

South Hams
Local Development Framework

Sherford Area Action Plan

Area Action Plan Examination
Topic Paper No. 3: Transport

Topic Paper No. 3: Transport

1. Introduction

- 1.1 Movement, by whatever mode, is inevitably generated by settlements both as internal and external trips. In developing a new community the level and mode of movement is a key part of planning for a sustainable outcome. Sub-regional context, current and future requirements as well as site specific elements all need to be taken into account. In preparing the AAP these aspects have been fundamental elements of the process.

2. Background

- 2.1 The three highway authorities (Devon County Council, Plymouth City Council and the Highways Agency) have been closely involved in the development of the AAP proposal for Sherford since the publication of the Devon Structure Plan, adopted in October 2004. The Structure Plan is a joint document prepared by Plymouth City and Devon County Councils amongst others, and the Highways Agency were a consultee in its production and the evidence presented at the Structure Plan Examination in Public.
- 2.2 Since 2004 all these highway authorities were members, with officers from South Hams District Council, of the Sherford Strategic Steering Group, with the aim of delivering the Structure Plan's requirements at Sherford.
- 2.3 These same authorities were also involved in the Enquiry by Design sessions held in 2004/05, which identified and developed the proposal for the new community now incorporated in the Sherford AAP. Their involvement has continued through studies, reviews and advancement of funding bids.
- 2.4 There has thus been a longstanding spirit of partnership and co-operation between these authorities to deliver the Structure Plan requirements and now the AAP proposal at Sherford.

3. Sub Regional Context

- 3.1 The need for growth in the sub-region is reflected in adopted and emerging spatial strategies such as the Devon Structure Plan 2001-2016 which identifies the need for 14,500 homes in the City and urban fringe. The draft Regional Spatial Strategy, having regard to forecasts for economic growth, provides for 31,500 new homes in Plymouth by 2026
- 3.2 Plymouth has been identified in "The Way Ahead", the regional response to the National Sustainable Communities Plan, submitted by the Regional Assembly and SW Regional Development agency, to lobby Government for resources to deliver the accelerated growth

agenda. Following a successful bid, Plymouth is now recognised by Government as a New Growth Point.

- 3.3 The bid outlined the Mackay Vision for Plymouth, showing that Plymouth does not yet have the critical mass of population to support the highest quality of services found in other major urban areas. To create the greater critical mass it is necessary to build around 30,000 new homes and create around 42,500 new jobs by 2026. Collaborative sub regional working has established a consensus around the sustainable growth distribution within the sub region. Delivery of the vision supported through the Plymouth LDF will create sustainable linked communities across the city. The South Hams and Plymouth LDFs focus the most significant concentration of new development at Sherford and Langage, providing the opportunity for carefully planned urban extensions to Plymouth with sustainable links to the City and the rest of the sub region.
- 3.4 The Plymouth Local Transport Plan 2 (LTP2) is a significant step towards the attainment of longer term requirements for the city and the sub-region. The developments of Sherford and Langage are the key private sector investments proposed along the eastern corridor. Understanding the impacts and the delivery of these schemes is vital to the sub-region, as is the accommodation of traffic impact within the integrated transport network. Through integrating land-use planning in the Local Development Framework (LDF) and transport in the LTP2, Plymouth City Council is seeking to ensure appropriate sustainable infrastructure is provided at these new developments. The City Strategy Vision for Plymouth embraces transport and seeks workable transport links, prioritising bus travel, aiming to increase the numbers of people using local buses and a strong focus on improving services designed to provide clear accessibility benefits. LTP2 was developed alongside Plymouth's emerging LDF. Accordingly, the LDF identifies the development of a strategic High Quality Public Transport (HQPT) route along the Eastern Corridor as 'a key element to enabling the ...spatial vision of sustainable growth to be delivered'. LTP2 expects the new developments of Sherford and Langage to:
- a) Provide viable alternative transport choices and develop sustainable transport provision;
 - b) Combine new transport interventions and persuasive measures designed to alter travel behaviour;
 - c) Encourage modal shift and consider demand management initiatives (particularly during peak periods) where these are clearly linked to wider travel choices and where impacts are fully understood.
- 3.5 The Plymouth LTP2 in Chapter 4, Page 48 makes specific reference to the securing of appropriate cross-boundary transport infrastructure to link these developments to destinations in Plymouth as a means of ensuring that travel needs can be accommodated sustainably. Many of the elements will be funded by developers through the planning

process but the highway authorities also recognise the need to secure alternative sources of funding through the Regional Funding Allocation to deliver a 'step-change' in sustainable transport options along the Eastern Corridor.

