

South Hams Local Development Framework

Sherford Area Action Plan Response Form



South Hams
District Council

Please read the Guidance Notes before completing this form in black ink. **A separate form should be used for each matter and should relate to a Test of Soundness for your representation to be properly considered.**

All comments should be received by **4.00pm on Friday 11 August 2006** to guarantee that they will be considered.

For Official Use Only
Reference No. 2229
Date Acknowledged

Please complete this form if you are responding to the Sherford AAP only.

1. Personal Details	2. Agents Details (if applicable)	
Title	MR	
First Name	ARTHUR	
Last Name	SIMS	
Job Title (where relevant)		
Organisation (where relevant)		
Address Line 1	25 SHERFORD CRESCENT	
Line 2	ELBURTON	
Line 3	PLYMOUTH	
Line 4	DEVON	
Post Code	PL9 8DU	
Telephone Number	01752 406414	
E-mail		

Please Note: Following the Submission Stage consultation, if you wish to be notified by the Council of the publication of the Planning Inspector's recommendations, or the Council's adoption of the Sherford AAP, or both please provide the Council with your name and address to the Council's contact details at the end of this form.

Data Protection

The comment(s) you submit on the Local Development Framework (LDF) will be used in the plan process and may be in use for the lifetime of the LDF in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998. The information will be analysed and issues raised will be considered by the Council. Please note that comments cannot be treated as confidential and will be made available for public inspection at the Council offices, and available to view on the Council's website (www.southhams.gov.uk).

3. History of Representation

Did you raise the matter that is the subject of your representation with the Council earlier in the process of the preparation of the DPD, i.e. before it was submitted for Examination?

No

Yes (at Issues & Options Stage)

Yes (at Preferred Options)

If you answered 'No' to the above, can you briefly explain why you did not do so:

4(a). Nature of Representation

Do you consider the DPD is:

Sound¹

Go to Q.4(c)

i.e. that you

support the DPD

Unsound

Go to 4(b)

i.e. you consider

the DPD should be changed

4(b). Nature of Representation

If you consider the DPD is **unsound**, please tick which test of soundness your representation relates to. For more information on any of the 9 Tests of Soundness please see the Guidance Note.

Please note you should complete a separate form for each test you consider the development plan document fails.

Please tick one
Test only

Failure to meet a Soundness Test

1. It has not been prepared in accordance with the authority's Local Development Scheme (LDS).

2. (A) It has not been prepared in compliance with the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI).

(B) Where no SCI exists, it has not been prepared in accordance with the minimum requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.

3. The plan and its policies have not been subject to sustainability appraisal.

4. (A) It is not a spatial plan, or it has not properly had regard to any other relevant plans, policies and strategies relating to the area or to adjoining areas.

(B) It is inconsistent with national planning policy.

(C) It is not in general conformity with the regional spatial strategy.

¹ The Planning Inspectorate defines 'sound' within its ordinary meaning of 'showing good judgement' and 'able to be trusted' and within the context of fulfilling the expectations of legislation.

- 5. It does not have regard to the authority's community strategy.
- 6. The strategies/policies/allocations in the plan are not coherent and consistent within and between Development Plan Documents (DPDs) prepared by the authority and by neighbouring authorities, where cross boundary issues are relevant.
- 7. The strategies/policies/allocations fail to represent the most appropriate in all the circumstances, having considered the relevant alternatives, and they are not founded on a robust and credible evidence base.
- 8. There are no clear mechanisms for implementation and monitoring.
- 9. The plan is not reasonably flexible to enable it to deal with changing circumstances.

For more information on any of the 9 Tests of Soundness please see the Guidance Note

4(c) Nature of Representation

To which part of the DPD does your representation relate?

Paragraph

7-68/69

Policy

SNC7

Proposals Map/Plan/Diagram

5. Changes to the DPD

Please give details of what change(s) you consider necessary to make the DPD sound, having regard to the test you have identified in response to question 4(b). You will need to say why this change will make the DPD sound. Please be as precise as possible.

