The adjacent Ernesettle Creek is an SSSI. The site is visible from and will affect the setting of the Tamar Valley AONB and the Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area. It is adjacent to the SAC and SPA. There are Egrets, herons and Kingfishers in the Creek as well as other wildlife. It is sandwiched between two nature reserves and is therefore a wildlife corridor. • The area is also important for landscape as the trees that grow there provide a high quality setting to the AONB and frame the waterfront. Mature trees would be lost to the development. The proposal is not compliant with the NPPF. • It will be detrimental to the setting of Tamerton Foliot village and will destroy its rural character and separation from Whitleigh. The peace and quiet of the area will be lost. The development would join Holly Park with the village of Tamerton Foliot. • Public facilities in the village are already at capacity (such as the primary school and doctor's surgery). There is no play provision for children locally. The facilities in Whitleigh would be too far away for residents to access. • Access to the site will be challenging as traffic conditions are already critical. It would increase traffic and noise along Lake View Drive. Bus access to the site would be difficult to achieve. Where would they turn around? Milford Lane is already a rat run. The road junctions are not designed to cope with the extra traffic that will be generated. Construction traffic would cause harm to local residents. Riverside Walk would be unsuitable for 2-way traffic if this was used for access. • The existing sewage infrastructure doesn't have any extra capacity. The area has already lost greenspace and gained extra housing with the development of the old Tamerton Vale Primary School site and other sites in the vicinity. There are more appropriate brownfield sites that could be developed. The land here is unstable and drainage is difficult. • Building here could add to flood risk for neighbouring estates. Part of the site is on a flood plain. Milford Lane already floods. The site is steeply sloping and it will be difficult to drain safely. • It is an enjoyable wildlife area to visit. Building here will destroy wildlife, damage the environment and add to traffic congestion. It will also spoil the rural character of the walk along the estuary. • Development here would go against Article 8 of the Human Rights Act (right to private and family life). Housing would overlook the housing on Station Road. • It will go against Policy 30 of the Plymouth Plan Part 30 (points 1 – 4). A site at Allern Lane was refused by SHDC on traffic impacts and visual impact, and this site should also be refused. Applications for development on this site in the past have been refused. An application for the trees along Riverside Walk to be TPO'd is under consideration. It is contrary to the Plymouth Plan Part I policies (theme 2, theme 3, SO5, Policy 24, Policy 26, Policy 29, Policy 30, Policy 36, SO8, Policy 40). • Support: • Part of the site is in private ownership and not accessible. It will be highly desirable to future home owners. There are opportunities to open up parts of the site for public access. The site relates well to Whitleigh and Tamerton Foliot. It would lend itself to a

Site reference and address	No. of Comments	Key issues raised in engagement
		<p>mix of housing types, particularly detached and semi-detached properties. It could also include affordable housing. It will help the Council to achieve its 5-year land supply. The site could be developed in a way that minimized visual impact on the AONB. Traffic could be managed to achieve an acceptable impact on the highway.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part of the site is in a flood risk zone. • The site is visible from and will affect the setting of the Tamar Valley AONB. The site assessment fails to consider the proximity of the site to these conservation designations. This is contrary to section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000. It is not compliant with the Tamar Valley AONB Management Plan.
0924 Duke Street	No comments received.	
0935 Novacold Factory	No comments received.	
0939 Chelson Meadow Recycling Centre	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to have regard to the impact on Saltram • How might any proposal take the opportunity to enhance or reinforce the character of the long ride to Saltram?
0942 Land at Stuart Road/Victoria Park	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wouldn't object to part of the site, but park and bowling green should stay as they are. • Area is rich with local heritage related to Brunel and the city's railway and maritime history and the sculpture by Richard Deane appears to be within. • Some housing is ok but the arches and remnants of bridges are really interesting! • Like to see more public access, preferably from the park with some information boards. • Area seems to be within 400m of a greenspace. • Not suitable for housing. • Site abuts the North Stonehouse Conservation Area. • Site has poor drainage. • Should become a wild flower area.
0946 Errill Retail Park, Plymouth Road	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the alternative health to retail. • Like to see a mixture of housing, majority as assisted living. • Will need suitable transport/access. • Needs strong wording here or retail could affect the viability of Plympton Petrol Station and store, serving the residential estates to the north. • Could also be used for educational/youth needs? • What health use?
0947 Milehouse Bus Depot	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key elements of the buildings on this site relevant to Plymouth's heritage should be protected. • It makes sense to have the bus depot towards the centre of the city • Given the existing levels of contamination it's best to leave it as it is.
0948 Land South of Stoggy Lane	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site has manageable flood risk if built into the design and developers will need to show how a proposal satisfies the exception test. • Support but would ask for flood mitigation additional play & leisure facilities; suitable sustainable public transport; provision for additional dental, medical & educational facilities. • Need to consider how traffic will access new development. • Minimum pressure on existing road network. • New houses will exacerbate existing traffic problems. • What would the catchment area for schools be? • The current public bus service is rural in nature and won't be able to support fringe developments as a viable alternative to private cars. • Roads into Plympton are already congested – will cause issues of pollution. • There's a high level of risk due to the use of scooters by young people which will be made worse by cyclists. • The improvements needed would be beyond any Section 106 agreement. • An alternative site is the undesignated land at the south east of Deep Lane adjacent to Tuxton Farm adjoining the Sherford development.
0949 Brickfields Recreation Ground	35	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It's used a lot for sport and recreation. Building on this site will have a big negative impact on health and fitness. • Repair and use existing housing, stop taking away greenspace. • Children and young people of Plymouth need this space to stay green.

Site reference and address	No. of Comments	Key issues raised in engagement
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site is rich in biodiversity. Keep as greenspace. • More housing would put a strain on the local infrastructure • Housing would need to be thought through and used to deliver more facilities in the rest of the area. • This is a possible future site for a single or double 3G FTP. • Depends on the layout and scale of the housing. • Site is an important sporting facility site and may be needed to further deliver artificial grass pitches. • Would like the site to remain as formal playing fields without the loss of any natural turf pitches. • Would need to meet paragraph 74 of the NPPF.
0950 Vets and finance services office, Central Park	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not need any further sport facilities here. • Need to retain the vet. • Which support? How would it be developed? • Land is not available and is subject to legal/multiple owner constraints. • Keep as green. • Site should be protected for sport, perhaps cricket?
0953 Land West of Ernesettle Lane	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the implications of this site upon the significance and setting of the historic assets to the south, which include the Ernesettle Battery and Church of St Budeaux? • Site has topography issues, will it be levelled? • Some of the area could be suitable for employment
0954 Fields to north of St Budeaux, A38 junction	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the implications on the setting of Ernesettle Battery and Church of St Budeaux. • Has an appropriate historic environment assessment been undertaken? • Site is a green corridor to ham woods. Recognised as being a requirement to protect the biodiversity of existing LNRs under the current environmental strategy. • Suitable "wild" wildlife corridors should be a requirement of any developments of these sites. • Should stay as greenspace. • Traffic will affect the A38. • Pollution will become a problem. • One of the last areas of historic farmland. • Field is a natural introduction to the AONB. • Viewable from Agaton Fort. • Ancient trackway is present. • Like, but only for residents, not students. • Need to think of schools/community resources. • Want further clarification.
0956 Open Space at Plympton House	19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Worried it could be considered for housing. • Area is historic. • Drainage system hasn't been upgraded. • Should be kept as greenspace, has a lot of wildlife, flora and fauna etc. • Worried about flooding – consideration should be given to tree planting. • Worried about increase in traffic. • Agree with the 'green' constrain. • Should protect historic areas outside of centralised areas too. • Worried about setting a precedent if housing is built here. • Worried about the expense of the open space on the tax payers and the council. • Worried about local schools. • What restrictions will be put on residential development in terms of design etc. • Brownfield before greenfield. • Sympathetic development would be supported if the green band contour of the land is not changed and the strategic views over Plympton St Maurice to the Ridgeway are kept. • Object to local green space, there is potential for the whole site to become housing. • Release part of the grounds adjacent to the Ridgeway as public open space. • Any development should be complimentary to the Grade I Listed Building and Conservation Area.

Site reference and address	No. of Comments	Key issues raised in engagement
0958 Site off Weston Mill Lane	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns re how public access to the whole of this greenspace may be affected.
0959 PML site, Leigham Street	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No objection to low-rise building. Concerns re effects of underlying pollution on health. Housing is appropriate but not overbearing apartment complexes which could destroy the character. Mixed use should include office or live/work space.
0960 (SH_49_18_16, SH_49_19_16, SH_49_20_16) Langage extensions	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fully support the development of the land for commercial purposes. Part could be allocated for future sports/pitch hub. Could be appropriate to channel sports facilities here rather than dot it around the city? Number of Grade II listed buildings on the site, need to assess the impact.
0961 Mayflower Street West	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> While change is necessary, consistency is important when changing the Abercrombie Plan in terms of its intensification and connectivity.
0962 Mayflower Street East	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development has already started on this site. While change is necessary, consistency is important when changing the Abercrombie Plan in terms of its intensification and connectivity.
0964 New George Street West	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is in the city centre and therefore food retail use is acceptable in principle. Could be for the elderly? No more student accommodation. While change is necessary, consistency is important when changing the Abercrombie Plan in terms of its intensification and connectivity.
0965 Bath Street East	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support.
0966 Playing pitch adj. Western National site	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to satisfy the flood risk sequential test, inappropriate for residential development. Preference would be for a pitch linked to a hub site or off site mitigation to Collins Park. Single pitch not used for many years. Any proposal affecting open space, sport and recreation would need to meet para 74 of the NPPF and Sport England Playing Fields Policy. New housing will need to provide pitches and sports facilities to meet the needs of new residents.
0967 Land at Sutton Road	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flood risk is a concern but possibly manageable with design. Developers will need to show how a proposal satisfies the exception test. This site is very prominent and in close proximity to the Barbican. Support mixed use development should make appropriate contributions towards the management of off-site urban realm infrastructure. Like if there's enough parking added. Would it be possible for the strategic plans to permit the erection of a building higher than 6 storeys on the site, particularly at the western end, at the junction of Sutton Road and Exeter Street? – Such buildings would draw attention to the junction and to the opportunity to turn into Sutton Road to visit the National Marine Aquarium and the other amenities on the east side of the Sutton Harbour as well as the walkway giving access to the Barbican.
0969 Land behind Marett Road, St Budeaux	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Likely to be limited risk to Hornchurch Local Centre, given the distance of the site from Ernesettle. Site is an essential green corridors to ham woods. This is recognised as being a requirement to protect the biodiversity of existing LNRs.
0971 MDEC Central Park Avenue	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site is partially affected by fluvial flood risk. Land is adjacent to, if not part of Central Park and should not be built on.
0972 Social Club Site, Milehouse Bus Depot	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site is not and will not be available for residential development. Site is to be commercial or light industrial use. If site is allocated for housing this would impact upon the business activities at the Milehouse Bus Depot. <p>Heritage is not mentioned in the draft plan as a constraint, but should be.</p> <p>Key elements of the buildings on this site relevant to Plymouth's heritage should be</p>

Site reference and address	No. of Comments	Key issues raised in engagement
		<p>protected.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residential developments should be located away from existing and programmed sources of noise. The location is inappropriate for residential.
0973 Open space near Manadon Junction	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential for a single or double 3G FTP site but will need to be discussed further due to remote location and how it will be managed/maintained. If not 3G, should be protected for sport.
0974 Royal Assurance site, Armada Way	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One of the key Abercrombie grid frontages and should be celebrated and carefully protected. The site is in the city centre and therefore food retail use is acceptable in- principle as part of any redevelopment. Want the retention of A1-A4 uses on ground floor and currently considering residential, student accommodation, hotel (Use Class C2) and office space (Use Class B1) for upper floors. Needs to be considered for a wider variety of uses. Site is already housing/student accommodation.
0975 Savage Road, Barne Barton	No comments received.	
0976 Bull Point Barracks	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site includes a number of grade II historic assets and there are Scheduled Monuments to the west of the site. Has an appropriate historic environment assessment been undertaken to assess the sites suitability for development?
0977 Cornwall Street East	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site is in the city centre and therefore food retail use is acceptable in principle as part of any redevelopment. The site has been put forward as part of a wider development site with the Money Centre etc. – site would be suitable for a mix of uses including residential; student accommodation; and / or hotel use. (0854/0977) While change is necessary, consistency is important when changing the Abercrombie Plan in terms of its intensification and connectivity.
0978 Cornwall Street West	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site is in the city centre and therefore food retail use is acceptable in principle as part of any redevelopment. While change is necessary, consistency is important when changing the Abercrombie Plan in terms of its intensification and connectivity.
0979 Seventrees, Baring Street, Greenbank	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, but could there be provision for ordinary housing? More than enough student housing in the area. Concerned – would oppose high rise buildings. Area is already overcrowded. Insufficient parking. Area should be used for recreation or extension of Beaumont Park, tennis court, swimming pool etc. Re-provision of facilities within a central, accessible location needs to be taken into account in any redevelopment, potentially within the Seven Trees site boundary. Under One Public Estate: OPE3 currently considering the potential for redevelopment for housing and improved dental health provision rather than just a housing development.
0980 Plymouth University	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partnership is good with PCC but the University seems dominant, and there is enough accommodation newly built. What is being proposed? Too vague.
0981 Elburton (Land at Candish Drive)	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Question the need for more housing in the area. The infrastructure is not in place and the road network around Plymstock/Elburton cannot cope with additional development. Suggest brownfield regeneration. New sites create a greater need for greenspace. Worried about the health and welfare of the local community with the building on greenspace. Support the inclusion of the site for development on the basis of the services, facilities and infrastructure to be provided as part of the Sherford development. Consider that the whole of the Elburton edge area within the ownership of the

Site reference and address	No. of Comments	Key issues raised in engagement
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> consortium should be identified for further development. Disagree that the site is not within 400m of greenspace on the basis of such facilities to be provided by the development of Sherford.
0982 North Hill/Tavistock Place	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need more detail, concerned with pedestrianisation which would look good on paper but just increase vehicular traffic. This is already in progress.
0983 Tavistock Place	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need more details. Want to keep the existing Victorian houses. What sort of education? Needs enough parking added for commercial and housing.
0984 Land North of Broadley Park Road	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Worried that the assessment has not considered enough the impacts of the proposed use on the AONB. New industrialisation has already had a negative impact on the AONB – will further harm the setting to the AONB through the erosion of its character. Impacts will be hard to mitigate. Not compliant to the NPPF. The area is good for walking and therefore healthy exercise. Lukes Lane is too narrow for access. Will increase human presence and activity. Site already has outline planning permission.
0985 (SH_04_14_14) Land West of Broadley Park Road	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Large number of other brownfield sites available in the City. Worried that the assessment has not considered enough the impacts of the proposed use on the AONB. New industrialisation has already had a negative impact on the AONB – will further harm the setting to the AONB through the erosion of its character. Impacts will be hard to mitigate. Not compliant to the NPPF. The area is good for walking and therefore healthy exercise. Lukes Lane is too narrow for access. Will increase human presence and activity. Site already has outline planning permission.
0986 (SH_04_13_14) Land North of Belliver Way Industrial Estate	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Forms a complete dislocation between the Strategic Greenspace of Coombe Valley, passage from the Tamar via Tamerton Lake and Dartmoor National Park. Provision must be made for a reasonable green passage through this area. Need to look at the emerging Bickleigh NP. Significant constraints due to location and impact on the landscape and access Vehicular access is likely to be impossible due to the road frontage. Area is close to AONB and will impact on the area. Consider other sites such as Beliver and Broadley Park first.
0987 Land North of Tamerton Road	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pitches should be protected. Seems to affect existing playing pitches. Site is important sporting facility and may be needed to further deliver artificial grass pitch(es) to meet the under supply of playing pitches. Any proposal if affecting open space, sport and recreation would need to meet para 74 of the NPPF.
0988 Land South of Roborough House	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extent of proposed industrial land is opposed. Forms a dislocation between the Strategic Greenspace of Coombe Valley, passage from the Tamar via Tamerton Lake and Dartmoor National Park. Significant constraints due to location and impact on the landscape and access. Vehicular access is likely to be impossible due to the road frontage. Area is close to AONB and will impact on the area. Consider other sites such as Beliver and Broadley Park first. This in the past has been put forward as possible land to develop for playing fields, could be linked to Woolwell?
0989 Land North of Clittaford Road	No comments received.	
0990	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MoD access crosses the site and the boundary appears to impinge on the MoD owned

Site reference and address	No. of Comments	Key issues raised in engagement
Land at Keyham Road		<p>Quarry Car Park. The Babcock land is identified as being strategically important to the long term support of the Babcock Marine and Technology business in the Dockyard.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is utilised for storage of facilities needed in the refits to RN platforms and employee parking. Future demand on the Goschen area to support new classes of RN platforms. • No intention to release this land in foreseeable future. • Housing would benefit from a play park and general greenspace. • Increased housing would benefit from additional retail, no local shopping in the area. • Suggest a bridge over St Levans road to connect the housing area to the playing fields. • Area would benefit from access to the waterfront via controlled paths through the dockyard. • Flood risks have not been recognised. Flood Map for Surface Water indicates a significant flood risk. • Proposal is not supported. • Artificial Grass Pitch wrongly identified for housing and should be protected. • Planning permission has been granted for a new building which has not yet been constructed – suggest boundary of site is reviewed.
0991 North West Quadrant, Derriford Business Park, former Seaton Barracks Parade Ground and sites on Brest Road	14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to a commercial and retail centre which will rival the City Centre. • Supportive of the development. Site is suitable for a wide variety of commercial or residential uses. • Existing buildings are subject to occupational leases which are due to expire in March 2020 – reasonably confident that there are no intentions for the existing occupiers to remain beyond 2020. • Acceptable for the Seaton Barracks site to include a district centre but cautious about further business park development – demonstrated that there is an over-supply of employment land, particularly in the northern corridor. Flexibility in the type of employment generating uses that can be accommodated is important. • The TA centre site is identified in the Governments Future Reserve 2020 plans – site has seen recent development and as such has been subject to significant investment. The Reserve Estate is always open to approach but it is currently considered that the site meets the needs of the Volunteer Estate. • Overall proposal is suitable but raises environmental concerns – i.e. the loss of mature trees on site and would be severely detrimental to the visual environment. • The single Plymouth Pear at Morlaix Drive must be afforded utmost protection. • Proposed improvements to Morlaix Drive potentially threaten control of traffic at the hospital and concerned that it could result in a rat run. • Support for the principle of creating a new wider mixed use commercial centre. • Should be more specific in respect of the level of food retailing floorspace that is being anticipated. • A new district centre has the potential to pull trade from existing smaller local centres and a site specific retail impact assessment should inform the allocation. The residual expenditure capacity should be taken into consideration when determining other food retail applications. • Consider the development will be viable but only at a small scale given the impact on the highway network. Only small shops should be encouraged. • What will be done at Manadon to improve congestion?
0992 Land at Mowhay Road/Coombe Farm	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns about the impact of the development of the site for gypsy and travellers on the woodland, local nature, local property prices and lead to an increase in crime. • Consider that if sites need to be identified for gypsy and traveller use, more than one site should be identified. The current proposal should be rejected. • There is already provision for gypsy and travellers at Chelson Meadow. • Disagree with development in any way – it is key to the continued food ecological status of Ham Woods local nature reserve. • Area has ancient Devon lanes and other historical features. • Includes valuable habitats such as ancient woodland and unimproved grassland and is close to a CWS (for Depford Pinks). • Area owned by PCC contains several paths and is an accessible greenspace which is used by dog walkers and mountain bikes etc. There is a cycle path going through this area. • This area is a strategic green corridor for wildlife moving from rural areas to Ham