- 3.6 The Devon Local Transport Plan has very similar aspirations. For instance, in Chapter 5, page 173 it identifies a Major Scheme in connection with development to the east of Plymouth. Amongst other things it lists high quality unimpeded public transport between Sherford/Langage and major centres within Plymouth. It also identifies a major improvement to Deep Lane Junction and unimpeded access onto the A379 for public transport. It also says that the SW Region has concluded that there is a strong case for funding through the Regional Funding Allocation programme up to 2016.

4. AAP Requirements

- 4.1 The adopted Devon Structure Plan to 2016 in Proposal ST8 indicates that, in respect of transportation, the new community should be linked to Plymouth at the commencement of development by an effective high quality, high capacity public transport system; should include Park and Ride Interchange provision accessible to the A38 and the A379; and be accessible to the Strategic Road Network and the local highway system. The South Hams Core Strategy carries forward the requirements of the Structure Plan and the AAP conforms to the Core Strategy.
- 4.2 Transport and movement has a significant impact, and the Area Action Plan seeks to minimise this impact to more sustainable levels. The location and design of the community is to be such that it encourages sustainable travel modes for movement within it (by provision of an enhanced environment and facilities for walking, cycling and local buses), and outside it (by walking, cycling and the availability of high quality public transport).
- 4.3 From its earliest days of occupation high quality public transport will be introduced, including eastwards to the developing employment area at Langage, which will form part of an overall transport system within Plymouth. A fast, regular and efficient service to the City Centre will help to ensure a significant modal shift. In order to ensure that the bus journey is quicker than by car funding contributions towards improvements along the A379 will be required in conjunction with development of the Sherford new community.
- 4.4 The Sherford development will also provide funding for junction improvements appropriate to the increased demand placed upon them by additional journeys arising from the development. However, the Sherford development will also provide funding for the provision of a Park and Ride Interchange at Deep Lane Junction on the A38 and this will have some mitigating effect on traffic increase from the proposed development.

- 4.5 Vehicular travel will predominantly be along the south west to north east axis. However, there will be traffic that will wish to travel south-eastwards toward Brixton and the South Hams, and northwards to Plympton. The effects of this traffic will be measured in the Transport Assessment, which is required to accompany a planning application, and proposals will need to be put forward to mitigate this impact.

5. Delivery of Transport Infrastructure

- 5.1 The Area Action Plan requires the development to provide a safe, convenient and sustainable movement and transport network for all within and beyond the community. Public transport will not be self-financing until there is a large population base, but it is a requirement of policy for the development to provide public transport from the earliest days in order to set the pattern for such modes of travel. Any developer will therefore be required to demonstrate through a Transport Assessment what transport infrastructure and levels of public transport funding are required, and these will be sought through obligations attached to any grant of planning permission.
- 5.2 Extra car journeys will have an impact on major junctions such as Deep Lane on the A38. A developer will again have to demonstrate through the TA the effect proposed levels of development will have and provide necessary improvements to a level appropriate to that effect (in harmony with advice from Government on impact on trunk roads by development). Other factors such as other major developments could render such improvements abortive, requiring in themselves a greater level of improvement. Thus, any Transport Assessment will have to demonstrate not only what mitigation is required at Deep Lane Junction for the development at Sherford, but also what further improvements may be needed by other development, and these improvements planned for accordingly.
- 5.3 Encouraging the aspiration for the City and supporting the development of necessary infrastructure improvements, Plymouth City Council is the lead authority in the promotion of the Eastern Corridor High Quality Public Transport (HQPT) network as part of a Major Scheme Bid submission for funding via the Department for Transport and the Regional Funding Allocation. To secure this additional funding, all relevant organisations including local planning authorities, highway authorities and developers will unite on transport issues facing this area of the Plymouth sub-region to maintain the confidence already demonstrated at Regional and Government levels.
- 5.4 The delivery of the strategic sites at Sherford and Langage are key elements in the Regional Spatial Strategy and have long been recognised by the RPB and RDA as requiring a degree of public funding support for infrastructure. The Development Plans process is in place to give clear guidance for public as well as private funding decisions and the adoption of the Sherford AAP will be a significant step forward to the identification and release of this funding.