The South Western section of the new Sherford development should be re-located to the space alongside the A38 allocated for potential future expansion and its 'spine' road re-aligned approximately parallel with the A38 and joining it at a new junction to the West. Alternatively, the South West section could be re-located to the East at Deep Lane. This amendment will make the development 'more appropriate' environmentally and economically and will obviate the necessity for a major road link to the A379.

(Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation. **After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.**

Copy of my submission to you on 23/2/2002 / Devon C.C. on 4/9/02 and my letter to The Prince's Foundation on 24/11/05 are attached.

6(a). Examination

Can your representation seeking a change be considered by written representations or do you consider it necessary to attend in person at the Examination?

Written Representations Attend Examination

6(b). Examination

If you wish to attend in person at the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to attend the Examination.

Signature

Date

5/8/06

Please return your completed Sherford AAP Response Form to:

Post: Major Developments Team, South Hams District Council, Follaton House, Plymouth Road, Totnes, TQ9 5NE

Fax: Marked - Major Developments (01803) 861404

Email: major.developments@southhams.gov.uk

For any enquiries please call **01803 861234**

The Prince's Foundation
c/o 7, Forest Gate,
Pewsham,
Chippenham, Wilts.
SN15 3RS

25, Sherford Crescent,
Elburton, Plymouth,
Devon. PL9 8DU
24th November 2005

Proposed Sherford Town Plan

I refer to your exhibition and subsequent meeting at Plymstock School on the 18th November and would like to make a short comment.

My submissions to South Hams District Council on the 23rd February 2002, and to Devon County Council on the 4th September 2002 (copy attached) envisaged the present type of development being considered. I am disappointed, however, to see that it has virtually been joined onto the north-eastern edge of Elburton.

My contention would be that the south-western "chunk" of the new development should be moved up to a position adjacent to the A38 leaving a substantial "green belt" between the new town and Elburton.

This supports my other contention that the motorway standard A38 trunk road plus the near railway line with it's associated Laira junction should be the main commuter route. The rail link is particularly important in view of modern-day traffic congestion.

To build a link-road to, and upgrade the A379 together with the problem of Laira Bridge traffic capacity would be an expensive alternative which would have very doubtful success.

Yours Sincerely,

Arthur J Sims

SOUTH HAMS LOCAL PLAN REVIEW (1995-2011)

Attachment to the form of objection completed by Arthur J Sims, 25, Sherford Crescent, Elburton.

Paragraph 5 (Grounds of objection.)

The creation of 4 "villages" at Sherford will use up a very large area of green land and create huge problems with traffic and pollution not only in and between the "villages" themselves but spilling over into a large surrounding area. The 'commuter corridors' will spread pollution over an even wider area. No, this scheme is an architectural and planning dream which smacks of the 'let's try something different' approach and which bears little relation to the real world. The environmental cost is much too high and your idyllic "villages" would not materialise.

Paragraph 6 (Possible changes to the plan)

If we are forced to accept the fact that this additional housing is really necessary, by far the best solution is the formation of a new town where different types of accommodation can be merged together without being visually obtrusive. Provision for schools, public and private amenities, service and semi-industrial areas, and open space is much easier to plan and create at a quarter of the cost of a multi-centred development. The amount of 'green' land required would be much less than the current proposal and there would not be the spread of pollution over a large country area.

If, again, we have to accept that this development has to be east of Plymouth, the best site for a "new town" seems to be in the A38 corridor where you have a major arterial road and also a railway line which could be further developed for commuter traffic without a detrimental effect on the surrounding countryside. If the blessing of Plymouth City Council is important, then first choice of site would be between Plympton and Ivybridge (I believe that Lee Mill has been mentioned in the past), but if not, then farther east than Ivybridge would give a good gap between developments.

To sum up, I consider that the present "4 village" plan should be abandoned and, if still under relentless Government pressure, a "new town" proposal put forward.

SHDC 23/2/2002 ✓
DEVCE 4/9/2002.