Site reference and address	No. of Comments	Key issues raised in engagement
		<p>Woods LNR and as such is part of the green infrastructure strategy to join up the key greenspaces in Plymouth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Friends of Ham Woods would be willing to assist in the management of this space.
0993 Land adjacent to Plumer Road	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for housing but does not consider the identification of constraints has been applied consistently. • Does not consider that this site is of significant economic importance for the city and this constraint should be removed.
0994 Land off Newnham Road, Colebrook	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flood risk is a concern but possibly manageable with design. Developers will need to show how a proposal satisfies the exception test. • Support the identification of the site for housing as it is felt that Colebrook would benefit from some regeneration and additional housing with preference given to starter and low occupancy homes. • Need adequate or enhanced flood protection, good traffic management, additional parking facilities within the development, accessible regular and sustainable bus service along with provision of greenspace and contributions to local infrastructure providers (dental, medical and education).
0995 Former China Clay site, Coypool	13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of housing does not reflect ambitions for preservation of greenspaces or access to public transport. • Due to contamination it should be left to nature to regenerate. • Will lead to an increase in traffic flow in the local area. • Site could be better used as mainline rail station which would improve journey time to London. • Alternatively, the site could be a new sports stadium or industrial units. • Support for proposed allocation as part landowner of site which could deliver up to 350 dwellings. • No need for an area-wide masterplan, provided it can be demonstrated that one development does not unduly prejudice the delivery of housing on the additional land. • Support the proposal providing it does not impact Woodford residents. • Development should comprise a good mix of housing and include low occupancy and affordable homes. • Roads will need to be improved. • Consideration needs to be given to the impact on school places and whether a new school is needed. • Essential that both landowners work together and with the landowners of the site to the north to deliver a comprehensive development in the area. • Considers that the viability of delivering a scheme on this site with the necessary remediation measures will result a non-policy compliant scheme in respect of affordable housing and infrastructure. Because of these constraints, a larger site should be allocated including adjacent greenfield land which could result in an additional 200-300 homes, leisure facilities, a country hotel, golf club. • Agrees with the desire for the development to be delivered as part of a masterplanned scheme for the whole site. • Do not agree that the site is distant from greenspaces and play areas as appropriate masterplanning of the site would include recreational and amenity areas for these purposes. • Disagree that the site is disconnected from local services – it is well connected to the eastern corridor growth area, the park and ride and rail infrastructure and master-planning could encompass these requirements. • Site is identified as being contaminated but this can be addressed. • Ground conditions are not difficult. • No intentions of progressing a wider development proposal joining with other locally promoted schemes at this stage. • Vehicle access should be off Coypool Road. • Community benefits should address the lack of open space in Woodford, create links from Saltram to Boringdon Hall, highways infrastructure, school places and wider community facilities. • Question whether the site contributes to the setting of the Scheduled Ancient Monument at Efford Fort or the Registered Park and Garden at Saltram. If there is a relationship, how might the design avoid harm or mitigate to enhance its setting? • The council should satisfy itself that there is no long-term requirement for china clay

Site reference and address	No. of Comments	Key issues raised in engagement
		processing at the site.
0996 Land at Outland Road Depot	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site should not be built on or used for any other purpose than greenspace. • Support for proposed use providing: provision is made for direct access from Outland Road to the cricket field, a new connecting path to link Peverell Corner and Pennycomequick, provide space to store equipment and tools for servicing Central Park and provide space for green waste and timber collected from Central Park. • Needs agreement on the type of sport to be provided and how it will be developed. • Access to Goals and Peverell Park to be retained. • Unsure about what is actually meant by the allocation. • Sites need to be protected for sports. • Site should be protected and allocated for cricket pitches to help secure the Plan for Pitches.
0997 Agaton Fort	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unnecessary expense – money should be spent on creating attractions within the waterfront area. • Question if a facility will be membership only. • Site is too far for most of the local community. • Still needs to be something for community use by the green in Ernesettle.
0999 Chittleburn Hill	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question the location – suggest closer to Plymstock Centre or Deep Lane and centralised to serve Sherford/South Hams residents. • Should be integrated with other bus routes/services with a transport plan. • There needs to be a walk and ride, perhaps at Deep Lane? • To work it needs improved cycle/pedestrian links between Brixton and Elburton. • A park and ride will improve transport links to Plymouth, reduce traffic into city and reduce delays at Laira Bridge. • Unclear about the size of the facility and capacity. • Should be well sited with safe access, the existing topography may make this difficult. • Should be well screened, reduce visual impact and light spill.

APPENDIX II: LIST OF NEW SITES PUT FORWARD WITHIN THE ‘AT PLYMOUTH’ BOUNDARY

Site Reference and Address	Ward	Proposal/Description
1014 Southway Valley, Dunraven Drive	Budshead	Proposed use: Residential and greenspace
1040 Old railway line north of Milne Place, Devonport	Devonport	Proposed for residential and parking.
1008 Land at Bladder Meadow, Crownhill	Eggbuckland	Proposed for residential.
0842 Stirling House & Honicknowle Clinic (partially site 842)	Honicknowle	
1005 Land at Wollaton Grove, Crownhill		Proposed for residential.
1006 Land at Shakespeare Road, Crownhill		Proposed for residential.
1012 Tesco Transit Way		Surplus car parking space identified as suitable for mixed – commercial and / or housing (0.49ha).
1019 Cheriton Close		Proposed for residential.
0398 Eaton Business Park, Estover	Moor View	Proposed for residential or retail mixed use.
0399 Airport Business Centre		Proposed for residential or retail mixed use.
0401 Land at Thornbury Road		Proposed for retail and residential.
1009 Land at corner of Pattinson Close, Plymbridge		Proposed for residential.
1010 Island Farmhouse, Plymbridge		Proposed for residential.
1011 Tesco Roborough		Surplus car parking space identified suitable for mixed – commercial and / or housing (0.2 ha).
1033 Land adjacent to 54 Blunts Lane		Proposed for residential.
1004 Police & Fire Station, Glen Road, Plympton	Plympton St. Mary	Proposed for alternative employment uses.
1016 Land at Boringdon Park		Proposed for residential, leisure uses, country hotel and golf course.
1034 Land at Boringdon Hill		Proposed for residential.
0730a Land off Plymbridge Road		Proposed for residential.
1002 Land at 60 Vinery Lane	Plymstock Dunstone	Proposed for residential.
0342 Radford Quarry	Plymstock Radford	Proposed for residential.
0759 Ashery Drive Garages, Hooe		Proposed for residential.
1018 Land at Jennycliff		Proposed for residential and enhancements to tourist facilities.
1037 Plymstock Clinic		
0404 Land off Coombe Lane, north of Southway	Southway	Proposed for residential.
0766 Jeffery Close		Proposed for residential.
1017 Land off Allern Lane, Tamerton Foliot		Proposed for residential and greenspace.
1021 Land north of Coombe Lane		Proposed for residential.

Site Reference and Address	Ward	Proposal/Description
I036 Land south west of Belliver Way (Former Playing Field to west of Becton Dickinson)		Proposed for employment.
I001 St Budeaux Methodist Church & Victoria Snooker Centre	St. Budeaux	Proposed for residential (single person/bedroom) alongside Church and community space.
I007 Land at Trevithick Road, Kings Tamerton		Proposed for residential.
I013 Money Centre	St. Peter and the Waterfront	Proposed for mixed use residential, student accommodation and /or hotel.
I015 Millfields Trust, 278 Union Street		Proposed for mixed use community hub including youth and enterprise zone, community space, health and well-being, business uses
I022 Quay Point		Proposed for retail, leisure, food and drink and art and performance space and pop-up facilities.
I023 Quay Square/Quay Road		
I024 White House Pier		
I025 Vauxhall Quay		Proposed for leisure, retail, residential and commercial, boardwalk.
I026 Sutton Wharf		Proposed for commercial retail leisure, office parking, art and performance space and pop-up facilities.
I027 North Quay		Proposed for food and drink, car parking, retail/kiosk outlet, art and performance space and pop up facilities.
I028 Brunswick Place		Proposed for commercial, hotel, residential, student and PRS.
I029 Horsewash		Proposed for retail, leisure, office, hotel, residential and student accommodation
0025/0033 North Quay House II		Proposed for mixed use to include a hotel, office, residential and student accommodation.
0140 Plymouth Boat Yard	Sutton and Mount Gould	Proposed for residential, industrial/business use, offices and marine infrastructure
I030 Sugar House, Sutton Harbour		
I031 China Quay		Proposed for car park, food and drink, retail.
I032 Eastern Gateway		Proposed for retail, restaurants, leisure, hotels, residential, parking and mooring facilities.
0405 Land at West Trehills, Tamerton Foliot	South Hams	Proposed for residential.
0416 West Trehills Farmhouse, Allern Lane, Tamerton Foliot		Proposed for residential.
0419 Old Newnham Farm		Proposed for residential.
I035 Whiston Farm, Whitson Cross Lane, Tamerton Foliot		Proposed for residential.
I038 Land at Dodovens Farm, Brixton		Proposed for residential.
0400a Land at Pick Pie Drive, Woolwell		Suggest this is just added to 0400 as it forms a key access point.
Please note that these sites do not include additional sites which have been identified by the Council through other means. The full list of additional sites will be considered as part of the engagement commencing November 2016.		

APPENDIX III: SUMMARY OF NON-SITE SPECIFIC COMMENTS IN PLYMOUTH

Theme	Summary/Key issues raised in engagement
Arts and Culture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Want an arts/culture building or hub for artists to own and work in – would add to the cultural offer if small groups can get together and work together. • Want pop-up sites in areas currently not ready for development, for performance or exhibition. • Devonport Dockyard should be protected, both a working dockyard and a potential heritage site. • Agreements should be made with Babcock and the MOD to provide residents access to the waterfront.
City Pride and Vision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supportive of the JLP approach and the extension of the time period from 2031 to 2034. • Need clearer more consistent policies across the JLP area as a whole. More work will be needed to address issues.
Economy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tall structures, especially tall buildings should not cause an obstruction to air traffic movements at MOD aerodromes or compromise the operation of air navigational transmitter/receiver facilities. • Need to be aware of MOD statutory explosive safeguarding consultation zones.
Getting Around	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Difficult to assess whether infrastructure needs will affect the JLP or whether the JLP will be pushed forward irrespective of infrastructure requirements. • Parking on the Westfield Estate is an issue and causes delay for emergency services. • Want a mini-roundabout at the top of Wolverwood Lane. • A transport strategy which allows development proposals which can be accommodated within the existing capacity of a section (link or junction) of the strategic road network, or they do not increase demand for use of a section that is already operating at over-capacity levels, taking account of any travel plan, traffic management and/or capacity enhancement measures that may be agreed would be acceptable on a plan-wide basis. • May need to identify the "level of service" of the transport network necessary to ensure that the conditions for the economic growth set out in the plan are realised. • The JLP should set a strategic context requiring developer contributions towards rail infrastructure where growth areas or significant housing allocations are identified close to existing rail infrastructure. • Planning applications need to include a transport assessment and Network Rail needs to be consulted if there is likely to be an impact on the rail network. • Worried about the lack of major infrastructure to support 30,300 new homes to be built. • Too much traffic calming around the city.
Greener Plymouth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 189 comments were received which supported the creation of Boringdon Strategic Greenspace. • 1 comment suggested a change to the boundary of the Boringdon Strategic Greenspace. • Want clearer consistent policies for protecting ancient trees, planting new trees and protecting street trees across the whole JLP area. • Support the need to protect green infrastructure functionality and the need for robust planning in green/rural areas. • Boundary needs to be changed/investigated of the Plym Valley. • Want stronger policies for landscape. • Objection to school playing fields not being included in local green space designations. They may not be open to the community but they have visual amenity which can be enjoyed by the community. There has been a loss of school playing fields across the country to development which runs counter to current thinking on the vital importance of physical exercise to national health, wellbeing and economic success. • Concern for a lack of protection for playing pitches. • Want stronger natural infrastructure policies regarding trees, landscaping and mitigation in all development. • Maintenance of green spaces is an issue. • All existing large and small parks, "pocket parks" (often at street intersections) and all land alongside and central to highways currently planted with trees or capable of being planted with trees should be identified and designated as greenspace, for example spaces in Stonehouse Peninsula have been omitted. • Object to "Highways Land not demonstrably of local significance" as a valid reason for rejection as they provide an essential ingredient to the characteristic of an area. Mature trees in streets correlates very closely with higher and highest property values. In other words, mature trees provide the most sought-after environments. • Language regarding planning for trees should be considerably strengthened in order to reflect aspirations of Plymouth Plan Part One. • All mature and younger trees over 20 feet high should be protected unless they are crowding each other so as to impede their further development, healthy life or unless they are demonstrably irrecoverably diseased or damaged. • No tree should be permitted to be felled due to its proximity to buildings or services unless it's a member

Theme	Summary/Key issues raised in engagement
	<p>of one of the species with deeply spreading roots, in a particular type of clay subsoil which would cause encroachment on foundations or without independent expert advice on necessity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several nominations have been rejected as extensive tracts of land but the size should not stop it from being protected. No guidelines were given on size. Instead of rejecting a nomination it would be more useful to suggest subdivisions which could be accepted. • The plan should list with site references all the sites which have been nominated and accepted for protection as greenspace. • Many small areas are described as 'not demonstrably of local significance' but which offer valuable habitat for wildlife like bees and other pollinating insects. • All central greens in the Abercrombie housing estates (Ernesettle, Whitleigh, Ham, Honicknowle, Efford, Southway) should be designated as local green space. The estates were designed as self-contained villages and their central 'village greens' are one of the key features of their design. • Would like to see a greater encouragement to grow trees. • Former Blue Money site is dangerous. • Disappointed that the Former Blue Money site has been rejected as local green space. • Should recognise the need to consider cross-boundary issues and opportunities. • Many of the greenspaces are not suitable for recreational purposes as they are of high inclines, cemeteries and woodland that are not accessible to the public, do not allow for people to walk freely or play ball games and other activities and do not feel safe from violent attacks. • The designated landscapes such as the AONB or Dartmoor National Park are not referenced in the constraints. • Careswell Avenue and Conway Gardens are extensively used as play areas and should not be rejected for local green space. • Mannadon roundabout to Donnington drive is a wildlife corridor and Mowhay Road is an essential green corridor and both should not be rejected for local green space. • Weston Mill Lane is considered by most walkers as being part of Ham Woods and is an area which contains historic and environmentally sensitive sites and should not be rejected for local green space. • Want to improve and maintain the playing fields in Central Park, to the benefit of not only the Plymouth Argyle Football Club but also of the youth and the community in Plymouth and the surrounding area. • The lack of high quality local facilities in Plymouth impacts not only on Plymouth Argyle but also Plymouth Albion in the Community, which plays an important role in engaging and educating Plymouth citizens and in supporting the Council's public health agenda. • Keen to explore the idea of a further four grass pitches, and a site for a new 4G artificial pitch. Ideally the pitches would be located close to Home Park where the facilities at Home Park can then negate the need for newly-built structures. • Understand the council's concerns re exclusivity of new sports pitches but believe the leases could be structured so as to address this issue and ensure widespread community use of well-invested, high quality sports facilities.
Health and Wellbeing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A strategy for the development of a health and wellbeing network is being drafted and the proposed location of physical hubs will become clearer as the commissioning plan is finalised. • Need to ensure there are adequate mental health facilities.
Living and Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All growth should be within Plymouth. • Housing needs to be mixed with some social and start up housing. • Housing should not be divided between wealthy and poorer areas as you see in Stonehouse i.e. Union Street, Millfields and Royal William Yard. • A number of brownfield sites potentially suitable for high density residential development are omitted by virtue of the qualification criteria, in particular the size of 0.25 ha and current occupation. • Brownfield before greenfield. • Need to up the building standards and be more generous with the space provided for families. • Welcome proximity to playgrounds but good insulation and privacy within homes is also important. • The objectively assessed housing needs may have been underestimated as there's no separate assessment of affordable housing needs. • Proposed housing requirement ignores unmet needs from the preceding plan periods. • Disappointing that the proposed housing requirements in this consultation are reducing housing provision both in comparison to existing adopted Plans and previous consultations. • The housing requirement should be expressed as a minimum so that full housing needs are planned for. • The JLP should identify a Housing Land Supply including contingencies over the plan period which is flexible enough to respond to changing circumstances. • A Plymouth Urban Fringe policy area should be produced. • Welcome the clear message regarding Dartmoor National Park.

Theme	Summary/Key issues raised in engagement
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don't agree with the Plymouth Housing Market Area, it should also include Dartmoor and Cornwall. Currently presents a confusing baseline position for housing needs, the PBA report is inadequate and the needs of the area have been greatly understated. • South Hams has no particularly strong migrancy relationship with either Plymouth or West Devon. • The 'Dartmoor Provisional Allowance' of 600 new homes is not explained or justified. • Need to think about converting/improving derelict properties before building new ones. • Disagree with the analysis of the site reference SH_07_14_16 (Dodovens Farm, Brixton).
Local Community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Early liaison in the planning process (pre app) with the Police Designing Out Crime Officer will enable appropriate and relevant advice and recommendations on designing out opportunities for crime, fear of crime, anti-social behaviour (ASB), unacceptable behaviour and conflict in the built environment, following crime and ASB analysis and a demographic overview in relation to specific sites. • There are a lack of amenities and places to meet in the PL5 area – nowhere to run community meetings from and lack of public seating for the elderly. No facilities for young people. • Need to provide more public toilets. • Faith communities aren't really considered in planning. • Need another mosque in the City. • Will there be a separate waste plan? • Need an enforcement policy on refuse bins in Plymouth. i.e. bins should not be left out on public highways or back lanes where it is possible to bring them in. • St. Budeaux needs more investment, particularly St. Budeaux Square.