6. The Main Issues raised in the Submission Stage Consultation

- 6.1 The main issues raised in the representations on this matter relate principally to.....
- a) Delivery of HQPT
 - b) Modal shift
 - c) Deep Lane Junction
 - d) A379 Park & Ride
 - e) Impact on local roads [predominately a cross border issue]
 - f) Link to A379 [a cross border issue]
 - i) Adequacy of Haye Road/Stanborough Cross
 - ii) Impact on King George V Playing Fields
- 6.2 The representations submitted on transport consider that the Sherford Area Action Plan fails to meet the following Tests of Soundness;
- 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 the adjoining areas
 - 4. (b) It is inconsistent with national planning policy
 - 6. The strategies/policies/allocation in the plan are not coherent and consistent within and between Development Plan Documents (DPD's) prepared by the authority and by neighbouring authorities, where cross boundary issues are relevant.
 - 7. The strategies/policies/allocation 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.

7. Summary of the issues raised and the Council's position¹

7.1 Re: Test of Soundness 4a.

7.1.1 Summary of Representations

7.1.2 DCC (Rep 920) considers that the AAP should outline the requirements and key principles for the transportation and movement strategy, and

¹ Appendices referred to in this section can be found on the Councils website www.southhams.gov.uk/sherford, and identify all those respondents who have made similar comments.

that the strategy should seek to discourage car use and encourage walking and cycling for the remaining trips.

- 7.1.3 Parking standards should be better than those in PPG13 and linked to proposed car trip generation forecasts. More detail is required on the standard and frequency of public transport in different phases (Applicable to Tests 4, 6, 8)
- 7.1.4 The Ramblers Association (rep. 1093) consider that there are a lack of footpaths in / out of the site and a lack of footpaths in the area to connect them to. 'Shared paths' are not favoured with walkers, particularly those hard of hearing. Paths should be wide enough to accommodate both parties.
- 7.1.5 The Cyclists Touring Club (rep. 1864) considers that the development will result in an increase of traffic and potential dangers for cyclists on the A379, which is in turn likely to result in the removal of existing cycle lanes, thus leaving the local people disadvantaged.
- 7.1.6 The standard letters received from Plympton Community Council Action Group, Plymstock and Plympton City Conservative Councillors and the 'other standard letter' representing individuals (Appendix 1, 2, 3, 18) consider that the proposal will not achieve Policy SNC7 (12). (Applicable to Test 4a and 7)
- 7.1.7 The standard letters received from Plympton Community Council Action Group, Plymstock and Plympton City Conservative Councillors and the 'other standard letter' representing individuals (Appendix 1, 2, 3, 20) consider that the HQPT needs to be available from the commencement of the development. (Applicable to Test 4a and 7)
- 7.1.8 The standard letters received from Plympton Community Council Action Group, Plymstock and Plympton City Conservative Councillors and the 'other standard letter' representing individuals (Appendix 1, 2, 3, and Mr Skinner (rep. 2238) and Chaddlewood Farm Association (rep. 1952)) consider that the A38 and Deep Lane junction should not be used as public transport corridor, which will result in more traffic on the A38, contrary to the policies of the Highways Agency. (Applicable to Test 4a and 7)
- 7.1.9 The standard letters received from Plympton Community Council Action Group, Plymstock and Plympton City Conservative Councillors and the 'other standard letter' representing individuals (Appendix 1, 2, 3) and Chaddlewood Farm Association (rep. 1952), Frederick Sharpe (rep. 931) and R Skinner (rep. 2238), consider that the best opportunity to achieve HQPT is to provide a direct link to the A379 at Chittleburn. (Applicable to Test 4a and 7)
- 7.1.10 RPS (rep. 1936) on behalf of Plymouth City Council (Asset Management Services) object to the exclusion of "PCC's agreement" in respect of the Integrated Movement and Transport Strategy. (Applicable to test 4, 6 and 7)

