

South Hams Local Development Framework

Sherford Area Action Plan (Submission Stage) – Alternative Sites Consultation 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 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	MR	
First Name	DAVID BOKE	
Last Name	FOLEY	
Job Title (where relevant)	MANAGING DIRECTOR	
Organisation (where relevant)	MAGNUM LTD	
Address Line 1	LANSWORTHY HOUSE	
Line 2	13A ELSBURTON ROAD	
Line 3	ELSBURTON	
Line 4	PLYMOUTH	
Post Code	PLA 8JB	
Telephone Number	01752 494510	
E-mail	MAGNUM@KOL.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. The Alternative Site is sound as it fits all the Government Inspector's tests and is physically and financially deliverable unlike to current proposals. The Co-Op Alternative Scheme complies with Professor Cross's previous support following the examination in 2010 that located the Sheffield Valley at "CHITTEBURN" "EAST & WEST SHEFFIELD" AND "WIVERTON" NOT IN ELBURTON AND PLUMPTON. THE CO-OP SCHEME INCLUDES A PARK & RIDE ON THE A374 ON THE OUTSKIRTS OF ELBURTON ON A UNDER UTILISED ACCESS INTO THE CITY. THE SCHEME PHYSICALLY FITS AND IS FINANCIALLY DELIVERABLE & SUSTAINABLE UNLIKE THE TRIBBLE PRINCES FOUNDATION'S PROPOSALS THAT WERE PRODUCED FROM A "BLANK CANVAS" WITHOUT THE WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS HIGHLIGHTING 132KV, 33KV H.P GAS MAINS CROSS & MINERAL RIGHTS HIGHLIGHTED. FENOMINAL PRE-INTRODUCTION COSTS ARE REQUIRED UNDER THE CURRENT PLAN WHERE AS THE CO-OP'S ALTERNATIVE COMMENCES WITH ONE ROUNDABOUT AND ONE SET OF TRAFFIC LIGHTS AND PUTS TRAFF BETWEEN THE A338 & A374 THAT WILL RECEIVE THE A38 WHEN BLOCKED AS IT IS ON A REGULAR BASIS THROUGHOUT ACCIDENTS WILL ALSO EXIT ALTERNATIVE. HAVING SPENT 2 YEARS ON STEERING GROUPS THE CO-OP SOLUTION IS SUSTAINABLE.

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:

HAVING CONTRIBUTED SOME TWO YEARS OF FREE TIME, AND AT SOUTH HAMS INVITATION, SAT ON VARIOUS WORKING (STEERING) GROUPS I WOULD LIKE TO UNDERSTAND HOW THE TEL-BELL & PRINCES FOUNDATION PROPOSALS WERE SUPPORTED DESPITE THE KNOWLEDGE OF COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH DEEP LANE JUNCTION RE-STRUCTURING, M.P. HAS MAJOR DIVERSIONS 132KV & 33KV LINE BURYING. AND THE NOW PLANNED DESTRUCTION OF COMMUNITIES SUCH AS PUMPEAN AND ELBULTON.

PARK # RIDES NEED TO BE ON THE BOUNDARIES OF ELBULTON

WHY HAS PROFESSOR CROWES IDENTIFICATION AND SUPPORT OF THE SOUTH HAMS PROPOSALS NOT BEEN REFINED TO A COMMUNITY ON THE A38 ONE ON THE A379 WITH INWARD TRAFFIC GENERATION

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

14/9/06

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**