APPENDIX IV: SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE CITY CENTRE AND WATERFRONT DRAFT AREA VISION

Theme	Summary/Key issues raised in engagement
Arts and Culture	<p>City Centre</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The architecture of the City Centre should be protected; it has wealth generating implications for tourism and the heritage and media industries. • A need to protect and enhance the historic fabric of Plymouth is balanced against the long term future of the City Centre. An inflexible stance in relation to historic buildings could stifle the vision set out. <p>Waterfront</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disappointed that there are no protections for recreation boating. • Tinside Pool which has hosted some events could be developed further by the installation of a roof cover which can be opened or shut according to the weather. • South Yard presents a golden opportunity to set up a heritage centre to promote the history of South Yard, Devonport and the Waterfront.
City Pride and Vision	<p>City Centre</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Want a doubling (and more) of the resources to “sell” the City Centre for investment to investors, retailers and developers. • Armada Way should be prioritised for development as soon as possible. • City Centre public realm should be on the council’s list of priorities to see regeneration, changing customer experience and job creation. • The drive to deliver the City Centre masterplan must come from leadership, significant and focused resources (much greater than they are now) towards inward investment and a consistent and faithful approach to retail strategy plans. • There is an urgent need to provide a City Centre which is an attraction to visitors and tourists by having an appropriate balance of shops, offices, residents and students. • Support the approach to develop taller buildings of 5 to 6 storeys. • Land should be reserved at the Railway Station area specifically for a Tall Buildings zone in the City Centre, and tall buildings (over 8 storeys) should not be permitted anywhere else. • Mixed development is welcomed in the City Centre. • Colin Campbell Court: lets protect the elevation of the 1930’s building and pull-down the properties facing Western Approach. At the same time remove the two small access points to the car-park from Western Approach and off Market Street for something more stylish and available to all in the way of entrances. • Part of the City Centre should be given a free-standing translucent roof creating an all-weather zone. • Better publicity of events is needed. <p>Waterfront</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plymouth would benefit from tourist trails and novelty transport modes. • Need a new pier. • A cruise terminal would be an unnecessary expense for the council – cost would outweigh the income. Money should instead be spent on creating attractions within the waterfront area. Would contribute to tourism and education facilities for children. • If the Cruise Ship Dock should go ahead there will be a need to provide refreshment facilities close by for passengers. • Support plans for Sutton Road, in particular to increase residential population and sense of arrival for visitors. • Millbay needs an “anchor” to attract people and investment – e.g. a landmark cultural, educational or leisure use. • Question the planning decisions which have been made in the Hoe Conservation Area. There needs to be more communication and collaborative working with residents as new sites come forward. • Pleased with the introduction of a bandstand and renovation of the area around the Dome. • Concerned that the draft masterplan doesn’t make reference to extant planning permissions at Millbay and wants more specific reference. • Boundary of Millbay should change to reflect the extant planning permission in place. • Vision for Clyde Quay is inconsistent with the approved outline permission for the site. • Nothing wrong with the municipal feel of the Hoe and doesn’t need changing. • The area around the Dome should be kept as it is. • Local residents are worried about the way in which the Hoe Promenade is being used and how this may be escalated in the future for commercial purposes to the detriment of The Hoe

Theme	Summary/Key issues raised in engagement
	<p>Conservation Area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wish for more vision for foreshore, including more development opportunities and year-round uses. • The RNLI's facilities at the site should be significantly expanded to provide improved training, educational and operational facilities and a greatly increased public presence, whilst simultaneously providing a major new land mark complex and visitor attraction at the Eastern Gateway to Millbay where presently none exists.
Economy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whilst the documents promote creation of local jobs from an end-user perspective the 'initial stages' of proposed projects is often not taken into consideration. • Whilst the need for publicly funded projects is understood to achieve 'best value', there is surely a case for use of local professionals to help strengthen our local economy. <p>City Centre</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Want policies that restrict the sale of comparison goods in other places around the City set out. • Support the retail hierarchy with the focus on the City Centre for non-food retail. • New centres should have controls on floor space. • Support the redevelopment plans for Colin Campbell Court – but some concerns over loss of car parking and want increased access/more on street car spaces to be provided in the short term and that the proposed multi storey car park proposed between Mayflower Street and Cornwall Street west is brought forward for early development. • Retailers and residents should have no additional cost put on them due to removal of part of Frankfort Gate. • The potential for re-development for Royal Parade east should be extended to include the whole of the block covering the units westward to the House of Fraser store. • Need quick positive intervention with short term actions and announcements to deal with recently approved out-of-centre retail applications which goes against unanimously approved retail policy in Plymouth Plan Part One. • Imperative that Plymouth City Centre remains competitive, providing a retail offer which meets the changing expectations of visitors, provides modern floorspace for new and existing retailers and responds to the challenges of the changing retail landscape. • Large blocks in the City Centre are commercially redundant. • Strongly support the intensification of Mayflower Street East and Mayflower Street West but site boundary to the north should be extended to include the Copthorne Hotel and for the hotel to be re-included in the overall development of the site. • Want a commitment to re-locate Council offices in the City Centre. • Employment growth should be prioritised. • Plymouth's future growth needs to be led by employment, not by housing development, and should reflect this ambition to provide jobs. Whilst employment on the city's periphery is welcomed, a more ambitious plan for walkable, central employment would be preferable in terms of sustainability. • Surprised that there are no sites allocated for employment / mixed use in Millbay / Stonehouse. • City needs a good conference centre. • Use the Council land holdings for the benefit of re-development. • Allocation for mixed use regeneration should be carried across into the JLP as a formal policy allocation to support the City Centre as the primary location for major comparison shopping. <p>Waterfront</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Big events are costing the council money and are not enhancing the Conservation Area. • Loss of Lambhay Car Park and other sites around the Barbican will lead to a loss of car parking spaces which serve the Barbican which would have a significant effect on the Barbican economy. • There is not enough capacity for the amount of fish that could be landed at Sutton Harbour. This is part of Plymouth's global reputation for marine engineering research and it needs to be explored how the facilities for the fishing industry can be helped. • Improvements in tourism and leisure based sectors in the city and to the urban realm around the Harbour should not be at the expense of the fishing/seafood industry. • Support the need to safeguard the working quay. • Want rationalisation and introduction of new uses including – retail, hotel and residential. • Want to include SHH proposals for specialist retail, food and leisure, car parking, student accommodation, private rented sector accommodation, moorings, pontoons and extension/conversion of Harbour Car Park (AAP Proposal SH08). • Include Teat's Hill, beach and foreshore and links to car park in a way that is sympathetic to marine conservation and sea-faring. • Would like a wider lighting strategic and sound system infrastructure to make events more

Theme	Summary/Key issues raised in engagement
	<p>economic.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pleased to see the importance attached to the link between the economic health of the city and its hinterland and the waterfront but nowhere is this extended to the Cattewater, which is a key commercial port area. • Cattedown Wharf, Corporation Wharf, Victoria Wharf and Pomphlett Wharf should be delineated as being safeguarded for their current use, together with a buffer zone of at least 250m within which a policy should apply to exclude non-compatible uses, or subject them to appropriate limitations to prevent conflict with the current use which needs to operate 24 hours a day because of the tides.
Getting Around	<p>City Centre</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better connectivity needed to the Barbican and Millbay from the City Centre. • Could promote a historic route between the City Centre and Waterfront via Whimble St. • Want a massive investment in public realm to change the experience of visiting the City Centre and add dwell time. • Need strategic transport improvements to the north and east of the City. • Support the statement that Western Approach should be made “more of a street than a road”, want greater access to the car park, more pedestrian crossings. • Support the proposal for a car borne street to be provided through Frankfort Gate. • Want full pedestrianisation of the eastern section of New George Street to improve the experience. • Union Street is dangerous as a pedestrian route dividing the areas either side. Exploration of this historic area is not encouraged. Increasing the pedestrian crossings and making a dedicated cycle lane would improve the area considerably. • The roundabout with Union Street at the top of Durnford Street, designated as part of a route to encouraging cycling and walking is dangerous. • Bring back the Royal Parade underpass. • Want an integrated, long-term plan for linking and unifying Millbay, Durnford/Union Street and Frankfurt Gate areas. • Public transport needs urgent consideration and must precede car deterrence. • Open up the Yealmpton/Turnchapel railway link. • The old SR/Lee Moor Tramway route along the Embankment from Marsh Mills to Friary Goods Yard could still make a viable route. • While change is necessary, consistency is important when changing the Abercrombie Plan in terms of its intensification and connectivity. • Want good communication with the rest of the UK and an extended M5 motorway. • Want an imaginative walkway between the city centre and to the waterfront via North Quay. <p>Waterfront</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The South West Coastal Path/Waterfront Walkway is best routed along Great Western Road and West Hoe Road before accessing the Millbay Dock area.” • Supports signposted route and public realm enhancements for Bretonside and Buckwell Street. • Support the Lock Bridge, but will need s106/CIL funding. • Support improvements to Exeter Street, in particular improvements to North Street subway linking towards harbour. • Supports a clearly defined route from the City Centre to Sutton Harbour. Gateway should feed to Barbican Parade, promoting access towards the East Quays via the proposed Boardwalk. • Links within Sutton Harbour omitted from waterfront masterplan for waterbus links. Need to add Boardwalk link and name it Sutton Harbour link not Barbican. • South West Coast Path and Sustrans National Cycle Network Route 27 use Lock Bridge. Need to reference this and the bridge’s strategic importance. • Support the delivery strategy of the waterfront masterplan. • Need to delete the black line around Sutton Jetty of the masterplan. It is not considered a significant structure. • Need to delete “potential to improve buildings” line on Fish Quay. Quayside pedestrian route is not possible but an alternative route will be agreed as part of masterplan for site. • Supports proposal to improve approach to harbour via Barbican Approach. Recommends incorporation of integrated mobility hub here, including water transport. • People can’t use Devil’s Point car park because it is free and people use it to park all day to live, visit or work in Royal William Yard. Could it become a short term paid car park? Keep the pool there – people can use this easily with young children, and it is an easy walk from Devonport and Stonehouse. • Stonehouse Creek Car Park is already well used for people working in the area, but especially for

Theme	Summary/Key issues raised in engagement
	<p>events like the car boot sale on Sundays. What will happen to the activities/people displaced if this too becomes a car park for Royal William Yard?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should allow the free-flow of traffic for all types. • Include Marsh Mills, Laira and Embankment Road transport and landscape improvements to improve arrival experience and ease congestion. • Include delivery plan for tram network similar to Brest, Brittany, with waterfront links. • Seek acknowledgement that Waterfront Walkway links to Cornwall and South Hams via ferries and that route be given weight as significant initiative for public realm improvements and educational interpretation of its history and assets. • Support Millbay Boulevard for early delivery. Wish to see more detail of Western Approach / Union Street junction. Support prioritisation of History Centre and St Andrew's Street link public realm improvements. • Seek significant improvement of public realm and appropriate repair of historic paving. Would like to see a public realm design code. • More attention should be given to Bretonside to Notte Street route, linkages, crossing and public realm as it is a strategically important artery/approach for the area. • Would like a coach drop-off pick-up facility located at Exchange Street Car Park. • Would like new underground car parking and event equipment storage at the Hoe – e.g. under Hoe Promenade or near Citadel entrance. • Would like to see Commercial Road area also included for redevelopment and public realm improvements. • Masterplan should identify tall ship berthing opportunities. • Keen to see improved access for the disabled and families between the Hoe and foreshore. • Support aspiration to deliver remainder of Millbay Boulevard. • Waterfront walking and cycling route from eastern kings to the Millbay area through the camber to the ferry terminal. • The route proposed through Millbay to Royal William Yard via the ferry gate is welcome, but misses the attraction of linking the waterfronts. It would be spectacular and a great heritage to leave. • Ensure that the west end of Hoe promenade has a non-stepped path down to Hoe road. (The area between the Belvedere and West Hoe cliff). The current path is negative towards prams, wheelchairs, mobility scooters, wheeled cases etc). • Welcome the plan to link Millbay with City Centre, and hopefully with RWY. It will promote the SW Coastal path and historic links around the waterfront. • Do not wish to see walkway routed through Millbay Marina. Consider existing route on Great Western Road / West Hoe Road better option. • Public transport in the Mount Wise area is inadequate. • Want a water taxi link to include Mount Wise and Devonport. • Welcome plans to connect Millbay to the City and hopefully with Royal William Yard via an extended South West coastal path through the Longroom at Stonehouse. • Want to encourage some pedestrians from St Andrews Cross to walk to the Barbican via the more historic route of Whimble Street, upper and lower St Andrew Street or Finewell Street. • Want maintenance contingency for the South West Coastal Path.
Greener Plymouth	<p>City Centre</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Armada Way, despite being generously planted with bushes, trees and flowers is not shown as a greenspace on the map. It should be protected. • The areas successfully planted with wildflowers this summer, like those near North Road Railway station, Charles Church and Derrys Cross Roundabout show how important it is to keep such areas as wildlife habitat and should be shown. • The masterplan acknowledges rainwater and refers to using SuDS in the public realm but the wording could be more strongly or firmly put. It would be good to see more definite statements of keeping surface water on the surface, integrated into landscaping and public realm and the long-term strategy of removing surface water drainage from the combined sewer system in order to reduce flood risk and protect water quality in Plymouth Sound. It would be good to see a surface water masterplan within the document. <p>Waterfront</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the proposal for a cruise terminal would need dredging or other works to the estuary/sound, it is likely to need a Habitats Regulations Assessment to ensure it avoids risks to the Tamar Estuaries Complex SPA and the Plymouth Sound and Estuaries SAC. • Landscaping and planting approach should be a pre-determined and joined-up code. • Coastal planting is debatable as best option – would like recognition of heritage in planting

Theme	Summary/Key issues raised in engagement
	<p>schemes - but would like to see preservation of Plymouth Thistle and consideration of wildlife. Support quality and cost-effective maintenance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Want a clear and credible plan for the 'wilding' of the Hoe. • The masterplans identify that well-chosen, well-grown trees are a key element of good quality places. Achieving this will require a cross-disciplinary approach with a commitment to providing post-planting aftercare. • The plan does not identify the gardens and large lawn in Royal William Yard as greenspace to be protected. • Devil's Point should be Strategic Greenspace and the whole area must be treated in the same way and given the highest possible level of protection as a prime area of public open space (with its special views across Plymouth Sound, its designation as an SSSI and its historic significance). • Greenspace in Mount Wise and Devonport needs to be protected. • Disappointed that there is only one reference to climate change and flood risk in the visions when it is a significant constraint now and into the future. • Disappointing that the vision makes no reference to improving water quality and habitats within the area. • There's just one reference to coastal flood risk; that is with regard to not using existing buildings in stormy conditions on the Hoe. Impacts from coastal storms and flooding are and will be a significant constraint on Plymouth's waterfront. Would have expected to see discussion of the defences at Sutton Harbour and impact of sea level rise. The Sutton Road work certainly needs to mention flood zones.
Living and Housing	<p>City Centre</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would like to see specific controls included for student housing which potentially prevent delivery of strategic and important sites for other uses. • Too much emphasis on providing student flats despite the amount of people on the housing register. <p>Waterfront</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No further housing should be permitted in the Mount Wise area. • The apartment block proposed for Millbay Pier is undeliverable but the balance of the existing housing consent could still be developed. A small number of units could be used by the RNLI as part of this reduced housing footprint funded as part of the site's affordable housing contribution.
Local Community	<p>City Centre</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Children's playgrounds placed strategically to encourage people to explore towards the Hoe would be fabulous in Armada Way. <p>Waterfront</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Want to capitalise on the opportunity for the Church of St John the Evangelist to re-orientate itself southwards and establish itself within the new local residential community. • Community centres are important and the 'social glue' that helps create a neighbourhood. • Needs to refer more to community facilities and services. • Lack of facilities for younger children and teens in Mount Wise.
General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some aspects of the Plan are contradictory and highlight conflicts of interests i.e. Plymouth Fish Market. • Concerned that the masterplans could join several previous ones in that project delivery has been patchy and there have been too many compromises over quality. • Want the appointment of a steering group and a project manager for the plan's delivery with local stakeholders being consulted to the fullest extent possible. • All issues identified in the SHAAP should be incorporated into the current waterfront plan. • The opportunity to link the chain of coastal and inland defences with those outside the City boundary and with the SW Coast Path should be taken within strategic interpretation and green/grey/blue infrastructure strategies.

APPENDIX V: SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE DERRIFORD AND NORTHERN CORRIDOR DRAFT AREA VISION

Category	Summary/Key issues raised in engagement
Arts and Culture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcomes the reference to make greater use of heritage assets, but vision is predominantly about access to nature. • Opportunity to promote multi-functional outcomes is missed. E.g. The Victorian defences around Plymouth are largely designated assets, but are linked by undesignated defences and communications lines. These should be protected but are not mentioned in the vision. • Welcome the reference to Crownhill Fort but the wider opportunity of linking the historic and natural environments misses an opportunity. • The use of the historic environment in the vision and the strategic actions (including its place in green infrastructure process) should be explicit to avoid policy conflicts. • Communication links and killing zones are often left undesignated when it comes to the forts.
City Pride and Vision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It's unclear what status the Derriford Strategic Masterplan will have within the Plan, would not want this to delay a planning application. Would it not be better to request that a planning application is accompanied by a Strategic Masterplan for the wider area? • The requirement for a Strategic Masterplan for the District Centre should not delay proposals coming forward, especially to support the needs of the Hospital. • Building closer to the street is not the only way to achieve a higher quality urban development, e.g. campus style development. • Confusion between the vision and site allocations in terms of whether proposals shown are existing/new. • Developing the airport site can contribute to the area vision objections.
Economy/ New District Centre	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the vision and especially the identification of Derriford Hospital as an economic driver. • New district centre should serve the new and existing communities within the Derriford corridor rather than a city-wide catchment. • Agree that the need for larger supermarket provision has reduced and will likely be replaced by smaller convenience stores. • Support the control of retail development in Derriford through a policy test. Suggest that the policy test is taken in conjunction with floorspace and unit restrictions to make sure that any proposals are relevant to the district centre functions. Proposals for a new district centre must receive a specific land use allocation so as to avoid the potential for significant adverse impact on the City Centre. • The Derriford area is the ideal location to establish a new heart for the north of the city given its considerable assets that offer huge potential for supporting growth and long term prosperity. • Need to ensure a new district centre is within walking distance of the Marjons campus and accessible. <p>South West Water, Glacis Park</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site provides the best solution and is deliverable within an acceptable timescale. • There is an agreed timescale for the waterworks to be relocated to Roborough. • The Plan should recognise a broad location for the new district centre to the west of the A386. • The Inspector at the Core Strategy enquiry concluded that the District Centre should be located to the west of Tavistock Road, and the local plan should continue to direct provision to the west of the A386. <p>North West Quadrant</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part of the site will be used for facilities directly related to core Hospital activity, such as clinical departments and parking. • There is potential for imaginative use of pedestrian and cycle routes, avenues, vistas and green corridors to create a premium value business environment. • Seek assurances that any non-health related businesses, such as a supermarket, would have car access separated from the hospital site to avoid car users with no connection to hospital activity driving through the hospital grounds. • Use for the site should also include multi-storey car parking and offices. <p>Seaton Barracks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question the value of showing a broad-brush approach to the District Centre site location. This will only serve to continue uncertainty. • The Seaton Barracks site is the logical location for a District Centre. • Suggest that the identification of different uses in the area vision in relation to the 'northern' area and 'southern' area is unhelpful and should be left more flexible. • The site should not include business park development as demand has not been proved in this area. • Needs to be flexibility, retail is now recognized as an important source of employment.
Education and Learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of provision of high density student friendly accommodation opportunities in this area. • Plans don't appear to recognise the intended growth of Marjons.
Getting Around	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is one pedestrian crossing near to the Jack Rabbit Pub, with the next crossing not available until the George Junction. This makes it very dangerous and difficult for pedestrians to cross Tavistock Road near

Category	Summary/Key issues raised in engagement
	<p>the Powisland Drive junction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need an official crossing for pedestrians, but also a mini roundabout or preferably a traffic light system for the vehicles attempting to exit from Powisland Drive onto Tavistock Road. Many drivers turn into Powisland in order to head back towards Crownhill. • Support the creation of a separate walking/cycling route to link the commercial heart of Derriford, together with public realm improvements. • Widewell is a giant cul-de-sac currently (off Southway lane) and needs better access. • The main arteries out of Plymouth, especially north of the city need to be kept open and widened. • Bottleneck between the George and Woolwell needs to be addressed. • The A386 to Tavistock is wholly inadequate to cope with the increasing traffic and lacks a safe cycle lane. <p>Morlaix Drive</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns over the width and planned use of Morlaix Drive. • It is not clear whether one- or two-way bus or tram transport is planned through Morlaix Drive and the proposed “Main Street” through the North West Quadrant. • Access to the multi-storey car park used by patients, visitors and staff to Derriford Hospital is currently via Morlaix Drive. It should not be widened to accommodate two-way lanes for buses and cars. • Private cars should be prevented from using the hospital as a through-route – one possibility is that buses or trams could pass one way along Morlaix Drive and the other way along the proposed “Main Street”. • Want narrow roads in order to avoid creating an environment which is hostile to pedestrians. • Car access to multi-storey car parks for ambulant patients, visitors and staff should be via access roads in the North West Quadrant, and not via Morlaix Drive or the hospital grounds. • Need to relieve congestion on the hospital site and compensate for the use of hospital land for the bus interchange and strategic public transport route. • The existing unfinished road north of the multi-storey car park could be extended westwards to provide access to the car park, and blocked off at its eastern end to prevent through traffic.
Greener Plymouth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many trees have been felled at the front of Derriford Hospital, changing its character and going against claims to protect greenspace. • A green area should be preserved on the south-east corner of the North West Quadrant site as part of any development plans and a green area to be preserved or created between the North West Quadrant development, Derriford Road and Derriford roundabout. • If the quality and health of the existing trees is poor, they should be replaced. • Want to include a green area for staff rest and recreation at Derriford Hospital. • Welcome enhanced cycle and pedestrian routes to and within the hospital grounds and greater use of public transport. • The new Forder Valley road is likely to carry a large volume of private cars, and it is essential that those unconnected with hospital activity do not pass through the hospital grounds. • Concerns about inconsistencies in the Derriford Community Park boundary in relation to land in private ownership on Blunts Lane. It is shown as strategic greenspace on the proposals map, but not clear why and where the Community Park boundary goes. • Need to be careful that paths shown through the Community Park do not cross over private land. • Concerned about the increasing urbanisation of the setting of Plymbridge Woods. • Careful consideration needs to be given to the remaining open space at the end of Estover Close and the contribution it makes to the character and function of the wider greenspace networks. • Discussion of the Woolwell expansion does not make any reference to the strategic green infrastructure and recreation opportunities offered by the Plymouth and Dartmoor Tramway and the Plymouth and Devonport Leats – these are all very significant assets and should be considered by the plan.
Local Community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area Visions should include a general and wide-ranging definition of ‘community services and facilities’ (such as ‘community services and facilities provide for the health and wellbeing, social, educational, spiritual, recreational, leisure and cultural needs of the community’) and work with others to understand what is needed in each development context. Critical that this approach should not be limited to ‘core infrastructure’ but should encompass statutory and non-statutory provision and the planning authority should work in partnership with existing local and sub-regional service providers to understand the needs and pressures arising from the development.