The Council's Position

- 7.1.11 *Test of Soundness 4(a) requires that the Plan has had regard to any other relevant plans, policies and strategies relating to the area or to the adjoining areas.*
- 7.1.12 *The representations that have been made are that the proposals should encourage more sustainable modes of transport, and that those modes of transport be adequately catered for in type and detail. Concern that parking standards are likely to be too high is also raised.*
- a) SNC 7 (1) requires high quality public transport from the outset.*
 - b) SNC 7 (7) requires good quality connections to the local and national network for cycling, footpaths and bridleways.*
 - c) SNC 7 (8) requires the development to be laid out such that walking and cycling within it are attractive and safe.*
 - d) SNC 7 (10) requires the levels of car parking should improve on the standards of PPG13.*
- 7.1.13 *It is considered that the AAP is in conformity with Policies in the Structure Plan, Core Strategy and relevant national policies. Many of the matters raised, e.g. whether footpaths and cycleways are to be shared or not, how the parking standards are to be derived, and the arrangements for public transport are matters of detail that should properly be left to the detailed consideration through any application made pursuant to the AAP. Furthermore, the Council will work in conjunction with neighbouring and relevant authorities to achieve a common objective with regard to any of these matters.*
- 7.1.14 *One representation said that the proposal will not achieve Policy SNC 7 (12). It is the Council's view that the requirement to link to the A38 and A379 should be achievable. The planning application now received by the Council provides further evidence of this.*
- 7.1.15 *Use of the A38 by public transport. It has been stated above that there will be improvements to the A379 in order to provide a much improved journey time for buses when compared with the journey by private car to reach the City Centre. The need and capacity for buses to use the A38 will need to be addressed in the Transport Assessment submitted with any planning application for development of the Sherford new community.*
- 7.1.16 *A further representation stated that the best opportunity to achieve HQPT is to provide a direct link to the A379 at Chittleburn. There is no evidence that this is the case. However, the proposals within the AAP provide for good public transport links to the City Centre (with off site improvements appropriately facilitated (SNC 7 (1))). Thus it is considered there is no need to alter the AAP in this regard.*

7.2 Re: Test of Soundness 4b.

7.2.1 Summary of Representations

- 7.2.2 Plympton Preservation Group (rep. 1647) and Mrs Cooper (1180) consider the AAP fails to consider PPG 15 (Planning and the Historic Environment) in respect to the impact the new roads will have on the Plympton St Maurice's Conservation Area.

The Council's Position

- 7.2.3 *It is considered that SNC 7 (13) adequately addresses this issue. The precise nature of any measures is more effectively left to the detailed consideration of any planning application made pursuant to this Plan.*

