

SOUTH HAMS LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

RESPONSE TO SHERFORD ACTION PLAN

MAJOR DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK TEAM

SOUTH HAMS DISTRICT COUNCIL

OBJECTIONS

W. H. GOFFIN

P. D. GOFFIN MRS

108, UNDERLANE
PLYMPTON
PLYMOUTH
PL7 1QZ

31ST JULY 2006

STRATEGIC PLANNING MANAGER

PLANNING & REGENERATION

PLYMOUTH CITY COUNCIL

CIVIC CENTRE

PLYMOUTH

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAME WORK

CROSS BORDER ISSUES

SHERFORD

OBJECTION

MR W H GOFFIN

MRS P D GOFFIN

108, UNDERLANE
PLYMPTON
PL7 1QZ

DATED 14TH APRIL 05.
DELIVERED BY HAND 15TH APRIL 05

Letter comprises 4 pages

Strategic Planning Manager
Planning & Regeneration
Plymouth City Council
Civic Centre
Plymouth
PL1 2EW

Dear Sir,

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK – CROSS BORDER ISSUES –
OBJECTION – SHERFORD/PLYMPTON.

We, Plympton residents, wish to formally object to Plymouth City Council's Local Development Framework proposals for the new Town at Sherford and in addition, due to the absence of detailed information with regard to:- infrastructure, linkage, utilities and environmental and transport issues, the potential impact on the Community of Plympton relating to other proposals, the effect of which will compound difficulties already gaining momentum in the area.

- i. **Sherford** – The proposed location hard against the A38 and utilising the Deep Lane Junction is quite frankly a nonsense. This proposal ignores the already accident prone black spot and the history of recent fatalities at existing levels of traffic concentration. The proposal is contrary to the South Hams First Deposit Local Plan and the Devon Structure Plan. It also re-introduces details already given as a reason for rejecting the development at Lee Mill. (Development should not be squashed against the A38.)
- ii. The proposal in respect of access through the A375 and the implication regarding Haye Road is ill conceived. It presupposes that those who will live at Sherford will somehow be some kind of different species than those currently residing in Plympton concerning the manner of car use. What appears to be ignored is that Haye Road has become a main artery from the A379 into Plympton and down on to Plymouth Road, through Cot Hill. In the last 5 years, traffic flow has increased out of all proportion. Cot Hill separates two industrial estates East and West. It links to Saltram and abuts residential communities with a mix of more modern and older Plympton properties. Cot Hill is restricted at its junction with Plymouth Road and access to the East via Merifield Rd, Underwood Road, Underlane and Dudley Road and East via the Valley Road industrial estate, is restricted at the narrows as these roads constrict into Underwood Road and access to Ridgeway and Plympton St Maurice. The proposal that a Park and Ride aimed at reducing traffic impact from Sherford, ignores totally the prevailing pattern which includes Elburton and Plymstock.
- iii. Park and Ride already exists in Plympton at the Coypool site, with no discernable reduction in the traffic hiatus at Marsh Mills or along Plymouth Road.

- iv. The impact of potentially up to 4,000 vehicles commuting from Sherford cannot be viewed in isolation from the major developments at Plymstock Quarry and the ex Blue Circle site. Vehicles from those sites will travel both East and West either to the City, through the A379 or seeking access to the A38 in both directions. The second crossing at Laira Bridge will simply create a bow wave in both directions once crossed.
- v. The proposals regarding Derriford and the Estates to the North cannot be viewed in isolation. Proposals relating to Forder Valley and linkage to the A38 also has an effect on Plympton. Single incidents on the Parkway and at Deep Lane have caused very serious consequences of total log jam, blocking the main routes West and East and into Cornwall, including road access to Derriford Hospital.
- vi. There is a history of problems associated with heavy industrial traffic using Valley Road, Dudley Road, Cot Hill and Market Road with its proximity to St Mary's, Old Priory, Hele's, Ridgeway and Chaddlewood Schools and St Mary's Church. The prospect of heavy goods traffic serving Langage, mixing with commuting traffic from Chaddlewood and converging on two already busy intersections and then Deep Lane, to the South, or Glen Road back to St Mary's presents a dreadful scenario and yet there appears to be no coherent policy to separate this form of transport.
- vii. The Local Plan seems to acknowledge that Plympton St Maurice should be treated with sensitivity. But Plympton is a major community across a far wider spectrum of 35,000 people. Its green belt is becoming further and further eroded. It has a unique history and should not be subsumed in an urban sprawl into the City or as part of Sherford, or by using City Centre comparisons.
- viii. For the above reason an assumption that all future growth for this area of the South Hams should be on green field sites adjoining Sherford and within the City boundary is totally opposed.

2. Environment.

- i. Plympton has now become virtually saturated with a mix of retail and industrial estates. The retail services provide a virtual out of town shopping criteria by drawing in wider custom to major retailers from all the surrounding area with no real benefit to the Plympton community. Valley Road has become an over congested industrial site with in some cases dilapidated and old business premises. The nightmare of noise pollution associated with Princess Yachts, prior to their vacation of the site should never be repeated. This industrial site which is situated in a valley is totally inappropriate for any process producing industrial pollution due to residential concentration built into the upward slopes.