APPENDIX VI: SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE EASTERN CORRIDOR DRAFT AREA VISION

Category	Summary/Key issues raised in engagement
Arts and Culture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should contain reference to a positive strategy for the historic environment as well as the natural environment. For example, through appropriate incorporation of archaeological sites and historic landscape features into greenspace strategies. The scope for Sherford to grow back towards the city must take into account the effect on the setting of Saltram House and Park. The Borringdon/Triumphal Arch is an integral and significant element of the designated landscape at Saltram and was designed as an eye-catcher to be seen from the house.
City Pride and Vision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vision should acknowledge that the Hemerdon tungsten mine is of international importance and the future growth of Plymouth should not constrain future mineral working here.
Economy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What types of employment are proposed for Langage and how will this be supported by housing and infrastructure? Need more companies to relocate here.
Education and Learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suitable educational provision should be planned alongside new developments to meet additional need. Secondary education needs arising from new development will likely be met within Plymouth boundaries. Provision of special education needs should be planned for.
Getting Around	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A park and ride will improve transport links to Plymouth, reduce traffic into city and reduce delays at Laira Bridge. Unclear about the size of the current proposed facility and capacity. Laira Bridge is inadequate and a significant bottle-neck and Exeter Street is over capacity as the only route in and out for both Plymstock and Plympton. Expectation that people will cycle or take the bus is consistently proved wrong. Traffic development for Sherford and Saltram is enough without more. Speed limits are required in the Broadway car park. Access out onto the A38 takes at least 20 minutes via Deep Lane or the Plymouth Road at peak times. The proposed Langage relief road should be implemented and a Sherford by-pass. The main street of Sherford will be full of speed limits and obstructions, when Sherford Road is closed problems will arise. Further housing will increase traffic on Plymouth Road and approaches. Further consideration should be given to Langage in order to ensure that the supporting transport infrastructure, particularly at Deep Lane Junction and Voss Farm, can be appropriately planned. Development west of Sherford will help to bring forward major infrastructure such as a new junction at Voss Farm and improved walking and cycling connections linking Sherford with Langage and across the A38. Want a second river crossing to the north of the present Tamar Bridge.
Greener Plymouth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is important that the setting of Saltram and the Countryside Park is considered in any future growth. The green wedge to the west of Sherford as a cultural and environmental asset is fully recognised. Agricultural grazing is integral to the management of Saltram and it is important that this asset is not undermined by the pressures of increased urbanisation. Any proposals for Chelson Meadow needs to have regard to the setting on Saltram House and available evidence. Plympton is one of the few places remaining in Plymouth with greenspace, which needs to be protected. Greenspace is of equal importance as housing and amenities. There should be a halt to all new development in Plympton on green field sites and at Langage. The community park is shown as a "greenspace designation" but the community park at present only has outline permission and the detail has yet to be agreed, which will include access for the public. Area may be subject to changes. The community park currently contains active agricultural land, designating the area as greenspace could be misleading suggesting that it is open to the public. Object to any further development of greenspaces around Plympton and Plymstock. Development should be instead at the old quarry at Billicombe. Important to keep green and farming fields, especially skyline above Plymbridge and Colebrook as greenspace. The green area shown does not relate to the edge of the settlement or public park which is misleading and inaccurate. Support protection of land north of Hazeldene Quarry. Allocation of arable and pasture fields on the periphery of Plymouth for development should only be contemplated if it would result in a clear gain for biodiversity. Support the principle of mineral safe guarding zone, should also include a buffer zone to protect mineral reserves from non-mineral development.

Category	Summary/Key issues raised in engagement
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eastern Corridor should recognise the significant flood risks, particularly along the embankment and around Laira Bridge. • Vision should consider the importance of the inter-tidal habitats in the Plym Estuary and how they can be protected and enhanced in light of new development and rising sea levels. • In the region of 10 acres should be allocated to enable provision of appropriate cemetery and associated facilities into the future. Seek the allocation of a site in the area of land towards the south east of Saltram Countryside Park.
Health and Wellbeing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plymstock should have a swimming pool. • Part of Lamage could be allocated for sports/recreation.
Living and Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should address empty homes in the South West. • Plymouth is in danger of urban sprawl. • A second Sherford at Lee Mill should be considered, it already has a superstore and industry. • Only reasonably priced 3 bed houses should be built in suitable areas. • A Plymouth urban fringe policy should be developed.
Local Community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the plan to cope with a huge additional population in the Eastern Corridor? • A lot of inconvenience from existing development already for residents in the Plymstock and Elburton area. • New toilets are needed at Hooe and refurbishment of toilets at Broadway. Disabled toilets are needed at Elburton. • Area Visions should include a general and wide-ranging definition of 'community services and facilities' (such as 'community services and facilities provide for the health and wellbeing, social, educational, spiritual, recreational, leisure and cultural needs of the community') and work with others to understand what is needed in each development context. Critical that this approach should not be limited to 'core infrastructure' but should encompass statutory and non-statutory provision and the planning authority should work in partnership with existing local and sub-regional service providers to understand the needs and pressures arising from the development. • The Mineral Safeguarding Area should be shown on the diagram and where any area is identified a buffer should be provided between any longer term mineral working and proposed residential or other noise-sensitive development.
Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would be helpful to impose Sherford layout on to the vision plan. • Grey boundary line has no rational where it crosses eastern Sherford.

APPENDIX VII: THRIVING TOWNS AND VILLAGES COMMENT SUMMARY

Please note: each comment may have raised issues about a number of different sites or themes which is why the total number of comments as summarised may exceed the total comments registered on the Objective portal (1141).

Settlement or site reference and address	No. of Comments	Key issues raised in consultation
Whole Plan	287	<p>Joint Local Planning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Hams should not be linked with Plymouth, it is more closely linked with Exeter and Torbay. • The Joint Local Plan has a better understanding of local needs than the previous West Devon Our Plan. • The Joint Local Plan based on an HMA approach is flawed; the Plymouth HMA excludes the former Caradon area of Cornwall, the Okehampton area relates mainly to Exeter and eastern areas of South Hams relate to Torbay • The Plan fails to adequately assess and cater for migrancy trends, commuting and Dartmoor National Park's housing allowance. • The spatial distribution proposed in the Plan simply continues the previous RSS, however, assessment of the evidence highlights the strong inter-relationships that exist with the Torbay, Exeter, Cornwall and Barnstaple HMAs point towards the need for a higher level of growth than is currently identified, in particular at the peripheral settlements of the proposed JLP area. • There is concern that by joint working, Plymouth are spilling over into the South Hams and developing areas as an urban fringe. • A cohesive policy approach is need for South Hams parishes that fall within the Plymouth Urban Fringe. • The villages should be described as "vibrant" rather than "thriving." • The Plan should only show what will be built and not include what has already been built. • Coordination between the Joint Local Plan and the Devolution bid is necessary. • The Plan will need to be prepared in conjunction with Devon County Council and recognise the two-tier planning system in SH and WD. • The area is a low wage and high rent economy. <p>Consultation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The consultation was poorly publicised and held at time when many people were away on holiday. • Insufficient weight is given to community views by Planning Officers. • Online public consultations discourage participation by those without internet access. • A town workshop would have been appreciated by residents to understand the Joint Local Plan process. <p>Policy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan should promote a spatial strategy that directs new development into areas with greater potential to accommodate growth with the least harm to the South Devon AONB, the Tamar Valley AONB and Dartmoor National Park. • The South Devon AONB unit needs to be strengthened to better protect the AONB. • No housing should be developed within Dartmoor National Park Area as it is a national asset and is an essential are for people to use for recreation. • Areas outside an AONB or National Park boundary also have landscape value which should be recognised in the planning system. • The Plan provides little detail on how the historic environment will be protected and the World Heritage Site is barely mentioned. A heritage impact assessment is recommended to set out how the historic environment has been considered through the allocations process. • The Plan should offer protection for wildlife and biodiversity, including marine plans; biosecurity should also be considered. • Request for further clarity with regards to housing numbers in the South Devon AONB and its setting – a Village Site Allocation DPD is supported. • Policy – additional policy detail is required for heritage, resources, climate change, strategic green spaces, trees, nationally designated landscapes,

Settlement or site reference and address	No. of Comments	Key issues raised in consultation
		<p>undeveloped coastline, cycle paths and other sustainable travel initiatives, gypsies and travellers, wellbeing, minerals and waste.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Plan must ensure that recreational public access for a range of users (including those in wheelchairs) is properly considered across the Plan area; coastal access and implications for landowners in light of Coastal Access legislation is not correctly referenced in the South Hams GI Strategy. • No site should be allocated for development if it would endanger the survival of Devon's Greater Horseshoe Bat population, for example by causing the loss of foraging habitat or flight corridors. • No site should be allocated if it currently acts as a "stepping stone for nature" in a wider strategic sense. • Mineral resources should be protected, including provision of buffer zones to allow practical exploitation of resources; the international significance of the Drakelands tungsten resource must be recognised. • Stowford and Lewdown Turbine Action Group are pleased that there are no site allocations for renewable energy within the Plan. • The Plan should ensure that allotments with a water connection are provided within developments at a ratio of no less than 1 plot per 50 (25?) households. • There is a lack of a policy area for the Plymouth Principal Urban Fringe Area (PPUA) which was intended in the South Hams but never delivered. • Radon is a significant hazard; if large numbers of houses are fitted with extractor fans this could present a noise nuisance. • The A385 and AQMA must be covered by robust policies in the JLP. • Support for long term employment should be given in the Plan, rather than seasonal work. <p>Infrastructure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development should be directed into areas with good transport infrastructure. • A coordinated IDP is welcomed, with particular reference to heavily visited coastal areas • The whole JLP area needs more investment in transport, particularly rail links and fast trains to London. • Faster broadband is needed in rural areas. • Greater consideration is needed for the impact of increased growth (and travel associated with) in Torbay and Paignton. • Cycling and walking routes should be promoted across the Plan area. <p>Housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan does not adequately reflect the future changes in demographic; an increase in the elderly population is forecast with a reduction in working age people. This has implications for employment trends as a result. Implications of Brexit and associated impacts on immigration are not accounted for. • There is no justification for the split of housing numbers between Plymouth, South Hams and West Devon. More detail and clarity is needed surrounding the OAHN, along with a range of fully tested growth options. • The Plan states that 8700 houses are needed but caters for 9555 with no explanation for this increase. • Each village should accommodate a small number of houses, rather than larger allocations being focussed on the larger villages. • Development in a village is likely to have a greater impact on the community than development in a town. • The housing numbers seem to be serving Government targets rather than accommodating local need. • Houses should be offered with few or basic facilities, instead of the current "over specified" homes that are available. Houses should be offered with a private patio area whilst being linked to shared gardens to promote community interaction whilst reducing the land used per house to reduce costs. • The Plan needs to cater for an ageing population, with the provision of community hospitals and other locally accessible facilities to support the elderly in the community. • All homes built should fit into the local character of the area, using local stone in

Settlement or site reference and address	No. of Comments	Key issues raised in consultation
		<p>country areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the strategy for delivering employment land in SH is on mixed use development sites, it should be noted that housebuilders are reluctant to deliver land for employment and community space at low / nil value. • Developer led housing is not suitable, housing should be provided through community led projects and neighbourhood plans. • The Council should first decide where housing is needed, then ask landowners to submit land in these areas, rather than the other way round. • Developments should be carefully planned in conjunction with local residents who have already made a commitment to the area and not by ambitious developers. • The imbalance of second homes in coastal communities needs to be addressed. • A points-based system to inform development allocations in villages will result in planned decline of smaller settlements. • Affordable housing is in short supply and this issue is not adequately addressed in the Plan. • There is not enough employment land allocated in relation to the proposed number of houses. • Building in rural areas does not solve the problem of sustainability. • Insufficient support is being given to potential windfall sites; development of these sites would maintain the local character. • Rentplus should be considered as a model for delivering affordable housing for those ineligible for existing affordable housing yet who cannot afford an open market home. • Large numbers of houses should not be built near small villages (such as Hemerdon and Sparkwell) as they will destroy the community. • Small scale development of affordable homes should be prioritised for small villages in the AONB. • There is significant demand for smallholdings with a single dwelling in rural South Hams; could this be catered for in the Plan? • Many people wish to develop a self-build home but do not wish to be part of a community or campaign group; could the Council identify some land that might be suitable for self-build homes? • In rural areas, many people who require a live/work unit would prefer an outdoor/yard type area rather than an office; could this be catered for in the Plan? • Providing homes in rural areas (including the AONB) is one of the key challenges of the Joint Local Plan. The Local Plan should ensure that the criteria used to identify 'sustainable locations' in the proposed criteria-based policy approach are reasonable, reflect the components of sustainability and enable provision of sufficient housing to achieve the policy objectives. The use of settlement boundaries and Neighbourhood Plans to help identify and deliver housing sites is of limited value when there is no timetable for settlement boundary review (some boundaries are over 20 years old) or in areas where there is no Neighbourhood Plan underway. • Brownfield sites in Plymouth should be used, such as the former Derry's store. • Any home in the area (new or old) should only be sold to someone who has their main place of occupation in this area. • Existing second homes should be bought up by the Government and used to house those in need. • Population levels should be stabilised; Britain is an island with finite land available for development. • The Plan does not give sufficient recognition to the ancient villages of South Hams and therefore offers no protection against inappropriate development. • A CIL should be adopted so that Parish Councils can obtain 25% of S106 funding from developments in their area. • Due to lack of phasing information, it is unclear how the Plan will address the 5% or 20% buffer required in the NPPF. • It is important that the plan recognises the need for each local authority area to

Settlement or site reference and address	No. of Comments	Key issues raised in consultation
		<p>have its own individual five year housing land supply. Difficulties with this matter has been experienced in the Cheltenham-Tewkesbury-Gloucester Joint Core Strategy examinations where a five year housing land supply was not provided on an authority basis, and therefore it was impossible to understand where shortfalls might arise.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed housing requirement is lower than currently adopted annual rates, when previous housing needs assessments and appeal decisions have advocated a higher annual requirement. • The OAHN provides no housing requirement scenarios that take into account the need for economic growth or the need to meet the affordable housing requirement over the plan period. • The housing requirement is expressed as a maximum, when DCLG guidance requires a minimum target with a 20% contingency. • The perceived supply of existing committed housing erroneously relies upon 22% of the housing requirement to be met by windfall sites. • The committed housing rates also assumes all houses with planning permission will come forward with no account for lapse rates. It also optimistically doubles the expected number of completions. • A number of the proposed allocations repeat allocations from the Core Strategy that haven't come forward in the 5 years that they have been allocated. The deliverability of some of these sites is questioned. • A significant number of the proposed allocations already benefit from planning permission. Not including the deficiencies identified above, there is a shortfall of 700 dwellings that should be made up by additional allocations. • The current distribution of housing proposes more homes at the villages than the more sustainable local centres. This strategy should be reversed and the majority of the windfall allowance should be redistributed to some of the towns and local centres. • The Plan makes no provision for unmet need from the previous Plan period. • Totnes and some other towns have limited capacity to expand as their road infrastructure is overloaded and any solution would be cost prohibitive, new towns along the A38 may need to be considered as an alternative. • Delivery of infrastructure is a key factor in supporting proposed development across the area. • The Plan should acknowledge the difficulties of mixing affordable housing with age-restricted specialist housing on-site. Policy should allow for off-site affordable housing contributions subject to viability. • Speculative development for B1, B2 and B8 is generally not viable and therefore it is difficult to deliver employment land in practice. • The Plan should ensure that around 20% market homes meet the lifetime homes standard. • Housing numbers should be allocated only once there has been a detailed assessment of the needs of each settlement and community and the ability to absorb extra development. • The Council should build affordable homes instead of leaving it to developers. • Extant permissions should be built out before any more are granted to stop developers landbanking. • The Council should bid for Starter Homes Unlocking the Land Fund. <p>Neighbourhood Planning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parish Plans should be offered as an alternative to Neighbourhood Plans. • Neighbourhood Plan Groups should be supported in working together with neighbouring groups. • More professional support is needed for Neighbourhood Plans, including funding. • Villages should be given specific housing allocations to reduce the burden on Neighbourhood Plans. • Communities understand that Neighbourhood Plans (once made) will assume precedence over District level policy.
Bere Alston	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any development here should support the delivery of the Tavistock to Bere

Settlement or site reference and address	No. of Comments	Key issues raised in consultation
		<p>Alston rail line.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is sufficient primary capacity to accommodate the proposed development. • Any development would need to be assessed for impacts on the heritage asset of Buckland Abbey and the surrounding estate.
Bere Alston Land at Woolacombe Road (Phase 1 and 2)	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocation of this site is supported; the site has no known constraints to development and can be developed to minimise the impacts on the Tamar Valley AONB.
Bere Alston Land to the south of Woolacombe Road	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocation of this site is supported; the site has no known constraints to development and can be developed to minimise the impacts on the Tamar Valley AONB.
Bere Ferrers	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Parish Council is supportive of the housing numbers but the Plan should better address how employment will be delivered. • A solution to the congestion on the A386 needs to be found.
Bere Ferrers Land rear of Trevethan Park WD_09_08/13	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site should be allocated for development of 15 dwellings in the Plan as the site offers an opportunity for sustainable development.
Bickleigh	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A comprehensive, cross-border masterplan would be welcomed by the community in order to address the current pressures in the area, including, road infrastructure, lack of secondary school, library, recreational and recycling facilities. Cooperation is needed between the LPA and the Health Authority. • Greenspace and recreational need to be mapped as such in the Plan. • Self-build needs to be catered for in the Plan. • The Neighbourhood Plan Group would welcome a statement that sets out how many homes are planned for the Parish.
Bickleigh SH_04_01_08/13 Land off New Road, Bickleigh	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site would be supported for inclusion in the Strategic Landscape Area.
Bickleigh SH_04_04_08/13 Woolwell	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There needs to be greater consideration of Dartmoor National Park when considering the suitability of this site.
Bickleigh SH_04_08_13 Land at Whitson Farm	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site would be supported for inclusion in the Strategic Landscape Area.
Bickleigh SH_04_11_08/13 Land off Allern Lane	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site would be supported for inclusion in the Strategic Landscape Area. • A recent planning application was refused landscape grounds; this site is now proposed as a Strategic Landscape Area but there is no evidence to do so, or explanation as to what function this area would perform. The 2014 SHLAA notes that this site was considered "suitable" to deliver housing and therefore it should be reconsidered for allocation.
Bigbury	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is anticipated that only 10-20 homes will be needed in Bigbury.
Bratton Clovelly Land at Bratton Clovelly	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site should be considered suitable for development as it relates well to the village, is visually contained by mature trees and hedges, lies within flood risk zone 1 and has no currently identified contamination issues.
Brixton SH_07_08_14 Land to the east of Lodge Lane/West of Stamps Hill	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is free from significant constraints and offers good access to local services and facilities.
Brixton SH_07_09_14/16 Land to the east of Winstone Lane	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site has limited constraints which can be overcome. These mainly relate to the potential for landscape impacts on the AONB which could be addressed by a sensitive design and landscaping scheme.
Brixton SH_07_10_14/16 Land to the south of the Crescent	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subject to a suitable access being achieved it is considered to provide for a residential development with minimal visual impact. Access could be achieved from Winstone Lane.