7.3 Re: Test of Soundness 6.

7.3.1 Summary of Representations

- 7.3.2 Red Tree (rep. 913) note that in the North Plymstock AAP the off site highway and transport contributions agenda is much more extensive than Policy SNC7 – Movement and Transport.
- 7.3.3 Plymouth City Council (rep 1110) consider that reference to 'high quality public transport links' should reflect what is being included within the North Plymstock AAP derived from the Eastern Corridor Transport Study, a high quality public transport system with interchanges in locations at the western, central and eastern neighbourhoods, park and ride, including provision of priority measures along the main street (NP05, 39 and NP07). PCC also state that proportionate contributions towards wider transport works in line with the North Plymstock AAP Proposal NP07, NP09 and Policy NP08 should be included within the Sherford AAP.
- 7.3.4 Mr Brophy (rep. 2241) considers there is a discrepancy between the North Plymstock AAP (Diagram 3) and the Sherford AAP (Diagram 5) with respect to traffic along Vinery Lane and Sherford Road.
- 7.3.5 Mr Clowes (rep. 2243) considers there is inadequate traffic calming / pedestrian routes in Plympton St Maurice are proposed.
- 7.3.6 DCC (rep. 920) ask for clarification of the term 'at the outset' (in relation to the deliver of the HQPT), and whether it is consistent with the term 'from commencement of development' as specified within Policy ST8 of the Devon Structure Plan.

The Council's Position

- 7.3.7 *Test of Soundness 6 requires that the strategies/policies/allocation in the plan are coherent and consistent within and between Development Plan Documents (DPD's) prepared by the authority and by neighbouring authorities, where cross boundary issues are relevant.*
- 7.3.8 *Diagram 5 in the Sherford AAP is provided for information and does not act as a proposals map for locations within the Plymouth area. There are strong linkages between the two AAPs and a considerable degree of cross-border co-operative working. The detailed wording within the*

two AAPs may not be identical but it is the clear intent of both Plans to deliver the HQPT identified in the Eastern Corridor Study.

7.4 Re: Test of Soundness 7.

7.4.1 Summary of Representations

- 7.4.2 Turner Holden (rep. 1130) on behalf of Persimmon Homes consider that the link from the A38 at Deep Lane to the A379 is not considered 'appropriate', as neither junction is considered acceptable in terms of highway safety and capacity, and therefore does not meet the requirements of Policy SNC7. (Applicable to Test 7 and 8)
- 7.4.3 Turner Holden (rep. 1130) on behalf of Persimmon Homes consider that Haye Road is not of sufficient standard to accommodate the volume of traffic likely to be generated by the development and wishing to access the A379. They recommend that consideration should be given to alternative routes to provide an appropriate direct connection and junction with the A379. (Applicable to Test 7 and 8)
- 7.4.4 Turner Holden (rep. 1130) on behalf of Persimmon Homes consider that the existing junction at Deep Lane, proposed as the northern connection point of the road link from the A379 is also inappropriate, as it experiences heavy congestion at peak times and is a recognised accident black spot. Without significant improvements to the junction, it is considered inappropriate to accommodate any additional traffic. It is recommended that consideration be given to a suitable junction improvement schemes to be implemented at commencement. (Applicable to Test 7, 8 and 9)
- 7.4.5 Plymstock Community Forum (rep. 1222) and Mr C Munn (rep. 1839) consider that the Eastern Corridor Study is not robust enough to inform the AAP, as it contains many omissions, incorrect assumptions, and insufficient attention has been given to engineering, survey work and traffic infrastructure.
- 7.4.6 Plymstock Community Form (rep. 1222), the standard letters received from Plympton Community Council Action Group, Plymstock and Plympton City Conservative Councillors and the 'other standard letter' representing individuals, DG Minter (rep. 1695), Mr D Lowes (rep. 2971), Miss D Minter (rep. 1696) and Mr R Skinner (rep. 2238) all consider that the main public transport access should not be across King George V Playing Fields, and that the proposal is flawed due to a loss of playing fields, insufficient timescale to achieve delivery and Haye Road is inappropriate for such a use.
- 7.4.7 Turner Holden (rep. 1130) on behalf of Persimmon Homes considers the AAP fails to address how concerns over increased volume of traffic particularly at the Park and Ride can be addressed, nor the resources to implement an ambitious infrastructure programme. (Applicable to Test 7,8 and 9)
- 7.4.8 Turner Holden (rep. 1130) on behalf of Persimmon Homes considers that Criteria 13) of Policy SNC7 fails to address how mitigation

measures against changing travel patterns on the roads can be implemented. (Applicable to Test 7 and 8).

