

ELBURTON AND DUNSTONE

Sustainable Neighbourhoods Development Plan
Document Consultation 16/02/2011 – 30/03/2011



SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

This is a summary of some of the key issues emerging from the consultation process. Fuller versions of the representations can be viewed below.

Nineteen representations were received. The majority of people that expressed a view thought that the summary of the neighbourhood gave a reasonable reflection of the situation. Most comments were from residents but one representation was received from an agent on behalf of a client, and one from a non resident who uses local facilities.

Shopping

Most considered that the local shopping facilities were adequate. There were comments that a chemist would be desirable, and fewer estate agents and charity shops.

Local issues

Practically everyone that responded placed traffic volume and speed as the main concern. Springfield Close and Springfield Road were often mentioned as particular problem areas that required action. Other issues referred to were lack of youth facilities, and need to resist development pressures and protect greenspaces.

Important Greenspaces

All greenspaces were considered to be important, but most frequently referred as being of importance were Dunstone Woods (ref.ED01) the adjacent private field north of Springfield Close (ref.ED06).

Potential Development Sites

There was the general feeling that there should be no further development in the area. Only one site was suggested which was sensitive conversion of barns which are to the east of Elburton shops.

One site to the north of the A379 within the areas covered by the North Plymstock Area Action Plan was suggested, but this is beyond the remit of this consultation.

Other Comments

- Land in the neighbourhood to the north of the A379 should be included.
- The whole document contains many incorrect statements such as having a lower than average level of affordable housing, having two centres, having one of lowest residential densities, and the neighbourhood feeling quite green etc and it should therefore be disregarded.
- Vehicles using the footpath off Springfield Close are a danger to pedestrians.
- The field to the north of Springfield close should not be developed as it is important for amenity and wildlife .It would lead to more traffic and de value property also no dwellings should be demolished to provide access.

ELBURTON AND DUNSTONE

- Q2 – How are you connected with this neighbourhood?**
- Q3a – Do you generally agree with the summary of this neighbourhood?**
- Q3b – If not, what would you like to change?**
- Q4 – What do you think of the shopping facilities?**
- Q5 – Briefly in order of importance, what do you think are the biggest issues in the neighbourhood? e.g. youth facilities, traffic, affordable homes etc.**
- Q6a – Which green spaces/parks are important to you and why? (please identify them using the numbers on the map)**
- Q6b – Are there any areas of green or open space that are not shown which you feel should be protected? Please explain why**
- Q7 – Identify any sites you feel should or could be developed and for what purpose?**

Full Name	Q2 -	Q3a -	3b	Q4	Q5 -	Q6 -	Q6b	Q7 -	Other comments	Upload
Mrs Joy Howard Elburton and District Residents Association SNDPD168	Resident	Yes	Excluding the area covered in the North Plymstock AAP	Adequate	Youth Facilities Volume and speed of traffic Lack of chemist shop	ED01, ED02, ED03, ED04, ED05, ED06, ED07 ED09	King George V playing fields/see NPAAP	Not the Sherford Development Use Brown Fields Sites	This is a lop-sided survey by the exclusion of Haye Road, Vinery Lane and Sherford Road.	
Mr Peter Stackhouse CAD Architects SNDPD143									<p>I write further to a brief conversation with David Taylor of your Strategic Team, on behalf of a Client who has an interest in the land highlighted and I attach extracts from Google Earth for identification purposes only, so that you can establish its location. The land appears to be situated in the Elburton and Dunstone neighbourhood but may also fall within that part which was previously considered under the North Plymstock Area Action Plan.</p> <p>Our Client is looking for the subject site to be included within your relevant sustainable neighbourhood development plan with a view to future residential use which would contribute to the City's housing need and with its position in an already established residential area and bounded on three sides by existing buildings, we would suggest that it would be wholly reasonable to do so.</p> <p>We trust that you have sufficient information to consider this proposal but do not hesitate to let us know should you require anything further at this stage.</p>	
Mrs Truscott SNDPD375										File Attached
Mr Brian Troughton	Resident	No	There is neither need nor demand for	Adequate we have the	Traffic	All of them there should be no	It appears that you have identified most - but I	I know of none apart from a few small plots	It does not come under this remit but I could no see why planning was not granted for the old garrison nursery, on Haye Road - it did not appear	

