

# 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	2243
Reference No. ....	.....
Date Acknowledged .....	.....

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

### 1. Personal Details

Title

First Name

Last Name

Job Title (where relevant)

Organisation (where relevant)

Address Line 1

Line 2

Line 3

Line 4

Post Code

Telephone Number

E-mail

### 2. Agents Details (if applicable)

**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](http://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:

PLYMPTON ST MAURICE CONSERVATION AREA WAS REPRESENTED BY ANONYMOUS PERSON VIA PLYMPTON ST. MAURICE CIVIC ASSOCIATION

**4(a). Nature of Representation**

Do you consider the DPD is:

**Sound<sup>1</sup>**

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.

<sup>1</sup> 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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Policy <input type="checkbox"/>	Proposals Map/Plan/Diagram <input type="checkbox"/>
---------------------------------------	------------------------------------	--

**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.

PLEASE SEE ATTACHED LETTER.

(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.**

**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**

3 / 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**

Grove House  
23 Longbrook Street  
Plympton. St.Maurice  
Plymouth  
Devonshire  
PL7 1NJ

2243

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

3<sup>rd</sup> August 2006

Dear Sir / Madam

I am writing in response to the Sherford Area Action Plan. I consider the Development Plan Document '**Unsound**' with regards to the **Test of Soundness 6:**

"The strategies are not coherent and consistent within and between Development Plan Documents prepared by the authority and by neighbouring authorities, where cross boundary issues are relevant"

Plymouth City Council in their Local Development Framework No.16 Cross Border Issues states, "A particular issue is the need to safeguard the character of the Plympton St. Maurice conservation area. The character of the conservation area is unique with it being a medieval borough with many listed buildings of exceptional heritage value. Some of its historic associations include;

- A Norman Castle with has endured two sieges
- Being one of only four Stannary towns within Devon
- Being the Cradle of English Art with it's associations with Reynolds, Haydon and Eastlake
- In the past having returned it's own members of Parliament, including Sir Joshua Reynolds (the first president of the Royal Academy) and Sir Christopher Wren (architect of St. Paul's Cathedral)

South Hams in their Local Development Framework page 24, Transport 8.13 states, "Local roads, particularly linking to Plympton St. Maurice, Elburton and Brixton, will require sensitive traffic management treatment to ensure a minimal impact from changes in travel patterns and volumes, with the possibility of providing walking, cycling and public transport only connections where appropriate". The development proposals map shows the link between Elburton and Sherford Road as public transport and limited access only. In contrast the same map shows Plympton Hill as a local access route subject to appropriate traffic measures.

I feel that this proposal cannot be allowed to continue in its present form. Any local access route through St. Maurice's narrow streets will devastate its character due to the increased volume of traffic, pollution and reduced safety for its residents. The change in my opinion that would make the DPD sound would be that Plympton Hill becomes Public transport and limited access only.

The proposals I would like considered are as follows

1. Within Sherford New Town the aim is to discourage rat running to direct arterial roads, and to promote the use of public transport.
  - The road from its centre towards Plympton Hill should be closed by means of rising bollards to through traffic apart from buses, emergency vehicles, walkers, horse riders and cyclists
  
2. Within the conservation area the aim is to alter the perception of drivers with effective and enhancing measures.
  - There should be a pavement from the junction of Wolverwood lane with Plympton Hill north to the existing pavement by the Brook Inn. This would make it possible for Sherford residents to walk safely by grass verge and pavement into the conservation area. It would also make it possible for children to walk to St. Maurice Primary School by this route. It would provide safer access to the sunken lanes, New Barn Hill, Allotment Lane and Six O'clock lane (aims of Eastern Corridor Urban Fringe Countryside Strategy).
  - There should be a clear entry point for the conservation area between Wolverwood Lane and the Brook Inn with a chicane, appropriate signing, and a colour band on the road at this point. Speed restriction should be 20mph.
  - From Longcause to the Brook Inn the pavement should have its tiling (lost in the 70's when services were placed underground) restored. This colour coding would convey a strong message similar to a 'Home Zone'.
  - There should be bollards on the kerbside, one pair by the church in George Lane to deter traffic from getting too close to the pavement in these narrows, a pair where the paths from the neighbouring estate join Longbrook Street, and at the start of the pavement by Wolverwood Lane.

I believe that the measures stated above are the only way that the Conservation Area can be protected and preserved for future generations of residents of Plympton St. Maurice and Sherford alike.

Yours faithfully,

Philip Clowes