- 7.4.9 Turner Holden (rep. 1130) on behalf of Persimmon Homes consider that the transport policies and proposals are deficient and unsound (applicable to Test 7,8 and 9) in terms of the extent to which the resources are identified and the strategies needed to achieve the Plans objectives. They also consider that little reference has been given to the integration to the PCC's plans (Applicable to Test 4).
- 7.4.10 DCC (Rep. 920) considers that there is insufficient evidence to support the exclusion of the park and ride on the A379, and that the AAP should indicate the need to reassess the requirement for such a facility during the later stage of development.
- 7.4.11 DCC (rep. 920) considers that there is a lack of evidence to discount the alternative route for the A379 connection (Applicable to Test 7 and 9).
- 7.4.12 Turner Holden (rep. 1130) on behalf of Persimmon Homes state that developers at Plymstock Quarry have not yet been approached with a view to coordinating the access strategy for Sherford, and that resources for implementation have not been identified. (Applicable to Test 7 and 8)
- 7.4.13 Plymstock Community Forum (rep. 1222) and Elburton Residents Association (rep. 1495) consider that the proposed public transport is inadequate, and that the HQPT route will not benefit local residents
- 7.4.14 Plymstock Community Forum (rep. 1222) are concerned over the proximity of HQPT to Hazeldene Quarry, Suggest that the HQPT route should run above Colesdown Hill and into Sherford, and are concerned over a lack of a direct route from A379 to A38 for local residents (which avoids the main street).
- 7.4.15 Turner Holden (rep. 1130) on behalf of Persimmon Homes considers there is a lack of detail in respect to the capacity and frequency of the HQPT, and argues that Policy SNC7 does not make it clear whether the HQPT will be available from day 1. They recommended that Policy SNC7 is modified to prescribe in detail the nature of the service. In addition they consider criteria 1) is unclear and needs clarifying.
- 7.4.16 Turner Holden on behalf of Persimmon Homes (rep. 1130) question the deliverability / funding of HQPT in Policy SNC16. Infrastructure is unlikely to be phased from commencement of development (Applicable to Tests 7, 8 and 9).

The Council's Position

- 7.4.17 *Test of Soundness 7 requires that the strategies/policies/allocation should represent the most appropriate in all the circumstances, having considered the relevant alternatives, and they are founded on a robust and credible evidence base.*

- 7.4.18 *The AAP shows a connection from the south western end of the development to the A379 via King George V Playing Fields and Hays Road. An alternative route for the A379 connection south of Elburton was included in the AAP at the Preferred Options stage but was removed in the Submission stage, as this route would be delivered within the Plymouth area and was not included in the North Plymstock AAP following the results of the Eastern Corridor Study.*
- 7.4.19 *The AAP does not specifically address the issue of how a connection is to be made to the A379 via Hays Road and Stanborough Cross as this is a matter relating to the North Plymstock AAP, although it would be expected that a Transport Assessment would have to show its adequacy in deliverability and capacity terms.*
- 7.4.20 *SNC 7 (14) requires appropriate and proportionate contributions to improvements at Deep Lane junction. Any Transport Assessment that accompanies a planning application will be expected to address the extent of such improvements, their timing, and how they mitigate the impact of development.*
- 7.4.21 *The Eastern Corridor Study, included by Plymouth City Council in its background papers in connection with the consideration of developments along this whole corridor, is an overview of the effects and opportunities arising from development. In this context it is considered sufficient to inform the process, and a Transport Assessment provided through the planning process will address any shortfalls.*
- 7.4.22 *Issues associated with changing travel patterns on other roads in the vicinity of the development will of necessity be addressed through a Transport Assessment and proposals sought to mitigate this impact.*
- 7.4.23 *Devon's Structure Plan Proposal ST8 requires the provision of a Park and Ride facility accessible to the A379. This is not however incorporated in Policy SNC7 as it has been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the local planning authorities [Plymouth and South Hams] through the Eastern Corridor Study that a Park and Ride on the A379 is not required nor would be viable. This was a joint decision between the 2 authorities preparing the AAPs and maintains cross border co-ordination.*
- 7.4.24 *A further representation states that the transport policies and proposals are deficient and unsound in terms of the extent to which the resources are identified. It is considered that the measures listed in the Policies of the AAP are deliverable and achievable and that this will also meet the requirements of the Core Strategy when it is adopted. The Council has already received a planning application to implement the vision of this submission draft AAP, the detail of which application has been subject to ongoing discussions with the Council for several months. This includes detailed negotiations on the implementation and delivery mechanisms for the Section 106 Agreement Heads of Terms that will provide the funding for transport improvements and other benefits required by Policy. This will be complemented by the joint working by*