SNDPD352			'Affordable Housing' whatever that may mean people move here or come here precisely because they like the present mix of housing as it is.	Broadway less than a mile away.	Retention of all green areas Youth facilities for the kid who gather on the Broadway.	further loss of green space. Any development should be brownfield or existing building being replaced there are sites in Plymstock which are brownfield.	repeat no loss of any more green space.	with Sherford looming with all the people and traffic that will bring to Elburton we define do not need any more houses here.	to me to be detrimental to anyone and looked just like a fill in - maybe I do not have the whole story.	
Barbara Mickley SNDPD288	Shop at Centre	Yes		Good	Traffic Volume and Speed. Agree Stanborough Road needs crossing places for pedestrians.	'ED' symbols need naming.				
Ann Grantham SNDPD315	Resident	No	No, the estates were built for families, housing, single bungalows and 2 storey houses.	Ok with supermarkets that is enough. Butchers and post officers are important.	Traffic. To build more housing with average 3/4 cars per house would be criminal.	Elburton Field, Dunstone Woods are priceless especially for families and dog walkers ED01, ED06.	Dunstone Woods and Field, safety health and safety for families dog owners and children. Everyone needs exercise.	No sites should be built on, The damage noise and dangers to resident's family homes would loose value the beautiful character of the estate, peace and safety would be destroyed.	<p>Having lived here for over 50 years it is with shock that the owners of the 'field' between Dunstone Woods and Springfield Close should be allowed 'Building' permission.</p> <p>At a time of stress, money problems and pressure of the recession, families and home owners should not have this at this time.</p> <p>It is understood that the 'field' owners have bought 2 houses in Springfield close and hope that the City Council Planners will allow them to knock the houses down regardless that lives near them to get a gateway to Springfield Close and the 'Field'.</p> <p>Homes in the 'Close' would loose their value and 4 ton lorries would be too large for the 'Close' to cope with and with the world today ones home is priceless not anymore if the planning went to the 'Field Owners'.</p> <p>Dunstone woods are a trust and over the years, it has just coped with bicycles which should be band. If cheaper homes were built, the life of the woods is limited the 'Trust' should be notified so that they can prepare for the future either way.</p> <p>The owners of the 'Field' could have made it into a park, for walking and pleasure but no, there is no money in that.</p> <p>Our front gate is on the close near Springfield Road easy access to the front door with the fear of homes and volume if more traffic will it be safe to park on the 'Close'?</p> <p>I hope sincerely that the 'planners' dealing with this nightmare will think carefully of the negatives as this will affect the whole estate.</p> <p>The survey and title deeds of our homes (properties) ltd no mention of houses, having the right of being knocked down for roads in the future.</p>	