Settlement or site reference and address	No. of Comments	Key issues raised in consultation
Brixton SH_07_13_16 Land at Stamps Hill	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site has limited constraints which can be addressed, therefore offers potential for development.
Buckland Monachorum WD_49_07_08/13 Land adjacent to Yelverton Business Park, Crapstone	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of this site in the AONB is unjustified, as employment units on this site have been vacant and available for continuous periods of time. Previous proposals for this site have been excessive and disproportionate to local demand, therefore no further land should be allocated. This site attracts high levels of traffic (including HGV) from outside the Parish where transport infrastructure is poor.
Dartmouth	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No more houses should be built here until further jobs are available in Dartmouth. There is educational capacity available in Dartmouth to accommodate the proposed development.
Dartmouth Noss on Dart SH_30_05_16	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need for redevelopment of this site is recognised but the proposed allocation represents overdevelopment that is insensitive to its context. The current quantum of development is undeliverable on this site – 100 homes would be more realistic. Playing fields should not be lost to development. Part of the site is subject to a high risk of flooding. The effect of this site on the transport/highway network in the Brixham Peninsula needs to be considered; permission for the development of homes should only be granted where the provision of regular waterborne pedestrian links can be secured. The site includes the scheduled monument pertaining to the D-Day landings. Has an appropriate assessment been undertaken to determine what harm to the significance there is to the heritage asset and its setting by the proposal? This site has environmental constraints. This site should be allocated for a mixed use development; all constraints can be addressed.
Dartmouth DI	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Affordable homes should be built here not market/second homes. The site has a complex planning history and has resulted in too much time and money being spent on consultations instead of actually building homes. Part of the land is not and will not be available due to landowner aspirations and restrictive covenants.
Dartmouth Possible extension to Dartmouth West SH_51_05_13/16 & SH_51_06_13/16	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The sites form part of the setting of the AONB; robust LVIA would be needed to inform what development could be accommodated on this site. This sites should be supported for allocation; it has a lengthy planning history and all constraints are known. The sites are available and could offer 30% affordable homes.
Dartmouth SH_15_21_16 Land at New Barn Farm	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site should be considered suitable for development as it is well located, in single ownership and is available for development now without significant constraints or impact.
Dartington	193	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The quantum of development planned for Dartington as a whole is too high. The current road network does not have capacity to support increased traffic volumes from future development. This has implications for road safety. Maintaining community ethos is important for social cohesion; this will be damaged if Dartington becomes a dormitory town. A higher proportion of new houses should be affordable and rented to provide homes for young people. Current sewerage infrastructure cannot support further development. The design of recent developments is considered poor and not in keeping with the village. Densities are too high. Brownfield sites should be selected for development over greenfield sites. All new development should be of a high eco standard. New developments must be supported with proper infrastructure, including open space and children's play areas. The primary school still has not been built. Why has Dartington been merged with Totnes and not been designated a local

Settlement or site reference and address	No. of Comments	Key issues raised in consultation
		<p>centre in its own right?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no medical provision in Dartington. • A bypass for Dartington and Totnes to Newton Abbot and Torquay is required. • Residential car parking needs to be better planned for. • Dartington's hamlets would offer the potential for the development of garden villages; this is preferable to the isolated cul-de-sac developments in Bridgetown where residents have difficulty accessing facilities without adding to town congestion. • If 470 houses are built in Dartington, where are the jobs for another 1000 people in the Totnes area? • Any development in Dartington should be built on small sites close to existing houses. • There are lots of factory sites in Buckfastleigh that could be developed rather than sites in Dartington. • SHDC/WDBC should have considered the areas where development could be sustainably located and then approached the relevant landowners, rather than simply putting out a call for sites. • DCC noted constraints to improvements on the A385. • There is sufficient capacity at both primary and secondary schools to accommodate the proposed development. • Craft hubs are required in Dartington.
Dartington Broom Park SH_14_01_08/13	173	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100 houses are too many for this site but a smaller development would be supported. • No houses should be built here, as it would result in damage to the landscape. • Broom Park has significant archaeological constraints. • The community would prefer that DHT built on the estate rather than on this site. • Any development here would impact negatively on the hamlet of Week. The site has significant access, landscape, heritage, flood and contamination/environmental health constraints. • The site is adjacent a number of listed buildings in Week whose setting may be impacted upon. Has an appropriate historic environment assessment been undertaken to assess the sites suitability for development?
Dartington SH_14_03_08/13 Huxhams Cross	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a revised submission as part of a new site suggested by the Dartington Neighbourhood Plan group which is referred to as Woodlands Yard that is suitable for small scale rural workshops and employment.
Dartington Sawmills Phase 2 SH_14_04_13	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site should be selected for development as it is subject to limited constraints. • Any building here should be of a high eco design to blend in with the landscape and numbers capped at 20. • This site should not be built on. • The site is adjacent a number of listed buildings at Yarnier Farm whose setting may be impacted upon. Has an appropriate historic environment assessment been undertaken to assess the sites suitability for development?
Dartington SH_14_07_13 Staple Field	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site is subject to landscape constraints.
Dartington SH_14_08_13 Beacon Park	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This land should be considered for an employment allocation.
Dartington SH_14_13_08/13	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site should not be developed unless it is earmarked for use by KEVICC. • This site has potential for development when considered with adjoining land
Dartington SH_14_14_13	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site has been correctly assessed as being unsuitable for development.
Dartington SH_14_15_08/13	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site should not be developed as it would erode the rural gap between Totnes and Dartington. • Development of this site would increase traffic congestion. • There is no safe pedestrian route along Barracks Hill. • This site has potential for development when considered with adjoining land;

Settlement or site reference and address	No. of Comments	Key issues raised in consultation
		given the lack of a five year land supply, this site should be considered to provide flexibility of supply.
Dartington SH_14_18_08/13	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any development on this site would erode the green gap between Dartington and Totnes.
Dartington SH_14_19_08/13	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site should be selected for development as it is subject to limited constraints. This site should not be considered for development as there is poor access and infrastructure to support development.
Dartington SH_14_21_08/13	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site should not be developed as it would erode the rural gap between Totnes and Dartington. Development of this site would increase traffic congestion. There is no safe pedestrian route along Barracks Hill. Development in this location would impact on the setting of Grade II listed Longcause House.
Dartington THCLT SH_14_22_13	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This development of eco homes represents sustainable development and is supported. Any development on this site would erode the green gap between Dartington and Totnes.
Dartington SH_14_23_14 Aller Park	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SHLAA pack notes this area as having safe walking distance to services and facilities but has not been selected for development.
Dartington Higher Barton Farm SH_14_26_16	165	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A development of more than 10 houses on this development would be supported by the community. Development of this site would result in increased road congestion and a decline in air quality. The assessment of sustainable transport links would suggest that this site is not the optimum site for locating development. This site should be selected for development as it is subject to limited constraints. This site offers the opportunity for innovative / exemplar eco housing as new model for future developments elsewhere. Development of this site might cause significant harm to the historic character of the estate and its constituent heritage assets and that more evidence on heritage significance and sensitivity to change needs to be forthcoming before the core sites can be deemed acceptable for development in principle.
Dartington Foxhole SH_14_27_16	21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of this site would result in increased road congestion and a decline in air quality. This area should not be built on, as some of the land has been planted by Schumacher College as part of an educational agroforestry scheme. Parts of the site are subject to flood risk. This site should not be developed as doing so would run counter to the aims of the Dartington Estate. Development of this site might cause significant harm to the historic character of the estate and its constituent heritage assets and that more evidence on heritage significance and sensitivity to change needs to be forthcoming before the core sites can be deemed acceptable for development in principle. This site would support sustainable development. This site should be put to better community use as a hub for village life, with the development of a live/work environment for local artisans.
Dartington SH_14_28_16 The Old Postern	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Heritage impacts on this site would limit development to a small project of 10 eco homes. There are inconsistencies in the site assessment when compared with other sites with regards to its position relative to Cott. The site assessment is incorrect; there are two infill opportunities that would offer redevelopment opportunities which would support the DHT campus whilst being sensitive to heritage constraints.
Dartington SH_14_29_16	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site should not be developed as it would erode the rural gap between Totnes and Dartington. Development of this site would increase traffic congestion.

Settlement or site reference and address	No. of Comments	Key issues raised in consultation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no safe pedestrian route along Barracks Hill. • The site has landscape, heritage and ecological constraints.
Dartington RA13 Webbers Yard and Sawmills Field	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is some confusion regarding the actual number of houses for this site. • Make sure that trading estate development of houses goes ahead – more exposure with asbestos to remove.
Dartington Brimhay	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Redevelopment of this site will result in the loss of shared green space and wildlife diversity. • The properties should be updated instead of redeveloping the whole site. • Bungalows are needed for elderly people at a fair price. • The designs by Bob Tomlinson meet housing need while retaining the character of the village.
Dartington Land at Droridge Lane	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site needs to be withdrawn at the request of the landowner.
Dartington Staple Field	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site needs to be withdrawn at the request of the landowner.
Dartington Z-shaped field	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site needs to be withdrawn at the request of the landowner.
Dartington Huxhams Cross (older bungalows on south side / behind bus stop)	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site is suggested by the community. • A small eco-development could be accommodated here.
Dartington Site south of Redlake Cross access on to Cott Lane (S)	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site is suggested by the community. • This site is appropriate for community Land Trust / VHI type development • This site is not suitable for development – marshy land. Wildlife – deer, barn owls, buzzards.
Dartington Beacon Bungalow	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site is suggested by the community for mixed development.
Dartington Field at Huxhams Cross	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site needs to be withdrawn at the request of the landowner.
Dartington Beacon Park	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site is suggested by the community for mixed development. • Bus stop and footpath required.
Dartington Brooking/Tigley	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site is suggested by the community for a small eco-development to cater for all age ranges.
Dartington Venton Manor/Cross	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site is suggested by the community for a small eco-development.
Dartington Westcombe	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site is suggested by the community for a small self-build/eco-development.
Dartington Schumacher College	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site is suggested by the community for enabling development to support works required at the Old Postern.
East Allington The Mounts	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A new town should be built here; it has suitable drainage, good road access and is close enough to Kingsbridge and Totnes to meet criteria.
Exbourne with Jacobstowe	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further development in Exbourne is constrained by poor road infrastructure.
Exbourne with Jacobstowe WD_08_02_04	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference is made to SWWA requirements and their impact on viability; further detail is requested.
Exbourne with Jacobstowe WD_08_04_08	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference is made to SWWA requirements and their impact on viability; further detail is requested.
Exbourne with Jacobstowe Holebrook Lane WD_08_08_16	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is unsuitable for development due to lack of safe pedestrian access to local facilities, poor road infrastructure, landscape impacts, loss of productive agricultural land, heritage impacts and proposed housing densities that are greater than those on existing developments in the village. • The site assessment does not take into account primary school capacity as it does for other Exbourne sites.
Exbourne Land to the south east	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site should be considered for residential development.

Settlement or site reference and address	No. of Comments	Key issues raised in consultation
of Exbourne (new site)		
Frogmore SH_43_01_13	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site is not suitable for development due to its location and associated flood risk.
Frogmore SH_43_02_08/13	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site is not suitable due to its location, scale and landscape impacts.
Frogmore SH_43_04_16	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yield on this site will be reduced due to flood constraints.
Frogmore SH_43_05_16	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site has significant landscape impacts; development here would result in changes to local character.
Frogmore SH_43_06_16	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site has landscape and access constraints.
Harberton	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Harberton Neighbourhood Plan have identified land in the Parish that may be suitable for development that has not been included in the SHLEEA process.
Harberton SH_23_01_13 Old Allotment Field	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This was previously a burial site and should be withdrawn.
Harberton SH_23_02_13 Land off Harberton Road, Totnes (North of Plymouth Road)	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site should not be included in the Totnes SHEELA or Neighbourhood Plan as it is in Harberton Parish.
Harberton SH_23_03_13 Lane east of Dundridge House	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site had previously been withdrawn.
Harberton SH_23_11_08/13	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site should only be developed if a stipulated need was identified.
Harberton SH_23_15_08/13 Winsland House	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site should be allocated for development as it is supported by the Neighbourhood Plan Group and has limited constraints/constraints which can be overcome. This site should not be included in the Totnes SHEELA or Neighbourhood Plan as it is in Harberton Parish.
Harberton SH_23_16_08/13 Land off Harberton Road, Totnes (South of Plymouth Road)	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site should be allocated for development as it is supported by the Neighbourhood Plan Group and has limited constraints/constraints which can be overcome. This site should not be included in the Totnes SHEELA or Neighbourhood Plan as it is in Harberton Parish.
Harberton SH_23_17_16 Land east of Harberton	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site should only be developed if a stipulated need was identified.
Harberton SH_23_18_16 RA17	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site had previously been withdrawn and is unavailable for development.
Harberton SH_23_19_16 RA16	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site does not appear on the map.
Harberton SH_23_20_16 West Quarry Park, East Quarry Park, Quarry Park Field and Jackmans Park, Higher Dorsley Barton	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site has not been included in the Neighbourhood plan consultation.
Harberton SH_23_22_16	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site should be considered for allocation as a mixed use (small village community and employment land) and current constraints are limited/can be addressed. Further parcels of land surrounding this site should also be included to form a comprehensive extension of Follaton. This site has not been included in the Neighbourhood plan consultation.

Settlement or site reference and address	No. of Comments	Key issues raised in consultation
Harberton SH_23_23_16 Back Paddock, Hodgens and Cottage Field, Higher Dorsley Barton	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site has not been included in the Neighbourhood plan consultation.
Harberton SH_23_24_16 Pathfield, Coombe Park and East Down, Higher Dorsley Barton	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site has not been included in the Neighbourhood plan consultation.
Hatherleigh	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Both primary and secondary capacity is insufficient to accommodate the proposed development. Land adjacent to the primary school should be identified for the expansion of the school. Hatherleigh Moor has heritage constraints; Hatherleigh itself is in a conservation area and is part of the North Devon Biosphere. Hatherleigh has access and parking constraints. Hatherleigh offers limited facilities and services; there is no pre-school, bank, leisure centre or swimming pool, or rail connection. Hatherleigh has previously prepared a Community Plan, the Joint Local Plan does not take any of this work into account and simply allocates more homes that Hatherleigh cannot accommodate.
Hatherleigh WD_06_01_08	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site should be considered for residential allocation in the Plan.
Hatherleigh WD_06_02_08	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site should be considered for residential allocation in the Plan.
Hatherleigh WD_06_03_08	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site should be considered for residential allocation in the Plan.
Hatherleigh WD_06_13_16 Land North of A3072	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site should be considered for allocation as it offers access to services and facilities and no biodiversity, flood, landscape, heritage or contaminated land constraints. The SHEELA and accompanying map show different site assessment outcomes for this site.
Hatherleigh OPI3 Cattle Market	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parts of the site are subject to flood risk. The site abuts the conservation area and in proximity to a number of listed buildings who setting may be impacted upon. Has an appropriate historic environment assessment been undertaken to assess what harm to the significance there is to the heritage assets and their settings by the proposal? This site is not suitable for residential development due to flood risk and proximity to an operational abattoir.
Highampton WD_05_13_16	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The boundary of this site is queried.
Holbeton	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The number of sites proposed in the SHLAA for Holbeton is excessive and further development would exacerbate existing traffic and flood constraints.
Holbeton SH_25_01_13	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Constraints noted in the assessment can be overcome, therefore this site would support a small development.
Holbeton SH_25_02_13 Land north of Church Hill	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Constraints noted in the assessment can be overcome, therefore this site would support a small development.
Holbeton SH_25_03_13 Land east of Vicarage Hill	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Constraints noted in the assessment can be overcome, therefore this site would support a small development.
Holbeton SH_25_04_13 Land East of Brent Hill	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Constraints noted in the assessment can be overcome, therefore this site would support a small development.
Holbeton SH_23_05_13	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Constraints noted in the assessment can be overcome, therefore this site would support a small development.

Settlement or site reference and address	No. of Comments	Key issues raised in consultation
Land and Buildings West of Brownswell Farm		
Holbeton SH_25_06_13 Brownswell Farm	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Constraints noted in the assessment can be overcome, therefore this site would support a small development.
Holbeton SH_25_08_13 Land south of Garden Close	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Constraints noted in the assessment can be overcome, therefore this site would support a small development.
Inwardleigh	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inwardleigh Parish has a number of constraints to development relating to infrastructure, employment and lack of community cohesion. No further development should be located here unless these constraints are addressed.
Ivybridge	26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are access constraints to developments north of the town; the Strategic Transport Group set up by DCC will explore options with regards to A38 access. • Development in Ivybridge puts increasing strain on the road infrastructure in Bittaford; developments have not contributed towards management of this impact. • The schools at Ivybridge are currently at capacity and both primary and secondary schools would need to be expanded to accommodate the proposed developments. • The surgery at Station Road needs to be relocated to an area with better access and parking. • The retail provision in Ivybridge needs to be better supported to enable it to thrive. • No more houses should be built here until further jobs are available in Ivybridge. • Land needs to be allocated for sporting use. • The town has been allocated a CDA and is subject to flooding. • The town has air quality issues (an AQMA). • Land south of the A38 by the Tennis Centre would be suitable for employment/industrial units with the possibility of Travelodge type accommodation. • Current proposals elongate the town and exacerbate current traffic issues; land south of the A38 should be considered for development instead.
Ivybridge Stowford Mill	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is at risk of flooding but this can be managed. The site is within a CDA. • The reuse of this grade II Mill is welcomed. An update of the 2013 planning brief would be advised that properly considered the heritage significance of the assets that could provide certainty to interested parties to reuse the building. • This site has environmental constraints.
Ivybridge 11	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site should be selected for allocation but is capable of delivering an increased number of homes; 650 can be delivered rather than 538.
Ivybridge 12	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part of this site is subject to flood risk. The site is within a CDA. • Parking must be maintained on this site. • Open central spaces for community involvement (i.e. farmers markets) are essential.
Ivybridge Dame Hannah Rogers School	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any development here would exacerbate traffic and parking issues.
Ivybridge SH_27_01_08/13 Cornwood Road	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site has infrastructure, noise and flood constraints. The development of affordable housing in the area would exacerbate social problems and devalue existing properties. • This site is subject to a planning application 2208/16/FUL; the associated suite of technical documents addresses known constraints on site and therefore the site should be considered for allocation.
Ivybridge SH_27_02_13/16	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The principle of development has been established through a recent planning application on the southern part of this site. • This site is unsuitable for development due to visual, environmental, highway safety, air quality and flooding constraints and lack of capacity at local schools.