all the public bodies involved to secure grant funding towards the costs of road improvements.

7.4.25 One representation considers that the public transport provision is inadequate. However, the AAP does not specify the level of such. Any Transport Assessment must demonstrate that the public transport provision will be adequate to address the needs of the community and provide maximum opportunity for modal shift. Such a HQPT provision will become part of a City wide system, and thus be of benefit to nearby residents.

7.4.26 Another representation says there is no direct route for local residents from A379 to A38 that avoids the main street. The plan in the AAP shows the High Quality Public Transport route, through the town centre, as the most direct route. Also shown are “other main routes”, one to the north and one to the south of the proposed community’s heart. It is considered that these should prove adequate, but a Transport Assessment will have to demonstrate the volumes of traffic anticipated along each of these routes, and the final design will need to respond accordingly.

7.4.27 A point of clarification is sought in connection with Policy SNC7. It is said that it does not make it clear whether the HQPT will be available from day 1. Turner Holden recommended that Policy SNC7 (1) be modified. The Council consider that the arrangements for public transport should conform to the Core Strategy and the AAP but matters of detail should properly be left to the detailed consideration through any planning application made pursuant to the AAP. Furthermore, the Council will work in conjunction with neighbouring and relevant authorities to achieve a common objective with regard to any of these matters.

7.4.28 A detailed scheme for the delivery of the HQPT service and its phased introduction have not yet been prepared but the modelling carried out for the Plymouth Eastern Corridor Study gives evidence to the viability of such a service.

7.5 Re: Test of Soundness 8

7.5.1 See Representations and the Council’s responses above.

7.5.2 Other Representations

7.5.3 The following are issues raised where the respondents have not related them to a Test of Soundness –

7.5.4 Summary of Representations

7.5.5 Appendix 23 respondents were concerned over increased traffic / congestion/ pollution/ safety issues / inadequate transport infrastructure particularly at;

7.5.6 Haye Road, in and around Plymouth, on the A379, Marsh Mills, Cot Hill, Deep Lane, Glen Road, Ridgeway, Plympton St Maurice (Conservation Area, Fore Street) , George Lane, Merafield Road,

Plympton, Elburton Road, A38, Chaddlewood, Langage, Plympton Hill / Amados Hill, Sherford Road, Bullers Hill, Ridge Road, local narrow country roads, traffic from Langage, Drunken Bridge Hill, Laira Bridge, Billacombe Road, access to Plymouth city centre, road links between the A38 and A379, Stanborough Cross roundabout, Chaddlewood, Merafield Close, Wiverton, Longbrook Street, Wolverwood Lane, Pomphlett Road, Wembury, Valley Road and Market Road.