									It has been noted, that cheaper housing is an open door to bad behaviour, noise, can it be guaranteed this will not happen?	
Mr E R Mingo SNDPD345	Resident	No	Strongly disagree - see further comments	Adequate and sustainable	Traffic particularly in Springfield Road. Over development if green spaces are built on - see further comment.	The numbering on the map is confusing (the difference in ED01 and ED06 is far from clear) ED01 and ED10 seem to be school playing fields and ED08 is not on a green area. See further comments.	See further comments.	The unused barns immediately east of Elburton Shops could be carefully developed to retain the village characteristics. With the proposed major development in the designated North Plymstock Area and Sherford there should be very limited development in Elburton and Dunstone to sustain the present standard.	<p>This document should be disregarded for future planning. The introduction contains the statement 'Much of the northern part...quarry at Moorcroft'. This shows the writer did not understand the area of Elburton and Dunstone as designated by the map as the area north of the A379 IS NOT in the area being discussed. This severely limits the value of the comments.</p> <p>The conclusions noted under 'What have we found out about your community' has many INCORRECT statements. I understand the need for a concise document but the statements are unsubstantiated.</p> <p>Please note:</p> <p>Statement: 'The neighbourhoods has two centres' WRONG. There is only one centre (as defined on the map as Local Centre). Dunstone does not have a centre of businesses to be sustained 'do not have large enough population - WRONG. At present all the business premises in the Local Centre - Elburton are occupied and actively used by local residents.</p> <p>Statement - The neighbourhood - one of which is quite isolated from WRONG Elburton school is central to the Elburton Village, Dunstone School is central to the area it serves. It does not need to be 'near other facilities.</p> <p>Statement - The neighbourhoods has a lower than average ...WRONG. This area does not include the relatively recent developments of mainly detached house off Sherford Road or the well regarded 'Fletcher' estate of Furzhatt Road but does include flats in Springfield Road, terraced cottages in Springfield Road and Wembury Road all of which convenient to the Local Centre. There are also major areas of relatively affordable semidetached homes in the Wimpy built developments at Blackstone Close and Knapps Close/Wellhay Close. We know statistics can be used to prove almost any statement but lower than average is a very undefined statement.</p> <p>Statement 'Elburton and Dunstone have one of the lowest ... WRONG. Given the facts in the sentence immediately above concerning flats and cottages in Elburton I would question this statement relative to many similar small areas in Plymstock and Plymouth in general.</p> <p>Statement many cul-de-sacs makes it difficult to move - WRONG. Cul-de-sacs reduce through traffic flow and improve safety BUT there are many footpaths such as through Dunstone Woods to Elburton village or from Elburton Village to Coombe Dean School through park ED03 etc that encourages people to walk and makes it easy to move around. Why make a negative statement about this aspect that is typical of so many areas around Plymouth?</p>	File Attached

									<p>Statement - Public transport - within the area not very good. As the area is approximately 1.5 miles at its longest why question the transport within the area. A good bus service runs along Elburton Road, Stanborough Road and Springfield Road. Another negative statement about the area.</p> <p>Statement - The neighbourhood feels quite green due to spaces - WRONG. There are very limited green areas in Elburton and Dunstone. The map sets the wrong impression of the number of green areas by designating school playing fields ED10 and ED09, public parks ED02 and ED03 plus and unknown ED08 as green areas - left over. Removing these areas reduces the green areas and those remaining should be protected with very limited development.</p> <p>Statement - The average distance - may be a problem. Another unnecessary negative statement.</p> <p>There are so many errors in this document it should not be used for any future planning. It seems very biased against pleasant self sustainable residential areas and the remaining largest green areas of ED05, ED07 ED06 and/or ED01 should NOT be developed.</p>	
Mrs Ann Christine Payne SNDPD320	Resident	Yes		Adequate	Traffic - Springfield Close is increasingly being used as a "rat run" by people wishing to avoid congestion (and potholes) in Elburton Village & traffic lights in Springfield Road	ED06 see comments ED01 a rare wooded area, visible from a great distance ED02 a valuable green community space			<p>Re: ED06 - this field provides hunting ground and Sanctuary for birds & animals and also provides habitat for butterflies. It should be preserved as a preserved as a green space and should be protected from development. In the past there was a bollard at the entrance to the footpath from Springfield Close to ED06, this should be re-instated a) for safety of pedestrians coming to the road b) to prevent unauthorised vehicular access - the bollard could be lockable/removable to permit council access for maintenance of the path.</p>	
Mr Roger Payne SNDPD321	Resident	Yes	Springfield Close is becoming a rat run	Ok but could do with less house agents and charity shops & more small owner/occupier type shops	see 3b	ED01 Woodland with wildlife ED06 Hunting ground for wildlife in ED01 ED02 Public green area ideal for children & dog walkers	ED06 must be protected to give wildlife in ED01 a chance to survive.	ED06 must be a greenfield open wild space to support the wildlife in ED01. I hear owls living in the wood (ED01) although I have not sighted them they must hunt in the wild area of ED06 - bats also are in the area so may hunt insects in the wild field area of ED06. Last year I saw a slow worm on the south (top) path through ED01 no		