Settlement or site reference and address	No. of Comments	Key issues raised in consultation
Ivybridge SH_27_03_08/13/16	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of this site would result in loss of habitats and the wildlife that they support. This site is unsuitable for development due to visual, environmental, highway safety, air quality and flooding constraints and lack of capacity at local schools.
Ivybridge SH_27_04_13	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of this site would result in loss of habitats and the wildlife that they support.
Kingsbridge	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The town has been allocated a CDA. All greenfield sites must be protected to ensure the survival of wildlife. Previous Kingsbridge allocations have not been delivered during the life of the previous plan and have been carried over; has non-delivery of allocated sites been considered for the Joint Local Plan period? Additional primary and secondary school capacity will be required to support the proposed development. Road access in and around Kingsbridge is a constraint to any new development. Affordable homes for locals are required, including affordable rent for single people.
Kingsbridge SH_28_01_13 K1	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site is considered to be suitable for development.
Kingsbridge SH_28_02_13 Land at Coombe Lane	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site is considered suitable for housing; it represents sustainable development.
Kingsbridge SH_28_07_08/13 West of Belle Hill	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any development would have significant impacts on the AONB due to the prominent location of the site. The site does not have easy pedestrian routes to connect with Kingsbridge. A bat colony and barn owls are present on this site. The site is subject to a flood risk. This site is should be allocated for development as it is the least constrained of the sites available in Kingsbridge and is capable of delivering 100 dwellings. This site has poor road access and additional traffic will exacerbate existing problems on surrounding roads.
Kingsbridge K4 including SH_28_10_08/13	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site should be selected for allocation as it represents an opportunity for sustainable development – the principle of which was established through 28/1560/15/O. The site includes the listed building of Buttville. Has an appropriate assessment been undertaken to determine what harm to the significance there is to the heritage asset and its setting by the proposal? The K4 employment area is good for those who want to walk to work in Kingsbridge but getting goods out of town will be difficult due to access constraints.
Kingsbridge K5	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site is considered suitable for development. The site is in proximity to the listed building of Norden House. Has an appropriate assessment been undertaken to determine what harm to the significance there is to the heritage asset and its setting by the proposal?
Kingsbridge SH_28_18_08/13	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site is unsuitable for development due to AONB, SSSI, access, infrastructure and flooding constraints.
Kingsbridge SH_28_20_08/13 Land off West Alvington Hill, Kingsbridge (incorporating K5)	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information appears confusing when comparing the SHLAA pack and the allocations; this site encompasses K5 and planning permission has been granted under 28/0508/15/O.
Kingsbridge SH_28_30_08/13/16 Hospital Field	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site should be selected for development as it has close links to services and better road and pedestrian connectivity than other sites in Kingsbridge.
Kingsbridge SH_28_31_14 Dennings, Vallingford Road	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site would be considered suitable for housing once all known constraints were addressed.

Settlement or site reference and address	No. of Comments	Key issues raised in consultation
Kingsbridge SH_28_32_14 Land off Culver Park Close	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A site proposal is being prepared and this site should be allocated for housing.
Kingsbridge SH_28_33_16 Land off Warren Road, Southville	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site offers good potential for housing. • The SHLAA assessment for this considered incorrect, as known constraints could be addressed.
Kingsbridge SH_28_34_16 Fore Street	50	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Car parks are essential to the functioning of the local community and economy and should not be lost. • A legal covenant exists which would prevent any redevelopment of this site. • There are numerous grade II listed buildings within Kingsbridge and the grade I Church of St Edmund. Has an appropriate assessment been undertaken to determine what harm to the significance there is to these heritage assets and their settings by the proposal?
Kingsbridge SH_28_35_16 The Quay Side	33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any development would need to retain and enhance existing facilities and setting. • Car parks are essential to the functioning of the local community and economy and should not be lost. • This site has traffic, access, flooding and drainage constraints.
Kingsbridge SH_28_36_16 K3	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parking is required on this site. • The site is subject to flood risk. • Development of this site would be detrimental to the efficient running of the town. • There are numerous grade II listed buildings within Kingsbridge and the grade I Church of St Edmund. Has an appropriate assessment been undertaken to determine what harm to the significance there is to these heritage assets and their settings by the proposal? • This site would be suitable for some development to provide social rent accommodation with no loss of parking.
Kingsbridge SH_28_37_16 K6	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is subject to flood risk. • Development of this site would be detrimental to the efficient running of the town. • This site is considered suitable for development.
Kingsbridge Riverview Place, Fore Street	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site is a large unused garden which offers the potential for an infill development.
Kingsbridge SH_59_05_16 Land south of Kingsway Park	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site is unsuitable for development due to AONB, SSSI, access, infrastructure and flooding constraints.
Kingsbridge SH_59_06_16 Land south of Tacketwood – Part 1	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site is unsuitable for development due to AONB, SSSI, access and flooding constraints.
Kingston	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any housing development in Kingston should be in keeping with the size and character of the village. Development should provide affordable homes. • Any development should consider the impact on current infrastructure; roads, sewerage system, school places, lack of public transport, parking and poor broadband access. The local community does not wish to see street lighting put in the village. • Kingston does not yet have a Neighbourhood Plan but developers are already moving in with plans that are not based on village needs or take into account local infrastructure problems. • Neighbourhood plans should be leading on any development – not private companies.
Kingston Land to rear of Morgans Row and Westentown	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site should not be developed due to landscape and infrastructure constraints. • This site should be developed as there are no significant constraints that cannot be fully addressed. The site is capable of delivering 40 to 50 homes and should be

Settlement or site reference and address	No. of Comments	Key issues raised in consultation
SH_29_01_14		included as an allocation in the Plan.
Kingston Land Part of Beech Torr Farm SH_29_02_16	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site should not be developed due to landscape and infrastructure constraints.
Lewdown WD_32_10_08/13 Part of field 8087, Crossroads Farm, Lewdown	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lewdown would benefit from increased housing in order to support the existing facilities; the remainder of the field should be allocated for housing.
Lewdown WD_32_09_08/13 Field 5983, Crossroads Farm, Lewdown	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site offers potential for housing in order to support existing services in facilities.
Lamerton WD_44_08_08/13 Land behind Trenance Drive	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of this site would impact on the Lamerton “green triangle.”
Lamerton WD_44_03_08/13 St John’s	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The four frontage units would represent logical infill but any further development of this site would impact on the Lamerton “green triangle.”
Lifton	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The primary school will require expansion to accommodate the proposed development. The newly discovered hillfort in Lifton must be protected.
Lifton WD_35_05_08/13 Land at Glenhaven	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Part of this site is supported for allocation by the Neighbourhood Plan Group. The proposed allocation is disproportionately high compared to the current size of Lifton.
Lifton WD_35_08_08/13	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site has heritage constraints in light of the newly discovered hillfort.
Lifton WD_35_13_13/16	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site should be considered suitable for development; all known constraints have been assessed and addressed through an outline application.
Lifton WD_35_14_13 Strawberry Farm Fields	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site has heritage constraints in light of the newly discovered hillfort. Part of this site is supported for allocation by the Neighbourhood Plan Group.
Lifton WD_35_16_13	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site has high archaeological potential.
Lifton WD_35_20_16	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site has heritage constraints (newly discovered hillfort on the ridge crest of Lifton Wood).
Malborough	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A points-based system to inform development allocations in villages will result in planned decline of smaller settlements. Houses to rent from social providers must be the priority. Sewerage systems must receive investment; infrastructure as a whole must be planned for by the Council and not by a private company.
Malborough SH_33_04_08/13	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site has planning permission.
Malborough SH_33_05_08/13	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site assessment should be revised; access can be secured.
Marldon SH_34_01_08/13 Land at Five Lanes	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Torbay Council agree with the findings of the site assessment and would support a residential allocation on this land.
Marldon SH_34_02_13 East of Vicarage Road	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Torbay Council agree with the findings of the site assessment and would support a residential allocation on this land.
Meeth Land west of Station Road	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site has no known constraints and should be considered for development.
Milton Abbot WD_42_01_08/13 Land adjoining Fore	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Constraints on this site could be addressed and this site would offer the potential for 10 dwellings. If developed, the contribution to a cumulative impact on services and facilities

Settlement or site reference and address	No. of Comments	Key issues raised in consultation
Street		would make this site unsuitable.
Milton Abbot WD_42_03_08/13 Land adjoining Milton Abbot Primary School	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Primary School currently has limited capacity for expansion but this site could offer the opportunity to accommodate this, plus residential development. The site is considered to have no potential for development at this time due to current constraints.
Milton Abbot WD_42_05_08/13 Allotment Gardens at Fore Street	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The presence of allotments on this land is cited as a constraint; these could be provided elsewhere to enable development on this site. If developed, the contribution to a cumulative impact on services and facilities would make this site unsuitable.
Milton Abbot WD_42_06_08/13	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of this site should be supported in conjunction with WD_42_05_08/13. If developed, the contribution to a cumulative impact on services and facilities would make this site unsuitable.
Milton Abbot WD_42_07_13 Land west of 1 Springfield Cottages, Chillaton	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site is constrained and therefore unsuitable for development; constraints are such that engagement with the Neighbourhood Planning Group is unlikely to alleviate the constraints and the site should be removed from the SHLAA.
Milton Abbot WD_42_08_13 Land east of Marlow Crescent Chillaton	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site is constrained and therefore unsuitable for development; constraints are such that engagement with the Neighbourhood Planning Group is unlikely to alleviate the constraints and the site should be removed from the SHLAA.
Milton Abbot WD_42_09_13 Land between Sunwaye and Marlow Crescent, Chillaton	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given the lack of services and facilities in Chillaton, the scale of development proposed is considered excessive and unsustainable.
Milton Abbot WD_42_10_13 Land at Endsleigh House	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is considered to have no potential for development at this time due to current constraints.
Modbury	72	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No more houses should be built here until further jobs are available in Modbury. Smaller pockets of development around Modbury rather than large sites is preferred by the community. Small pockets of development are more easily incorporated into the existing community to support social cohesion. Parking must be better considered on new developments. A one way system would benefit all residents by reducing congestion in the town. Modbury has been allocated a CDA. Local connection clauses should be in place on all new homes in Modbury – not just the affordable ones. Areas should be redeveloped, with Champerknowne Park as an example. Housing for the elderly needs to be developed on central town sites to enable residents to move out of large family homes whilst still retaining access to facilities and services. The primary school has capacity to accommodate the proposed development, but anything further would require expansion. The designated secondary school (Ivybridge) will require expansion to accommodate the proposed development. No further development should be considered in Modbury until the RAI development is finished and its impact on the town is understood. Architectural design should blend in with existing old houses. A bypass is necessary for Modbury. The allocations should not be finalised until the outcome of the Neighbourhood Plan consultation is known. Public transport links are very limited in Modbury.
Modbury SH_35_02_08/13 West of Palm Cross RAI	36	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site has planning permission for 93 units. The quantum of development is too high. Current services, such as healthcare and transport links do not have the capacity to support future development.

Settlement or site reference and address	No. of Comments	Key issues raised in consultation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any future housing should be for local people and not for second homes. Affordable housing needs in Modbury are not being met at present. The proposed allocation of this sustainable site is supported. Development of this site would have landscape, traffic and infrastructure constraints. Trees must be protected during construction.
Modbury SH_35_03_08/13/16 West of Palm Cross extension	58	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site is unsuitable for development; the quantum being proposed is too great in relation to the existing built form of Modbury. The proposed allocation of this sustainable site is supported. The site abuts a grade II barracks. Has an appropriate assessment been undertaken to determine what harm to the significance there is to the heritage asset and its setting by the proposal? The site has landscape and infrastructure constraints. Trees must be protected during construction, as must the local residents from the effects of building works.
Modbury SH_35_04_13 Park Farm, Land to north of Modbury	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development of this site, together with additional land to the north and west would offer the potential to meet housing need towards the later stages of the Plan period. The southern part of this site would be suitable for small development.
Modbury SH_35_05_08/13/16 Land to the East of Brownstone Street and North of Traine Drive	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parts of this site would be suitable for small developments as it is well located with good footpath links.
Modbury SH_35_08_08/13 South of Poundwell St. the field known as Bailey, near Modbury Health Centre across the stream from car park	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access to this site can be achieved through the SHDC car park. The site is closer to the town centre than many of the others being considered and part of it is in allocation RA2. Known constraints could be overcome on this site and it could accommodate small scale development.
Modbury SH_35_09_08/13 South of Poundwell Street, Known as 'Oodles'	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access to this site can be achieved through the SHDC car park. The site is closer to the town centre than many of the others being considered and part of it is in allocation RA2.
Modbury SH_35_11_16 Land at Sheephams	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site provides a logical and sustainable short term extension of the proposed allocation.
Modbury SH_35_12_16 Field 3 - Land part of Pennpark Farm	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site provides a logical and sustainable short term extension of the proposed allocation.
Modbury SH_35_13_16 Field 1 - Land part of Pennpark Farm	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pedestrian access stops short of the RA1 development; access for this site could be possible along the green lane that runs between RA1 and the Industrial estate.
Modbury SH_35_14_16 Field 2 - Land part of Pennpark Farm	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pedestrian access stops short of the RA1 development; access for this site could be possible along the green lane that runs between RA1 and the Industrial estate.
Modbury SH_35_15_16 South of Plymouth Road	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Part of this site could be used to accommodate a small number of dwellings; there are no roads from which this site could be viewed so landscape impact is not a constraint.
Modbury SH_35_16_16 Poundwell Street RA2	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Redevelopment of this site would be acceptable if it accords with the former Masterplan produced for this site. Car parks are essential to the functioning of the local community and economy

Settlement or site reference and address	No. of Comments	Key issues raised in consultation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> and should not be lost. • Parts of this site are subject to flood risk. • There are numerous grade II listed buildings and the site is included within what appears to be the curtilage of the White Hart, a grade II listed building. Has an appropriate assessment been undertaken to determine what harm to the significance there is to these heritage assets and their settings by the proposal? • Known constraints could be overcome on this site and it could accommodate small scale development.
Modbury Parcel 1	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development of this site, together with SH_35_04_13 would offer the potential to meet housing need towards the later stages of the Plan period.
Modbury Parcel 2	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development of this site, together with SH_35_04_13 would offer the potential to meet housing need towards the later stages of the Plan period.
Modbury Land at Sheephams	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This additional land would provide for a long term strategic allocation towards the end of the plan period.
Newton and Noss SH_37_02_13	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Check that this is the correct field.
Newton and Noss SH_37_07_08/13 Collaton Cross	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site has planning permission.
Newton and Noss SH_37_08_08/13 Hannaford Road	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site assessment is correct.
Newton and Noss SH_37_010_13 Netton Road	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site assessment is correct.
Northlew	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any development in Northlew should meet local needs for affordable housing, accommodate a diverse age spectrum and contribute to upgrades in the local sewerage/utility network.
Northlew WD_20_03_14 Land to the rear of Kimberlands	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site is considered to have limited constraints, subject to a satisfactory access being achieved. This can be provided from the lane to the south.
Northlew WD_20_04_14 Land to the west of the Meadows	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site is considered to be constrained as there is no potential for direct access. However, access can be provided as part of the development of the wider parcel which incorporates the parcel to the south (rear of Kimberlands).
North Huish	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No further development can be sited in North Huish.
North Tawton	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The two North Tawton allocations with planning permission will contribute to an additional classroom at the primary school. The designated secondary school (Okehampton) will require expansion to support the development.
North Tawton WD_13_07_08/13	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site has heritage constraints.
North Tawton WD_13_08_08/13	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A change in circumstances has occurred surrounding the site since the last site assessment and it should be reassessed as suitable for development in light of this.
North Tawton Bathway Fields 01037/2013	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The boundary of the site as shown in the document is incorrect and should be revised. The site should be shown as mixed use, as the planning permission includes provision for a medical centre and employment land.
North Tawton H10 Woollen Mill	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is subject to flood risk. • The site has planning permission for 60 dwellings (not the 62 in the consultation material) and is for residential use only, not the mixed use as shown.
North Tawton Additional land to incorporate Bathway Fields and Woollen Mill, plus land to the north of Fore Street	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The wider site offers considerable potential to form a sustainable extension to the Local Centre which would be well integrated with the existing settlement and provide both homes and employment in accessible locations in the town. Constraints on the site would be addressed through a comprehensive masterplan.

Settlement or site reference and address	No. of Comments	Key issues raised in consultation
North Tawton WD_13_15_16 Land south of Strawberry Fields	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site should be proposed for allocation; the SHEELA site assessment was relatively positive, landscape constraints were identified but this was also true for Bathway Fields, which has since been granted planning permission.
Okehampton	18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Plan fails to recognise the links between Okehampton and Exeter. The Plan fails to recognise the need for better road and rail links between Okehampton and Exeter. Okemont and Taw Valleys should be designated as an AONB A new ring road is needed for Okehampton to ease the congestion caused by existing development. Okehampton should not be viewed as a brownfield site to be used to accommodate development/projects that are not wanted by communities in other areas of the HMA. Employment space is required in Okehampton. Development in Okehampton should take into account local need only. Development in Okehampton should be centred on the west of the town to balance recent developments on the east. Land needs to be allocated for sporting use. Parts of Okehampton have been designated a CDA. The Town Centre Access Road (Oaklands to Link Road) is urgently required, although this is challenging to deliver due to environmental and landowner constraints/costs. There are references to Our Plan, the Joint Local Plan and to Neighbourhood Planning – how many plans will there be and how can people be confident that these reflect the issues in their local area when decisions are taken by a committee in Totnes? Many new homes have been purchased to let. Additional provision of social housing on these estates has resulted in an influx of people with social issues, which has put a huge strain on local resources and has not resulted in an integrated community. Employment land should be located as close to the A30 as possible. Existing heavy industry in the centre of town should be encouraged to move to the new employment land at the edge of town. The central sites can then be released for smaller live/work units. Self-build and community projects should be supported, rather than relying on national housebuilders. A new 210 place primary school is planned for Okehampton, which could expand to 420 places. Okehampton College will have insufficient capacity by the end of the decade and therefore will need to be expanded. Most of the recent development has been focussed in Okehampton Hamlets rather than Okehampton Town; Hamlets is a predominantly rural parish and the recent development has put infrastructure under increasing strain. A bus station is required; this could be sited in the Waitrose car park.
Okehampton WD_15/23_03_13/16 Monkey Puzzle	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any development of this site is likely to increase traffic congestion by residents accessing the town centre or driving to Exeter. This site is suitable for 50 dwellings; the site is the most sustainable and accessible to all Okehampton facilities.
Okehampton WD_15_06_08/13 Rugby Club and Primary School	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site is shown as green on the SHLAA map but red on the assessment – which is it? The site is not subject to flooding as it is on a steep hill. Other constraints such as footpaths are easy to overcome but the Town Centre Access Road is essential before any development begins on site. It is not clear why this site would require a traffic assessment of impacts on the town but sites on the east of Okehampton would not.
Okehampton WD_15_43_13/16 H3	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site should be allocated for development; as landowner of part of the site WDBC supports its allocation. The landowner of part of the site would support its allocation for housing development.
Okehampton WD_15_45_16	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Car parks are essential to the functioning of the local community and economy and should not be lost. This is the only car park that offers all day parking at a

Settlement or site reference and address	No. of Comments	Key issues raised in consultation
Old Mill Car Park		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> reasonable price with a coach park. The site is in the flood zone and should not be built on. This is a medieval urban plot and has a high potential for archaeology. This site is unsuitable for development due to poor access.
Okehampton SP22A	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A community centre will be required. The school site has not yet been purchased by DCC – why is this? Part of the site is subject to flood risk. The site adjacent the scheduled monument of a Roman fort whose setting may be impacted upon. Where is the evidence that an appropriate historic environment assessment has been undertaken to assess the sites suitability for development? This site has outline consent for 375 houses and a school and is supported for allocation.
Okehampton SP22B	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dartmoor National Park's previous comments as submitted to WDBC on this site should be considered. This site should be supported for continued allocation as a mixed use site; other sites held by the landowner (previously submitted to WDBC for SHLAA assessment) have the potential to come forward if housing requirements are increased as the Plan progresses.
Okehampton WD_23_13_13/16 Land to the south of Chichacott Road	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Constraints on this site could be addressed through mitigation and development would be possible.
Okehampton WD_23_15_13/16 Land to the east of Okehampton	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site is located adjacent to Parcel 4 and in the event that 2731/15/OPA is granted, this site could be developed with appropriate mitigation.
Okehampton WD_23_16_13	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only the south west corner of this site is being promoted for development due to landscape constraints. The allocation of this site is supported, as it would form a logical extension to the south of Parcel 3.
Okehampton WD_23_17_16	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site is promoted for commercial use, in keeping with surrounding development.
Okehampton WD_23_18_13/16 Parcels 2, 3 and 4	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Too many houses have been allocated without regard to the impact on Okehampton. These developments fail to account for traffic impacts on the town centre. There is potential for a rail link at Hameldown Road but in the consultation there is no reference to rail travel or the S106 contributions to fund any rail infrastructure. Development of this site represents unrestricted sprawl, with topographical, heritage and drainage constraints. The Link Road to this site is still not completed, putting extra pressure on existing roads during development. Parcels 3 and 4 are currently subject to a planning application (ref: 2731/15/OPA) for 375 dwellings and the provision of a link road, together with additional land due to be determined by the Planning and Licensing Committee on 23rd August 2016 with a recommendation for approval.
Okehampton WD_23_19_23	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site should be supported for commercial/employment uses as it continues the existing pattern of development.
Okehampton ED2	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dartmoor National Park's previous comments as submitted to WDBC on this site should be considered.
Plymouth Airport	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plymouth Airport should be reopened.
Rattery SH_39_02_08/13 Rear of Garden Close	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site is suitable for development as it offers limited constraints.
Salcombe	14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Affordable housing for local people was not provided on the two recent developments at the top of Bonfire Hill. Restrictive covenants are needed to ensure affordable housing is available to key workers in the town.

