

South Hams Local Development Framework

Sherford Area Action Plan (Submission Stage) – Alternative Sites Consultation Response Form



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 Tuesday
10 October 2006 to guarantee that they will be considered.

For Official Use Only
Reference No.
Date Acknowledged

Please complete this form if you are responding to the Alternative Sites Consultation ONLY

	1. Personal Details	2. Agents Details (if applicable)
Title		
First Name	PLYMOUTH & SOUTH WEST CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETY LTD	PETER
Last Name	FRAMPTONS	FRAMPTON
Job Title (where relevant)		
Organisation (where relevant)	FRAMPTONS	FRAMPTONS
Address Line 1	ORIEL HOUSE	
Line 2	42 NORTH BAR	
Line 3	BANBURY	
Line 4	OXFORDSHIRE	
Post Code	OX16 0TH	
Telephone Number	01295 672810	
E-mail	Peter.Frampton@framptons-planning.com	

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 make a representation with the Council earlier in the process of the preparation of the Sherford Area Action Plan?

No

Yes (Issues & Options Stage)

Yes (Preferred Options)

Yes (Submission Stage)

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 Alternative Site to be:

Sound¹

Go to Q.5

i.e. that you support the alternative site.

Unsound

Go to Q.4(b)

i.e. you do not support the alternative site to the one proposed in the Sherford AAP

4(b). Nature of Representation

If you consider the Alternative Site 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 Alternative Site 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.

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.

(B) It is inconsistent with national planning policy.

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

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

5. Explanation of Representation

Please give details of why you consider the Alternative Site to be either 'sound' or 'unsound'. If you consider it to be 'unsound' please have regard to the test you have identified in response to question 4(b). Please be as precise as possible.

REFER TO ACCOMPANYING STATEMENT

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

10TH OCTOBER 2006

Please return your completed Alternative Site 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

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

SOUTH HAMS

SHERFORD AAP

**ALTERNATIVE SITES SUBMISSION – BY PLYMOUTH AND SOUTH-WEST
CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETY**

SHERFORD REFINED

- 1.0 The following submissions are made on behalf of Plymouth and South-West Co-Operative Society Ltd (PSW) in support of the proposals for the omission site identified as Sherford Refined.
- 1.1 The host policy for the development of the new community at Sherford is Structure Plan Policy ST8. This policy sets out the fundamental requirements for the delivery of Sherford. These include an 'effective high-quality high-capacity' public transport system linking it (Sherford) to Plymouth from the outset of development.
- 1.2 The Master Plan for Sherford Refined can deliver HQPT to the development from the outset of the development, through the provision of a direct vehicular access on to the A379 east of Eburton. This principal access would be provided with a Park and Ride facility as sought by Structure Plan Policy T17 and a transportation interchange.
- 1.3 The delivery and quality of public transport access would provide the greatest encouragement for modal shift away from the motor car to public transport. Provision of HQPT in the form shown on the Sherford Refined Master Plan is supported by local bus operators. The proposals have been costed and can be delivered. No special procedures are required to obtain land to deliver the HQPT, for example the taking of land from playing fields for new road construction. No statutory procedures are required to implement an effective access on to the A379

for the efficient and reliable running of a bus service between Sherford and the City Centre.

- 1.4 The aspiration of the Planning Authorities is to create Sherford as an exemplar of urban design – in short form – to be at the cutting edge of master planning and the delivery of a major urban extension to Plymouth. These aspirations are fulfilled by the Sherford Refined proposal which respects the established settlement pattern in the locality; avoids unnecessary expenditure in the relocation of major services, and can provide the infrastructure and facilities package sought within the Sherford AAP.
- 1.5 Sherford Refined makes provision for potential further expansion beyond 5500 dwellings. Sherford Refined supports the longer term vision to secure new public transport routes into the City Centre. The arrangement for the delivery of public transport at the outset of development enables the potential options for the longer term vision of public transport provision to be properly evaluated without predetermining the eventual solution.
- 1.6 Sherford Refined avoids the real risk that the proposal for Sherford in the AAP would have to commence in advance of the delivery of HQPT to ensure increased supply of housing or alternatively the delay in the production of housing at Sherford pending delivery of a HQPT link. Both scenarios would be harmful to the public interest. The risk of harm is avoided by Sherford Refined.

- 1.7 Sherford Refined has a distinct and important planning advantage over the Sherford AAP Master Plan in that the provision of two major points of access will enable two housing market areas to be established concurrently. This feature is a significant advantage in the overall public interest as it will enable an increased level of housing production to be achieved. The delivery of up to 4000 dwellings by 2016 is an ambitious target. Sherford Refined can respond to this strategic planning requirement in consequence of the sound spatial planning in the proposed Master Plan. Fundamentally Sherford Refined can deliver the key requirements for Sherford as set out in Structure Plan Policy ST8
- 1.8 The fundamental flaws in the Master Plan that is currently included in the Sherford AAP are overcome by the Sherford Refined scheme.