								doubt there are more in ED06		
Ms Anne Dodwell SNDPD322	resident	No		Not enough variety	Speed of traffic especially Springfield Close - danger at entrances to footpaths coming out onto road - no warning - needs a speed ramp to stop the terrific speed build up.	ED01, ED02, ED06		No	This open space known as the Pony field needs to be left free in order for the woods to live and breathe. Owls amongst other species hunt in this agricultural land. The lane is used by so many people - school children and dog walkers and enjoyment of the wood. It is a footpath not for traffic - an ancient footpath. Don't let greed spoil our open environmental treasure for the future.	
Mr J.B Hargreaves SNDPD323	Resident	No		A chemist would be ideal	Traffic	ED01, ED02, ED06		No	I have lived next to Dunstone Woods since 1963; the footpath leading from Springfield Close, to Dunstone Woods has always been for pedestrians only! Recently I have witnessed motorised vehicles breaking down the hedges with their tyres and in doing so they have damaged tress on each side of the lane, which are on private property! My point is.... you can't advertise a public footpath where it is safe for people to walk, to find motorised vehicles coming towards them! When I was a child, there was a concrete mound which stood approx. 2ft high positioned at the end of the lane near the pavement... what happened to it?	
Mr P.J. Lee SNDPD344	Resident	Yes		Satisfactory	Maintaining the character of the area	ED01 & ED06	ED01 - ED02 - ED06 should be designated as a protected wildlife haven (see comments)		The green spaces designated ED01, ED02 and ED06 are an essential part of the natural environment for this area, providing a refuge for wildlife particularly small mammals, birds reptiles, insects and wildflowers. The area is regularly used by residents for walking and by local schools for nature walks etc. Any development of these areas would seriously damage the viability of this green space as a wildlife haven.	
Miss Susan Down SNDPD358	Resident	Yes		Reasonable	Traffic	ED06 - ED01 - ED02	No		Lack of access routes to the pony field ED06 etc.	
Mrs V Harrison SNDPD360	Resident	No		Just about satisfactory, could have a chemist	Speed of traffic at Springfield Close perhaps a speed hump would help	The greenfield space nos. ED01 ED02 ED06 are very important to dog walkers and the residents	The increase in traffic in Springfield Close would be very intolerable if any development was allowed in the area.	There seems to be enough development at the present time in the Elburton area		
Ms Rosemary Willsher SNDPD361	Resident	Yes		Poor	Traffic	ED01 ED02 ED06			We value our wood and wildlife for ourselves, children and pets - further building would ruin our peaceful neighbourhood and devalue our properties owing to the constant flow of added traffic and plant and make our lives a misery	
Mr Ron	Resident	Yes			Traffic	ED01 ED02 ED06				

Brenton SNDPD362										
Mr & Mrs Clem & Doreen Spencer SNDPD364	Resident	Yes		Satisfactory but only just, there could be more variety e.g. D.I.Y and chemist maybe	Green spaces and traffic speed at junctions especially where Springfield Close meets Springfield Road	ED01 ED02 ED06				In recent times, permission has been sought and refused for building in the field bounded by Dunstone Wood and Springfield Close. There have been occasions when the public footpath has been used for vehicular access to the field (e.g. tractor, J.C.B. and 4x4s) thereby damaging the hedges either side. There are so many dog walkers and others including groups of children from schools that the public footpath must be kept as such
Mrs Helen Northcott SNDPD359	Resident			Elburton Village is good - post office, co-op, family butcher, newsagent	Speeding traffic on Springfield Road Speeding traffic on Springfield Rise (traffic which avoids one way system on Reservoir Road)	ED01 ED02 ED06				
Mrs S Mingo SNDPD319	Resident	No	Strongly Disagree - see further comments	Adequate and sustainable.	Traffic, particularly in Springfield Road. Over development if green spaces are built on - see further comment.	The numbering on the map is confusing (the difference in ED01 and ED06 is far from clear) ED01 and ED10 seem to be school playing fields and ED08 not on a green area. See further comments	See further comments.	The unused barns immediately east of Elburton shops could be carefully developed to retain the village characteristics with the proposed major development in the designated North Plymstock area and Sherford. There should be very limited development in Elburton and Dunstone to sustain the present standard.	See attached separate Sheet	File Attached