Settlement or site reference and address	No. of Comments	Key issues raised in consultation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The primary school will require expansion to accommodate further development. The designated secondary school (Kingsbridge) will require expansion to accommodate further development. Salcombe Neighbourhood Plan's work on housing needs should be included in the Plan. Employment space should be located near the existing employment area around Island Street and Gould Road. The park and ride should be better signposted and run later into the evening. Recent development has been allowed to go ahead despite negative landscape impacts and seem targeted to the second homes market. Any development should ensure the continued viability of the local fishing industry.
Salcombe Bonfire Hill RA3	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This development is harmful to the AONB through the use of inappropriate site layouts, scale and massing of built structures in prominent locations
Salcombe SH_41_01_08/13	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site should not be considered for development; it is not well related to Salcombe and has access, heritage and environmental constraints.
Salcombe SH_41_02_08/13	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site should not be considered for development; it is not well related to Salcombe and has access, heritage and environmental constraints.
Salcombe SH_41_03_13 Horsescombe Farm	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development here is unsuitable as it would produce isolated enclaves of houses in visually prominent beautiful rural landscapes. This site is not well related to Salcombe and is not suitable for development.
Salcombe SH_41_04_16 Former Gas Works	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This should be allocated for commercial purposes and may unlock development on SH_41_07_16.
Salcombe SH_41_05_16 Land north of Motherhill Farm	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development here is unsuitable as it would produce isolated enclaves of houses in visually prominent beautiful rural landscapes. Assessment of this site is inconsistent when read alongside SH_41_03_16 and is therefore incorrect; this site should be considered for a mixed use development.
Salcombe Land adjacent to West End Garage SH_41_06_16	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This development is harmful to the AONB due to LVIA impacts and loss of productive agricultural land. New homes could be built on this site or on the old Hockey Club; facilities such as the supermarket, primary school and buses are in easy reach. Only affordable homes are required, no market home should be built. This site is suitable for development; constraints relating to access are currently being investigated.
Salcombe Shadycombe Car Park SH_41_07_16	28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Car parks are essential to the functioning of the local community and economy and should not be lost
Salcombe SH_41_08_16 RA4	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site is subject to tidal flood risk. Any development here should accommodate the existing uses elsewhere in Salcombe. This site should not be considered for development due to land contamination issues.
Salcombe SH_41_15_08/13	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site is well located and it would be cost effective to develop affordable homes here.
Shaugh Prior SH_42_01_14 Lee Moor Refinery – Site A	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flexible planning policies are needed to support redevelopment of sites in the Lee Moor area for employment and residential uses. As the minerals planning authority, DCC must be consulted before any allocation occurs.
Shaugh Prior SH_42_02_14 Lee Moor Refinery – Site B	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flexible planning policies are needed to support redevelopment of sites in the Lee Moor area for employment and residential uses. As the minerals planning authority, DCC must be consulted before any allocation occurs.
Sherford	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New development should be concentrated in Sherford as the infrastructure is being built to support housing.
Slapton SH_44_01_16	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any development of this site would be opposed due to access and

Settlement or site reference and address	No. of Comments	Key issues raised in consultation
Highclere		landscape/visual impact constraints.
Sparkwell	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DCC recommend that no allocations are made within Sparkwell village until noise mapping is undertaken.
Sparkwell SH_49_04_13 Land at Birchland Farm	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of this land would provide a pedestrian link from the village to the zoo which would be beneficial to all.
Sparkwell SH_49_06_08/13 Old Newnham Farm	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A revised strategy is being considered for this site which covers that landscape and heritage aspects of this site; the agents would welcome further discussions with the Council.
Sparkwell SH_49_07_13 Marquis Motorhomes, Lee Mill	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site should be considered for a mixed use development subject to appropriate masterplanning and could offer an opportunity to alleviate some of the current problems in Lee Mill.
Sparkwell SH_49_13_16 Lee Moor	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site has heritage constraints and any proposals for development would need to be supported by archaeological investigation.
Sparkwell SH_49_17_16 Lee Mill	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site should be considered for residential development.
Sparkwell 0395 Stoggy Lane (also Coypool)	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plympton and its roads are already overcrowded. There are constraints relating to access, infrastructure, road safety, healthcare and school places. This site should be considered as suitable for development; all constraints can be addressed.
Spreyton	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two sites with planning permission for a total of 11 dwellings have been excluded from the maps – The Barton (planning consent 01396/2014) – 8no dwellings – Located at west end of village. The Old Smithy (planning consent 12289/2008) – 3no dwellings – Located at crossroads adjacent Cross Meadow.
Spreyton Land Opposite Cross Meadow WD_27_03_14/16	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site should not be selected for development due to landscape impacts.
Spreyton Land Opposite Chapel Park WD_27_04_16	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site represents appropriate infill development and should be supported; the results of the site assessment are incorrect and should be amended.
Spreyton Land to the West of Coffyns Farmhouse (now re-named Spreyton House) WD_27_05_13/16	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development on this site is supported at a suitable scale.
Spreyton Land north of Spreyton Wood Road WD_27_06_16	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development on this site is supported at a suitable scale, with surrounding Devon banks and trees protected.
Staverton Site behind Woolston Chapel, Landscope	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site should be selected for allocation as it offers good access to services and facilities with limited constraints.
Staverton The Bungalow, Memory Cross, Landscope	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site should be selected for allocation as it offers good access to services and facilities with limited constraints.
Stokenham/ Chillington	99	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of capacity on the A379 and surrounding lanes – no further development can be supported. Accessing services on foot is not possible in all areas and increases the use of cars in the village. Slapton Line – vulnerable to coastal erosion and road links may be lost Healthcare services are overstretched and no further development can be supported Utility infrastructure is overstretched and no further development can be

Settlement or site reference and address	No. of Comments	Key issues raised in consultation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> supported Broadband provision to rural areas must be a priority. New developments have resulted in loss of privacy in existing homes. New developments have resulted in devaluation of existing homes. Stokenham is in the AONB and any further development will have landscape impacts. Warden controlled accommodation for the elderly is required. Stokenham and Chillington do not offer the range of services and facilities that would enable them to be defined as a Local Centre. Chillington has seen the majority of new development in recent years and new development should be sited in Stokenham to allow Chillington time to adjust. Sites between the two villages should be developed so that neither village feels that they are accommodating more development compared to the other. The housing survey carried out in September-November 2015 in Chillington Village needs to be taken into consideration in the Plan. Stokenham Primary is at capacity and would require expansion to accommodate the proposed development. The designated secondary school (Kingsbridge) would also require expansion.
Stokenham/Chillington SH_53_01_13 Best Meadow, Stokenham. Adjacent A379 opposite the church	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site is unsuitable for developments as it has significant landscape, infrastructure, drainage, healthcare and access constraints.
Stokenham/Chillington SH_53_02_13 Old Playground Carehouse Cross	23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site is suitable for development as it has suitable access. This site is unsuitable for developments as it has significant environmental, landscape, infrastructure, drainage, healthcare and access constraints. Any home built here should be part ownership affordable or social rent, rather than second homes.
Stokenham/Chillington Green Park Way SH_53_03_08/13/16	68	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A limited degree of development may possibly be accommodated on site but the current proposed allocation would cause harm to the AONB due to the prominent elevation of the site. A maximum of 10 homes for affordable purchase or social rent could be accommodated on this site. The site should be supported as an allocation; the site offers a logical extension to the village and constraints on site can be addressed. This site should not be developed as there are significant SHDC policy constraints relating to transport, environment, access and parking, location of development, housing provision, flood risk, residential amenity, infrastructure provisions (including school capacity), sustainable construction and landscape character. Landowners surrounding the site will not allow any developer to divert surface water arising from potential development on this site through their land.
Stokenham/Chillington SH_53_04_13 Land adjacent to the NE of the village of Chillington, North of A379	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site is unsuitable for developments as it has significant landscape, infrastructure, drainage, healthcare and access constraints. This site should be considered suitable for development as it would facilitate access to existing plots and offer the opportunity for recreational land and development without joining up the two villages.
Stokenham/Chillington SH_53_05_13 Land adjacent to the SE of Chillington	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site is unsuitable for developments as it has significant landscape, infrastructure, drainage, healthcare and access constraints. This site is suitable for development as is close to the main road which would allow road and footpath upgrades. Half of this field should be developed.
Stokenham/Chillington SH_53_06_13/16	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site is not suitable for development due to poor infrastructure, access and traffic/parking safety issues. This site is suitable for housing.
Stokenham/Chillington SH_53_07_08/13	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site is unsuitable for developments as it has significant landscape, infrastructure, drainage, healthcare and access constraints.

Settlement or site reference and address	No. of Comments	Key issues raised in consultation
Land adjacent to the SE of the village of Chillington, South of A379		
Stokenham/Chillington SH_53_08_13/16 Land to the East of Stokenham Church	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site is unsuitable for developments as it has significant heritage, landscape, infrastructure, drainage, healthcare and access constraints.
Stokenham/Chillington SH_53_09_13/16 Land to the South of Stokenham Church, adjoining the A379, Stokenham	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site is unsuitable for developments as it has significant heritage, landscape, infrastructure, drainage, healthcare and access constraints.
Stokenham/Chillington SH_53_12_13 Meadow Field	31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This was selected as a preferred site by the community but flooding and access constraints would need to be addressed. This site is considered to be unsuitable for development as it is outside the development boundary, surrounding properties would lose privacy and there are access constraints. Any development on this site would represent boundary change and infilling that fails to properly account for the limitations on current infrastructure, such as roads, schools and healthcare provision.
Stokenham/Chillington SH_53_13_13 Meadow Field & Bulls Field	34	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This was selected as a preferred site by the community but flooding and access constraints would need to be addressed. This site is considered to be unsuitable for development as it is outside the development boundary, surrounding properties would lose privacy and there are access constraints. Any development on this site would represent boundary change and infilling that fails to properly account for the limitations on current infrastructure, such as roads, schools and healthcare provision.
Stokenham/Chillington SH_53_14_08/13 Land at Carehouse Cross	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site should be considered for allocation as it is more sustainable and suitable for development than SH_53_21_16. This site is considered to be suitable for development with less impact on surrounding residents, is located close to the village centre and has safe access to main roads. This site is unsuitable for developments as it has significant landscape, infrastructure, drainage, healthcare and access constraints.
Stokenham/Chillington SH_53_15_13 Land south and west of Stokenham Barton Barns	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site is unsuitable for developments as it has significant landscape, infrastructure, drainage, healthcare and access constraints. This site is considered suitable for development than other sites in the area.
Stokenham/Chillington Land behind Council Houses SH_53_19_16	25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site is unsuitable for developments as it has significant environmental, landscape, infrastructure, drainage, healthcare and access constraints. A small part of this site (to the south) could be developed with limited landscape impacts, subject to access being secured.
Stokenham/Chillington SH_53_20_16	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site is unsuitable for developments as it has significant landscape, infrastructure, drainage, healthcare and access constraints.
Stokenham/Chillington SE of Carehouse Cross SH_53_21_16	31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site is unsuitable for developments as it has significant environmental, landscape, infrastructure, drainage, healthcare and access constraints. This site was previously subject to a planning review and it was concluded that this site should not be developed, therefore it should not be proposed as an allocation. The site abuts the conservation area and in proximity to a number of listed buildings who setting may be impacted upon. Has an appropriate historic environment assessment been undertaken to assess what harm to the significance there is to the heritage assets and their settings by the proposal? Access and landscape constraints can be addressed, therefore this site should be considered suitable for development.

Settlement or site reference and address	No. of Comments	Key issues raised in consultation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> With careful design, part of the site may be acceptable but the current allocation as proposed would harm the special qualities of the AONB.
Stoke Fleming	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The AONB should be protected, this will help to maintain tourism in the area. Development should not take place outside the village boundary or between the A379 and the sea. Housing should be located in an unobtrusive area of the village with a maximum number of 20 homes built. Employment units are unnecessary as Dartmouth is two miles away.
Stoke Fleming SH_51_01_08/13	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The emerging Stoke Fleming Neighbourhood Plan would not support development on this site; other sites have been identified to accommodate Stoke Fleming's anticipated growth. It is considered that further needs in the plan period will be met by the West Dart development.
Stoke Fleming SH_51_02_08/13	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The emerging Stoke Fleming Neighbourhood Plan would not support development on this site; other sites have been identified to accommodate Stoke Fleming's anticipated growth. It is considered that further needs in the plan period will be met by the West Dart development.
Stoke Fleming SH_51_08/13	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The emerging Stoke Fleming Neighbourhood Plan would not support development on this site; other sites have been identified to accommodate Stoke Fleming's anticipated growth. It is considered that further needs in the plan period will be met by the West Dart development.
Stoke Fleming SH_51_09_13	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The emerging Stoke Fleming Neighbourhood Plan would not support development on this site; other sites have been identified to accommodate Stoke Fleming's anticipated growth. It is considered that further needs in the plan period will be met by the West Dart development.
Stoke Fleming SH_51_10_13	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The emerging Stoke Fleming Neighbourhood Plan would not support development on this site; other sites have been identified to accommodate Stoke Fleming's anticipated growth. It is considered that further needs in the plan period will be met by the West Dart development.
Stoke Fleming SH_51_11_13	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The emerging Stoke Fleming Neighbourhood Plan would not support development on this site; other sites have been identified to accommodate Stoke Fleming's anticipated growth. It is considered that further needs in the plan period will be met by the West Dart development.
Stoke Fleming SH_51_12_13	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The emerging Stoke Fleming Neighbourhood Plan would not support development on this site; other sites have been identified to accommodate Stoke Fleming's anticipated growth. It is considered that further needs in the plan period will be met by the West Dart development.
Stoke Fleming SH_51_13_14	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The emerging Stoke Fleming Neighbourhood Plan would not support development on this site; other sites have been identified to accommodate Stoke Fleming's anticipated growth. It is considered that further needs in the plan period will be met by the West Dart development.
Stoke Fleming SH_51_14_16	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The emerging Stoke Fleming Neighbourhood Plan would not support development on this site; other sites have been identified to accommodate Stoke Fleming's anticipated growth. It is considered that further needs in the plan period will be met by the West Dart development. This is a mismatch between the map and the table in the SHEELA in relation to this site.
Stoke Fleming SH_51_15_16	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The emerging Stoke Fleming Neighbourhood Plan would not support development on this site; other sites have been identified to accommodate Stoke Fleming's anticipated growth. It is considered that further needs in the plan period will be met by the West Dart development. This is a mismatch between the map and the table in the SHEELA in relation to this site.
Stoke Fleming SH_51_16_16	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The emerging Stoke Fleming Neighbourhood Plan would not support development on this site; other sites have been identified to accommodate Stoke Fleming's anticipated growth. It is considered that further needs in the plan period will be met by the West Dart development.
Stoke Fleming SH_51_17_16	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The emerging Stoke Fleming Neighbourhood Plan would not support development on this site; other sites have been identified to accommodate Stoke Fleming's anticipated growth. It is considered that further needs in the plan period will be met by the West Dart development.

