

***Further written statement from listed participants - Christina Torrington (comment ID 596) and Peter Bain (Comment ID 616)***

**Re: Site SH51\_21\_16 Stokenham (site assessment document). Plan policy area TTV29.23**

To The Planning Inspectors,

The current plan is not sound with regard to the proposed site in the Stokenham and South Hams AONB.

The plan fails to address the many genuine concerns raised by the (relatively small) Stokenham village community, and other interested parties. The issues highlighted as a result of the public consultation include the inadequate highway access and pedestrian safety, the negative environmental and aesthetic impact on the village residents and the failure to apply the AONB rules. The response to these representations by the council has been cursory, consisting of a series of generic phrases that appear to have been “cut and pasted” into the plan. \*

This site was originally rejected by the government inspector in 2011, due to highway and pedestrian safety concerns. The current traffic congestion is even worse and pedestrian safety is further compromised. The plan fails to prove that vehicle access and pedestrian / cycle safety is no longer a problem for this site.

We have no confidence in the soundness of the current process. Public opinion has been ignored and the decision appears to have been already been made.

\*Ref: “Schedule of Representations PolicyObjectiveThemeArea” – page 204 / 281

Regards

Christina Torrington and Peter Bain