- 7.5.7 Devon Rural Transport (rep. 2244) considers that the principles of the plan are good, although the details on how it will be delivered are unclear. They also consider (in para 7.64) that the transport mix should include making use of existing community transport services in the area.
- 7.5.8 DCC (rep. 920) considers that the hierarchy of modes should distinguish between walking, cycling and public transport, and that greater detail and clarity is needed in respect of the 'sustainable travel organisation'. The AAP needs a clear commitment to a package of travel planning initiatives.
- 7.5.9 DCC (rep. 920) considers that clearer guidance on the phasing, function and layout of the A379 – A38 link is required in para 7.72 of the AAP. It is also suggested that information on the HQPT network could be more appropriately incorporated into Section 7.
- 7.5.10 Highways Agency (rep. 1129) in respect to paras 7.63 – 7.74 has concerns over the mix of uses which are likely to be acceptable at the park and ride. They also state that the high quality bus service provision should not be over-prescriptive regarding stop / interchange facilities, quality and frequency, until the business case for the HQPT is better understood.
- 7.5.11 Mr Rogers (rep. 2247), Mrs Rogers (rep. 2248) and Miss Rogers (2249) consider that there is an inconsistency between North Plymstock and Sherford AAP with regard to 'potential long term links' crossing Colesdown Hill.
- 7.5.12 Appendix 21 considers that all transport infrastructure should be in place before development commences.
- 7.5.13 Appendix 17 considers there is an inconsistency between North Plymstock and Sherford AAP in respect to access into Plympton St Maurice, and that access to Plympton St Maurice should be changed to 'public transport and limited access' rather than local access, and the Conservation Area should be afforded more protection.

The Council's Position

- 7.5.14 *It is considered that all of the above are either covered in other sections above, or are matters of detail which are matters for a planning application to address.*

7.5.15 Summary of Representations that seek a clarification of the AAP

7.5.16 The Highways Agency (rep. 1129) have asked for clarification of Policy SNC7 Criteria (14) to ensure that it is clear that in the absence of any other major developments in the vicinity all the costs will fall to the developer for the complete major junction improvement at Deep Lane.

The Council's Position

7.5.17 *In accordance with DTLR Circular 04/2001 -Control of Development Affecting Trunk Roads and Agreements With Developers Under Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 - the developer will be required to provide sufficient information via a Transport Assessment to allow the impact of the Sherford development on the A38 Deep Lane junction to be properly assessed. Developers will be required to secure whatever highway works are shown to be necessary to accommodate all traffic generated by the development of Sherford in accordance with that Circular.*

7.5.18 DCC (rep 920) consider that the AAP must have commitments to deliver the transport and movement objectives at the outset. Suggest that the AAP should state that all properties 'will' be located within a 400m walking distance of a bus stop.

The Council's Position

7.5.19 *SNC 1 (2) requires that at least 80% of dwellings shall be within a 5 minute walk of a centre. This is equivalent to just under 400 metres. In order to provide the best possible modal shift, as many as possible should be close to a bus stop. The high quality public transport will stop in the local centres, so a high proportion of the residents will be close to one of these stops. However, there will be other local bus services interconnecting with the town centre and other destinations throughout the new community so it is considered reasonable to expect that all dwellings will be within a 5 minute walk of a bus stop and this will be pursued through the planning application process.*

7.5.20 GOSW (rep. 1) consider that there is scope to reducing the number of components within Policy SNC7, and suggest that (3) and (4) should be treated separately, and that (5) is dealt by SNC11 – 14.

The Council's Position

7.5.21 *Regardless of whether SNC 7 might be better set out it is not considered that this will affect the ability of the Policy to deliver the intended outcomes or the soundness of the plan.*

7.5.22 All those respondents listed in Appendix 18 ask for clarification of 'traffic management measures' required in relation to Plympton Hill and Plympton St Maurice.

The Council's Position

7.5.23 *Traffic effects upon communities near to the proposed site will be measured in the Transport Assessment and proposals sought to mitigate their impact. At this time it would be premature to suggest what these measures could be, in part as they will depend on other processes including Local Highways Committees.*

7.5.24 Devon Rural Transport (rep. 2244) considers that there is a lack of transport provision to meet the needs of young people, particularly safe and reliable evening public transport.

7.5.25 Devon Rural transport (rep. 2244), and Mrs Harrison (rep. 2631) note that there is no mention of providing links to rail services.

The Council's Position

7.5.26 *The proposed High Quality Public Transport will be part of a system in Plymouth that will serve all destinations, including the main railway station, and at all reasonable times of day, not just the morning and evening travel to work time.*

8. Conclusions

8.1 The AAP is considered sound and clear in its objectives and requirements to achieve a sustainable community which has a wide choice of travel modes, and which would not use the car as first choice of travel for the most common of journeys, whether within or outside the community.