Settlement or site reference and address	No. of Comments	Key issues raised in consultation
		period will be met by the West Dart development.
Stoke Gabriel	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sites assessed in the SHLAA within Stoke Gabriel are not supported as suitable for development by the community, although existing permissions are recognised. Current infrastructure cannot support further development. Stoke Gabriel's affordable housing needs must be addressed in the Plan. Stoke Gabriel must be protected from overspill development to meet Torbay's housing need. Stoke Gabriel's Neighbourhood Plan group has established that Stoke Gabriel already has around 80 dwellings either as allocations or permissions and based on assessments of housing need, would not anticipate any increase in numbers for the Parish. Stoke Gabriel has a number of sites within the AONB; the AONB should be offered protection to ensure that it remains a tourist attraction and supports the local economy.
Stoke Gabriel SH_52_01_13	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site has permission for a single dwelling even though the assessment stated the site had significant constraints.
Stoke Gabriel SH_52_03_08/13	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site now has permission for 10 dwellings.
Stoke Gabriel SH_52_05_08/13	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site has significant flooding constraints.
Stoke Gabriel SH_52_07_08/14	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is employment land and such be retained as such.
Stoke Gabriel SH_52_08_08/14	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The availability of this land is not established.
Stoke Gabriel SH_52_09_16	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The sewerage system has not capacity for further development; sewage is currently tinkered out of the village.
Stoke Gabriel Land at Paignton Road	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site should be considered for a mixed use site; it adjoins a consented site and represents the next sustainable site that should come forward in Stoke Gabriel.
Tavistock	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The town has been designated a CDA. DCC would support development to the south west of Tavistock, as it would support rail provision. Heritage assets (WHS) need to be protected. Tavistock's road infrastructure and current services and facilities cannot accommodate any further development in the town.
Tavistock SP23A Land at Callington Road	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is acknowledged that the site is in the Tavistock Masterplan SPD. Nonetheless the site is adjacent a number of listed buildings at Yarnier Farm whose setting may be impacted upon. Has an appropriate historic environment assessment been undertaken to assess the significance and setting of the site land to the farm at Crowndale? A new 210 place primary school is planned within the SP23A footprint. The SHLAA assessment of this site needs to be updated to reflect the planning permission for 750 dwellings. This site has environmental constraints. Too much reliance is being placed on this site – no work has started on site.
Tavistock SP23B	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site is supported for allocation as a missed use development. Too much reliance is being placed on this site – no work has started on site.
Tavistock WD_45_01_08/13	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site should be supported for allocation as it represents an opportunity for sustainable development.
Tavistock WD_45_05_08/13/16 Strawberry Fields, Mill Hill	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site should be supported for development; not everyone is employed in Plymouth so it is useful to have housing on the opposite side of town. The site has good access and drainage. This site should be put forward for allocation as it offers a good opportunity for sustainable development with limited constraints.
Tavistock Kelly College Campus WD_45_06_08/13	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site is supported for allocation and a planning application has been submitted for this site. This site is not suitable for development due to flood risk, congestion and air

Settlement or site reference and address	No. of Comments	Key issues raised in consultation
		<p>pollution issues, vehicle access and parking issues and potential heritage constraints. The College should not sell off its assets for short term financial</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is within the conservation area and abutting the World Heritage Site and adjacent a number of listed buildings whose setting may be impacted upon. Where is the evidence that an appropriate historic environment assessment has been undertaken to assess the sites suitability for development?
Tavistock WD_45_13_08/13	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site should be allocated for development, and should be considered in conjunction with SP23A. Constraints can be addressed through mitigation.
Tavistock WD_45_14_08/13	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site should be allocated for development, and should be considered in conjunction with SP23A. Constraints can be addressed through mitigation. • Tavistock's road infrastructure and current services and facilities cannot accommodate any further development in the town.
Tavistock Land East and West of Violet Lane WD_45_42_08/13	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of this site is not suitable due to topography, flood risk, poor access, lack of infrastructure and limited capacity at local schools.
Tavistock WD_45_52_08/13/16 Land opposite Challonsleigh, Whitchurch	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site is considered unacceptable but WD_45_78_16 is proposed as an allocation – WD_45_52_08/13/16 has more significant constraints yet is being proposed as an allocation. The assessment of WD_45_52_08/13/16 should be revisited.
Tavistock Brook Farm WD_45_69_13	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site currently benefits from planning permission 00233/2015 therefore its allocation is secure.
Tavistock WD_45_58_13 Land at Brook Lane	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site should be reconsidered as suitable for development in light of a planning appeal on a nearby site (00233/2015).
Tavistock WD_45_74_13	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tavistock's road infrastructure and current services and facilities cannot accommodate any further development in the town.
Tavistock New Launceston Road WD_45_75_16	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site should be supported for allocation as it represents an opportunity for sustainable development. WD_45_01_08/13 is proposed for allocation; this site should be extended to include WD_45_75_16. • This site should be selected for development as it is a sustainable location, will support the delivery of housing in strategic sites and will provide enhanced open space and recreational provision. • This site should not be selected for allocation, as other more suitable sites are available.
Tavistock Kelly College Preparatory School WD_45_78_16	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site is supported for allocation and it is considered that there are no significant constraints to delivering 150 homes on the site. • This site would be suitable for extra/dementia care rather than for developing family housing in this remote location. • This site is not well related to Tavistock or to the significant employment opportunities in Plymouth, therefore will increase traffic flows through town. • Dartmoor National Park's previous comments as submitted to WDBC on this site should be considered. • This site should not be selected for allocation, as other more suitable sites are available.
Tavistock OP9	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site should be supported for allocation; no further development should be considered until this is built.
Tavistock Land at Rowan Heights	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land previously submitted to WDBC under 00418/2015 should be considered for development as it offers the opportunity for sustainable development with limited constraints. There has been no development in Grenofen for approximately 35 years and this is something that should be considered for the future.
Tavistock ED4	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Much of this site is brownfield land. Part of it is nonetheless within the conservation area and abutting the World Heritage Site and adjacent a number of listed buildings whose setting may be impacted upon. Where is the evidence that an appropriate historic environment assessment has been undertaken to assess the site that would identify what development parameters might be for

Settlement or site reference and address	No. of Comments	Key issues raised in consultation
		the site bearing in mind the historic assets?
Tavistock North of Anderton Lane	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site should be considered for residential development as it represents logical infill.
Totnes	76	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The quantum of development planned for Totnes as a whole is too high. There is a need for employment sites in Totnes. SHDC should look to invest in alternative income-generation schemes, such as renewable community energy schemes. The proposals fail to identify mixed use opportunities at Longmarsh/Steamer Quay. Homes should be built on Longmarsh Car Park. The consultation was not supported by an SEA; retrofitting an SEA to justify the allocations may leave the Plan vulnerable at examination stage. Some information contained within the consultation is out of date and some site boundaries need to be amended. The Totnes Neighbourhood Plan Group is working on a range of options for regeneration and redevelopment in Totnes, including the potential for working with neighbouring parishes and community based projects to deliver affordable housing. All new build homes should be sold to local people only. Land needs to be allocated for sporting use. Development should be built on the other side of Bridgetown Hill. Parts of Totnes have been designated a CDA. Totnes is a travel hub and needs to be supported by appropriate infrastructure. Leisure centres in Totnes have been under funded compared to those in other key towns. Totnes and Dartington should be considered as separate entities; the green gap between them should not be eroded. The hinterland around Totnes has not been properly considered; Staverton, Littlehempston and Harberton are as equally dependent on Totnes as Dartington and should share some of the housing allocation. DCC noted constraints to improvements on the A385. The Grove Primary School has been expanded and expansion is proposed for St Johns Primary. There is sufficient secondary capacity to support the development. Quality of life in some areas (e.g. Bridgetown) does not match that in the rest of the area. The Council should not sell parts of Totnes to cover their funding gap from central Government.
Totnes Baltic Wharf T1	25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This development will increase road congestion and has very limited parking. This development does not meet local need for affordable housing. Open space land agreed for the south of the site is not identified on the maps. The site is subject to flood risk. In order to inform future proposals the impact of any new development upon the significance of the heritage asset (Sharpham House Park and Garden) and the way in which it is subsequently experienced should be considered and appropriate mitigation provided.
Totnes KEVICC T2	55	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information for this site as provided during the consultation was inaccurate and out of date. The KEVICC team are working with the Totnes Neighbourhood Plan Group on plans for this site and would welcome further engagement with those preparing the Strategic Infrastructure Plan to avoid any additional confusion or misinformation. The Totnes Neighbourhood Plan is currently working on a masterplan for the whole Northern Corridor area which will result in a larger footprint to include the Police Station and Magistrates Court to provide a mixed use development with 130 houses. This development will increase road congestion. This development does not meet local need for affordable housing. Any development on this site would need to meet paragraph 74 of the NPPF; playing fields would need to be retained with a protection allocation or replaced

Settlement or site reference and address	No. of Comments	Key issues raised in consultation
		by playing fields of an equivalent or greater quality.
Totnes T3	265	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The market square, Leechwell Gardens and the car park should not be built on, as they offer essential services and facilities to support the economy and community of the town. Both Leechwell Gardens and The Grove School have received significant financial investment in recent years – it would not make sense to redevelop them. • The Market Square and Civic Hall need to be upgraded but without compromising the viability of existing use; the Totnes Neighbourhood Plan Group would recommend the production of a detailed masterplan for a proposal that includes a maximum of 20-30 houses. Leechwell Gardens need to be removed from the allocation and designated a Local Green Space. • If read in conjunction with the OSSR study it is clear that there is significant protection for civic and open spaces, however, most people do not have the technical knowledge to interpret the consultation documents in this way and this has resulted in the petition against development in the T3 area. • The plans for this site are old and contain out of date information. • Any plan for this site would need to be subject to extensive public consultation and a public vote is needed on any plans for this site. • The idea of a multi-storey car park has some merit, however the associated traffic it would generate needs to be considered. • The heritage of Totnes Market is of great value to the community. • Sustainable, low cost housing is needed for locals. • The number of dwellings proposed is too high given the constraints.
T4	14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Estimated dwellings are given as 62 but the planning application is for 99. • The site is subject to flood risk but this has been managed through the preparation of the Community Right to Build Order. • A second civic hall should be built on this site. • The Atmos project should be held up a good example of effective public consultation and community engagement; this model should be replicated for other sites in Totnes.
T6	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parts of this site are subject to flood risk. • This site should be used for eco housing, with a maximum of 25 new affordable homes and shared parking. Trees should be retained on this site. • This site impinges on the green space between Totnes and Dartington.
Totnes T7	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development in Totnes should not be allowed to spill into the surrounds and impact on the setting of the AONB. • There is potential for additional housing on the Parkers Barn site although consideration for must be given to safeguarding the Chicken Run as public open space. • This development has already overburdened the existing infrastructure.
Totnes Great Court Farm	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weston Lane between the turn off at Dukes Road and the main road to Paignton is in a very poor state of repair. The road must be repaired and strengthened before building work begins on this site. • This site should remain a farm and not be developed.
Totnes Land to the rear of Follaton Bungalows	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site should be considered for allocation, given that planning permission was granted on a similar site at Follaton Farm. The site should be considered for allocation to cover the period 11-15 years in the Plan, as it appears that there are very few sites available for this period. There are no known constraints on this site that would prevent the site coming forward.
Ugborough SH_57_14_14/16	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site is within Ugborough Parish but will be classified as Ivybridge; splitting North and South Filham is not a good idea. • This site should be supported for allocation; once the Neighbourhood Centre in 11 is delivered, the site will offer a sustainable extension to the west of Ivybridge. • Development in this area will exacerbate traffic issues; this area would be better used as a sports/recreational area. • This site is poorly related to the existing settlement, has significant access constraints and thus would impose significant impacts on landscape setting and would therefore not be suitable for development during the plan period.
Ugborough	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site is within Ugborough Parish but will be classified as Ivybridge; splitting

Settlement or site reference and address	No. of Comments	Key issues raised in consultation
SH_57_15_14/16		<p>North and South Filham is not a good idea.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site should be supported for allocation; once the Neighbourhood Centre in II is delivered, the site will offer a sustainable extension to the west of Ivybridge. • Development in this area will exacerbate traffic issues; this area would be better used as a sports/recreational area. • This site is poorly related to the existing settlement, has significant access constraints and thus would impose significant impacts on landscape setting and would therefore not be suitable for development during the plan period
Ugborough SH_57_21_16 Land at Siding Cross, Wrangaton	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site should be considered suitable for development; details as set out in 1317/16.OPA address any known constraints on the site.
Wembury SH_58_12_08/14 Land at Cliff Road	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site should be considered suitable for development as relates well to the existing built form and has good access to Wembury's services and facilities. • There is reasonable expectation that growth will be delivered within the AONB, subject to suitable design and masterplanning.
Woolwell	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Woolwell Road is in a poor state of repair. • The A386 needs to be upgraded before there is any further development in Woolwell. • Green spaces should be retained in Woolwell. • New development must complement existing homes in the area and current residents must be protected from the effects of building works. • The local schools and GP surgeries are already oversubscribed, so cannot support additional development. • Woolwell has heritage and landscape constraints.
Woolwell Extension	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Woolwell Extension should be supported for allocation; all constraints would be addressed through a masterplan for the site. • This site has environmental constraints.
Yealmpton	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development outlined in the Plan has contributed to additional school capacity through a S106 agreement.
Yealmpton RA6	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The poor design of this site has created a number of issues, this should be avoided on future developments.
Yealmpton RA7	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site is supported as an employment allocation.

APPENDIX VIII: LIST OF STAKEHOLDERS WHO COMMENTED

Advocate Leeds GATE (Gypsy and Traveller Exchange)
Aggregate Industries UK Ltd
Alder King
Andrew Lethbridge Associates
AONB Partnership Committee
Au Capital Energy Ltd
Aviva Investors Pensions Limited
Babcock International Group
Barbican Theatre
Barkingdon Manor Estate Managing Trustees
Barratt Developments Ltd
Barratt Homes
Bartion Wilmore
Beaming Baby
Beers Solicitors
Bell Cornwell
Bickleigh Parish Council
Bickleigh Parish Neighbourhood Plan Working Group
Bigbury Parish Neighbourhood Plan Bigbury Parish Council
Blue Cedar Homes
Boringdon Committee
Boyer Planning
Brixton Parish Council
Buckland Monachorum NP Group
Buckland Tout Saints Parish Council
Campaign to Protect Rural England
Chillington Housing Action Team
Church Commissioners and Diocesan Board of Finance
City and Provincial Properties Plc.
City Centre Company
Collier Planning
Collings Park Trust
Concise Construction Ltd
Consultant Radiologist, Xray West, Level 06
Co-operative Group Ltd
Cornwall Transport Ltd
Courtgate Ltd
Creval Ltd
Dartington Neighbourhood Plan Group
Dartington NP Group
Dartington Parish Council
Dartington Parochial Church Council
Dartmoor National Park Authority
Dawnan Ltd
Derriford Hospital Environment Group Plymouth Hospitals NHS Trust
Designing out Crime Officer Devon & Cornwall Police
Devon & Cornwall Housing Association
Devon & Cornwall Police
Devon Countryside Access Forum
Devon County Council
Devon Senior Voice
Devon Stone Federation
Devon Wildlife Trust

DHd Infrastructure and Estates HM Naval Base
 DIO Safeguarding Defence Infrastructure
 Diocese of Plymouth
 Diptford Parish Council
 Dittisham Parish
 Don't Bury Dartington Under Concrete
 Drake Circus Limited Partnership
 dramaticresults! group
 Eagle One Ltd
 Efford Timebank (TBSW, PL3)
 EJFP Planning Ltd
 Elburton and District Residents Association
 Elder Tree Befriending Service
 English Cities Fund (ECF)
 Environment Agency
 Ernesettle Archive CIC
 Ernesettle Community Forum
 Estate Surveyor Associated British Ports
 Exbourne & Jacobstowe Grouped Parish
 Exbourne Neighbourhood Plan Group
 FlyPlymouth Ltd.
 Fowler Architecture and Planning
 Fowler Architecture and Planning Ltd
 Friends of Central Park
 Friends of Devonport Park
 Friends of Ham Woods
 Friends of Tamerton Foliot
 Friends of Victoria Park
 Gordon Fishleigh Ltd
 H2Land
 Hannick Homes & Development Ltd
 Harberton NP Group
 Harcourt Kerr
 Hatherleigh Town Council
 Hertford Investors
 Highamton Parish Council and Neighbourhood Planning Group
 Highways England
 Historic England
 Hoddell Associates
 Hoe Conservation Area Residents' Association (HCRA)
 Holbeton Parish Council
 Home Builders Federation
 Hon Treasurer Weston Mill Oak Villa Community Association
 Honicknowle Commnet Ltd
 Hopwood Swallow LLP
 House of Commons
 Hunter Page
 Ian Jewson Planning Ltd
 Inwardleigh Parish Council
 Jackson-Stops & Staff
 John Llewellyn Consultants
 KEVICC
 Kingsbridge
 Kingston Parish Council
 Knowle Avenue Allotment Association
 Lamerton Parish Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Langage Energy Park Ltd
Lifton Parish Council and the Lifton Neighbourhood Planning Team
Linden Homes
Little Owls Pre-School
Local Plans Home Builders Federation
Luken Beck
M&G Real Estate
Malborough
Mark Evans Planning Ltd
Marshmills Ltd
Martin S. Lee Associates Ltd.
Mego
Millbay Marina Village Residents Association
Millfields Trust
Milton Abbot Group
Ministry of Defence
Mitchell Architects Ltd
Modbury Parish Council
Modbury Society
Morley Court Residents Association
Mount Wise Towers Residents Association
National Federation of Fishermen's Organisations
National Trust
Natural England
Network of Wellbeing
Network Rail
Newton and Noss Neighbourhood Plan
North Huish Parish Council
North Tawton Neighbourhood Plan Group
Northlew Parish Council
Oasis Cafe
Oasis Project
OCEAN FISH Vistgate Ltd.
Okehampton Hamlets
Okehampton Town Council
Origin3
PCL Planning Ltd
Persimmon Homes
Petros Developments Ltd
Pillar Land Securities Ltd
Planner CBRE
Plymouth Architectural Trust
Plymouth Argyle Football Club Limited
Plymouth City Airport Limited (PCA Limited)
Plymouth City Council Bereavement Service
Plymouth City Council Economic Development
Plymouth City Council Gateway
Plymouth City Council Majors Planning Team
Plymouth City Council Transformation and Change
Plymouth Community Homes
Plymouth Cycling Campaign
Plymouth Fisherman's Association
Plymouth High School For Girls
Plymouth Labour Group
Plymouth Marine Laboratory
Plymouth Octopus Project (POP)

Plymouth Sutton & Devonport Constituency Office
Plymouth Trawler Agents Ltd
Plymouth Tree Partnership
Plymouth Unitarian Church
Plymouth University
Plymouth Waterfront Partnership
Plympton House Limited
Plympton St Maurice Civic Association
Plympton St. Mary Neighbourhood Forum
Plymstock and Hooe Team Ministry
Rex Down Wholesale Fish Merchants Ltd.
Rotolok Ltd
Royal Mail Group Ltd.
RSPB (Royal Society for the Protection of Birds)
Rugby Football Union
Rural Surveyor Savills
Rymack Ltd
Salcombe
Salcombe Harbour
Salcombe Town Clerk
Samways
Savills
Secretary
Senate Properties (SW) Ltd
Shaugh Prior Parish Council
Sherford New Community Consortium
Slapton Parish Council
Sothwest Landlords Association
Sourton Parish Council
South Devon Watch
South Hams Society
South Hams Tree Wardens Network
South Huish Parish Clerk
South Pool Parish Clerk
South West Conservative Association
South West Strategic Developments Limited
South West Water
Sparkwell All Saints Primary School
Sparkwell Parish Council
Spectrum Premier Homes
Sport England
Spreyton Parish Council
St Budeaux Methodist Church
St Levan Park NHW.
Stoke Fleming Neighbourhood Plan Group
Stoke Gabriel Cycle Path Group
Stoke Gabriel Neighbourhood Plan
Stoke Gabriel Parish Council
Stoke Gabriel Parish Environment Group and Stoke Gabriel low-e
Stoke Gabriel Parish Plan Group
Stokenham Parish Council
Stonehouse Residents Association
Stonehouse Timebank
Stowford and Lewdown Turbine Action Group
Strategic Planner Persimmon Homes
Stuart Partners

Sustainability Manager Sibelco UK Ltd
Sutton Harbour Holdings plc
Tamar Valley Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
Tamerton Foliot Village Conservation Society (TFVCS)
Tavistock Town Parish Clerk
Taylor Wimpey (Exeter)
Team Secretary Livewell South West
Tesco Stores Limited
The Architects Design Group
The FA
The Go-Ahead Group plc
The Maristow Estate
The Theatres Trust
The Una Group Ltd
Thurlestone Parish Council and Neighbourhood Plan
Torbay Council
Totnes & District Society
Totnes & District Traffic and Transport Forum
Totnes and District Chamber of Commerce
Totnes Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group
Totnes Planning
Totnes Town Council
Town Clerk Ivybridge Town Council
Transition Plymouth
Trustees of Broadreach House
Trustees of the Cann Estate
Ugborough Parish Council
University of Exeter
University of St Mark and St John
Urban Splash
Valad Europe
Versaperm Ltd
Vice Chairman Rattery Parish Council and Rattery Parish Plan
Vospers Motor Homes Ltd
Wainhomes (South West) Holdings Ltd.
Wembury Neighbourhood Plan Group
Wembury Parish Council
White Young Green
Widewell Residents Association
Woodland Trust
WX - Senior Estates Surveyor MoD
WYG
Yacht Havens Group Ltd
Yealmpton Parish Council



**Strategic Planning and
Infrastructure Department
Plymouth City Council
Ballard House
West Hoe Road
Plymouth PL1 3BJ
E plymouthplan@plymouth.gov.uk
www.plymouth.gov.uk/plymouthplan**



**South Hams
District Council**

**South Hams District Council
Follaton House
Plymouth Road
Totnes
Devon
TQ9 5NE
E strategic.planning@swdevon.gov.uk**



**West Devon
Borough
Council**

**West Devon Borough Council
Kilworthy Park
Drake Road
Tavistock
Devon
PL19 0BZ
E strategic.planning@swdevon.gov.uk**