

Responses to Questions for Thurlestone Parish Council

4. Is it the intention that infill development should only relate to land within the settlement boundaries in Policy TP3 and TP4?

There was 82% support among survey respondents for infill within the existing villages. It is therefore the intention that infill development should only relate to land within the settlement boundaries, as designated in Policy TP2 and shown in Figures 7, 8 and 9.

In Bantham, there is land presently used for allotments which has already been identified for housing by the Estate in its draft proposals. This is a matter of public record (see para 3.5 (third para) on page 9 of the Consultation Statement).

In Buckland, there is previously developed and under-utilised land and buildings.

In Thurlestone village, there is previously developed land and other opportunities for small-scale infill. Since the Plan was submitted, the care home has closed and it has been announced that the garage will close on 30 April 2018. This raises the possibility of one or both of these sites contributing to infill, provided that the criteria in Policy TP16 (Loss of Employment Uses), Policy TP3 (Affordable Housing) and TP4 (Open Market Housing) are met. See also our response to Q7 below.

5. Do you think that the restriction of market houses to 5 units will restrict the delivery of affordable housing in the village having regard to advice in the PPG regarding getting contributions for affordable housing in AONBs, for schemes between 6 and 10 units?

We do not think that the restriction of market houses to 5 units will restrict the delivery of affordable housing in Thurlestone village, or the parish as a whole, because the Plan supports affordable housing as infill or as a rural exception site. The expectation is that community-led housing and/or a village housing initiative on a rural exception site will be able to meet clearly identified local housing needs and will be delivered using their own funding mechanisms, rather than through commuted sums.

Further, there could be no guarantee that such commuted sums would be used to fund affordable housing in the parish – and certainly not to the extent to justify any market schemes of between 6 and 10 units being permitted in the AONB outside the village settlement boundaries.

However, were any market schemes of between 6 and 10 units brought forward within any of the villages as infill (possibly, in the form of flats or higher density housing), then - having regard to the PPG advice regarding contributions for affordable housing in AONBs - a commuted sum for off-site affordable housing may be appropriate.

6. Should the conversion of rural buildings be subject to a principal residence condition when the permitted development rights do not impose such a restriction?

The whole of the parish is in the AONB and Class Q permitted development rights for the conversion of agricultural buildings to dwellinghouses do not apply on article 2(3) land (GPDO 2015, Q1(j)).

The intention is that such conversions should be occupied year round in order to contribute to sustainable development and help support our local shops, schools and services. This is a necessary and proportionate response to a local issue.

7. Is there a contradiction between Policy TP4 which allows infill housing of up to 5 units or individual plots and Policy TP7 criterion i., which requires a one for one replacement “and excludes the inappropriate subdivision of plots”? If a large house on a large plot within the settlement boundary were to be demolished, would it not be an opportunity to create smaller houses within the settlement boundary which could then be subject to the principal residence condition. Normally restrictions requiring one for one replacement are only sought in countryside areas rather than within settlements.

Agreed. The demolition of a large house on a large plot within the settlement boundary would be an opportunity to create smaller houses within the settlement boundary and provided they were subject to a principal residence restriction, they would contribute to the vitality of the village.

Policy TP6 would also need to be amended so that only one for one replacement dwellings are excluded from a principal residence restriction.

8. Can there be OS based plans showing the sites of all the non-designated heritage assets, which shows the extent of the site to be protected by Policy TP23. In particular, there needs to be clarity for applicants and decision makers as to location of the heritage asset when considering a planning application. Possibly could they be shown on amended Figures 18 and 19? At the present time, I am uncertain as to the geographical extent

of the protection offered by the policy when it refers to the Streetscape at Bantham and the 2 quays and the Leat at Buckland.

Agreed. OS based plans could show the sites and geographical extent of all the non-designated heritage assets so that there is clarity for applicants and decision makers as to the location of the heritage asset when considering a planning application. We would suggest a new Figure 20 to replace the photograph on page 73 (the same photograph appears in Appendix B).

Responses to Questions for South Hams District Council

9. Does the LPA consider the allocation of affordable housing to be a planning policy or a matter for the Housing Authority, under the local housing allocation policy?

The allocation of Affordable Housing is considered to be a planning policy matter since it is a critical factor in meeting local need, particularly in rural areas.

The LPA secures local connection requirements through s106 agreements. This is most frequently used for smaller schemes or exception / departure sites.

Does that housing allocation policy restrict occupation to persons with a Local Connection?

The LPA restricts occupation to the Parish in the first instance. Where the number of properties exceeds local demand availability ‘cascades out’ to ever more distant locations.

The only exception to Local Connection is the ex-service personnel and intermediate home ownership products.

Can you provide me with details of the Devon Covenant referred to in Policy TP3?

Please see <https://www.southhams.gov.uk/article/3545/Designated-Rural-Area-Restrictive-Covenants-S157>. This relates directly to properties that were purchased under the right to buy of local authority properties.

10. I would welcome the LPA's views on questions 5 and 7:

5. Do you think that the restriction of market houses to 5 units will restrict the delivery of affordable housing in the village having regard to advice in the PPG regarding getting contributions for affordable housing in AONBs, for schemes between 6 and 10 units?

The Council anticipates that Affordable Housing would be delivered through Exceptions Sites.

7. Is there a contradiction between Policy TP4 which allows infill housing of up to 5 units or individual plots and Policy TP7 criterion i., which requires a one for one replacement “and excludes the inappropriate subdivision of plots”? If a large house on a large plot within the settlement boundary were to be demolished, would it not be an opportunity to create smaller houses within the settlement boundary which could then be subject to the principal residence condition. Normally restrictions requiring one for one replacement are only sought in countryside areas rather than within settlements.

Yes, there is potentially a contradiction. The Council suggests greater clarity in the policy to recognise that the creation of smaller plots / houses would be appropriate in certain circumstances.

11. Does the LPA request ecological surveys and archaeological surveys on all planning applications for the conversion of rural buildings elsewhere in the district?

The Council requires an ecological report for sites of 0.1ha or more depending on whether certain triggers are met. See [Wildlife checklist](#).

The Council does not routinely require an archaeological report for all planning applications. The need for a report / assessment responds to the sensitivity of the site.