- ii. Plymouths Planners appear to be prepared to contradict its own policies in respect of the way various permissions are granted. Everything appears to have its price, irrespective of the wishes or the effect on communities. It appears that preparedness to donate sums direct to the Council can be a precondition of approval. Quite rightly the City Planners attempt to safeguard line-of sight implications regarding development on higher elevation. An example is the Boringdon/Woodford/Plymbridge golf course development. Yet it would appear that the City is prepared to support the alternative Sherford proposal which would implement high density housing on an elevated level.
- iii. The one advantage which Plympton does enjoy is Saltram. However the now replaced 10 year Plan envisaged an extension to the industrial site on Saltram land to the North. Furthermore was the intention to develop Marsh Mills as a Rail/Road Terminal. In view of the existing hiatus already outlined in this objection the transport and environmental problems do not bear thinking about. Despite the question being asked at the public meeting no definitive answer was given. Saltram is a National Trust property and any attempt to interfere with this particular jewel in the crown would I am sure be fiercely contested. It would appear that the price of 'planners mania' is to impose the worst of all worlds, or Hobson's choice, in the guise of progress.
- iv. The importation of further quarrying into the City environs North of Hazeldene Quarry, as a trade off in place of mineral extractions consent within the designated area of Sherford New Town is quite frankly a disgrace. Once again the Sherford community are given all the benefits at the expense of existing communities within the City.

3. Utilities

- i. Like all of South West Water customers the people of Plympton pay the highest water and sewerage charges in the whole of the UK. For that privilege the Community has had to endure the foul stench emanating from the sewerage treatment works actually located in Plympton and which has persisted for many years. The City Council has paid lip service regarding complaints and still the problem persists. Obviously the sewerage process cannot cope with the existing demands. The prospect of an additional 4000 home encroaching into the Plympton area, together with the 500 new homes at Newnham with the existing developments already underway in Plympton, plus the Lamage implications, add to the feeling of nausea already carried on the prevailing winds.

Summary.

From the information now available it is clear that the so called democratic process one would have expected at any Enquiry was in fact flawed. The original proposals succumbed to the actions and lobbying of opposition by Parish Councils, including Brixham, and the surrounding rural communities.

All the more reason, it would have been thought to at least involve those who could be potentially affected by any alternative arrangements, at the Enquiry stage. There had at that time to be a hidden agenda. Why else would Enquiry by Design, facilitated by no less than the Prince's Foundation exclude representation from Plympton, at key meetings.

The principle of New Town development should be based on a self contained community with an internal balance of all of the social and economic requirements to the benefit of that particular community. It should not be achieved to the disadvantage of others. By any stretch of imagination that is not progress. That Sherford should not encroach into the green space which exists between Plympton and Plymstock. Extend Saltram by all means as part of a protected green lung, but not at the expense of some trade off arrangement in other areas of the Park. In fact a protected green buffer zone should be developed to protect against a total urbanised spread. That should be achievable by a manipulation of the proposed Sherford perimeter.

This objection identifies major issues under para's 1, 2, and 3 above, which taken individually does identify major difficulties. Taken as a whole, which should be the basis of consideration for the total Plympton community it establishes a mammoth task to be resolved, even before there can be a realistic appraisal in respect of the current proposals.

To add to the already perceived difficulties is the decision nationally to downgrade the A38/ Expressway.

For the above reasons we ask that this statutory objection is appropriately recorded and available for consideration at any future independent Public Inquiry into these proposals.

Yours faithfully.

W H Goffin

P D Goffin Mrs

Strategic Planning Manager
Planning & Regeneration

**ADDENDUM
TO
OBJECTIONS**

SHERFORD

FORMALLY REGISTERED 14 APRIL 2005

IN RESPONSE TO
PRESENTATION OF MASTER PLAN

FIRST PUBLIC PRESENTATION

18 NOVEMBER
2005

BILL GOFFIN
14 NOVEMBER 05

ADDENDUM TO OBJECTION

The Princes Foundation
c/o 7, Forest Gate
Pewsham
Chippenham
Wiltshire
SN15 3RS

SHERFORD – PRESENTATION FRIDAY 18TH NOVEMBER

The masterplan is fine for those who will potentially want to live in the new town. It does not show the infrastructure of how it will impact on the neighbouring communities. Conveniently the Plympton area is not shown to scale adjacent to Sherford and deliberately misleads.

I have already formally objected as a result of the Plymouth City Council presentation in April and would wish replies to the details of that objection. What has changed since that time. I also object to questions posed in advance of the presentation. Further questions or points of clarification are bound to arise.

Additional questions: 50% of the development is affordable housing. What does that mean in Pounds and Pence per household. In other words what is considered affordable housing.

The logistics for such a development are massive. How is it proposed to minimize disruption to existing communities through site access. Woodford are already experiencing the nightmare of transportation of spoil and associated debris

There is also the proposed massive development of Langage and the power generation plant with additional pressure on the Deep Lane junction – How will that be overcome?

I attach the initial objections and would seek answers to the detail in that objection.

Bill Goffin
108, Underlane
Plympton
Plymouth
PL7 1QZ