

City of Plymouth Local Plan 1995-2011. First Deposit.

Summary of Area Specific Representations.

Drake, Stoke and Trelawny Wards

July 2002

Contents

Introduction

Next Steps

For Further Information

Annex 1. Maps

Annex 2. Tables

Table 1. Local Plan 1995-2011. First Deposit Version. Overview of representations.

Table 2. Local Plan Representations for Drake, Stoke and Trelawny Wards: Cumulative totals.

Table 3. Summary of area and site specific representations relating to more than one of the wards of Drake, Stoke and Trelawny.

Table 4. Summary of area and site specific representations. Drake.

Table 5. Summary of area and site specific representations. Stoke.

Table 6. Summary of area and site specific representations. Trelawny.

Introduction

This is one of a series of reports being published to inform people of the formal representations made on Plymouth's Local Plan for 1995-2011 at its First Deposit Stage.

The Local Plan was on public deposit from 25th January to 15th March 2002. In that period 3,569 representations were received, 64% objecting to a part of the Plan and 36% supporting a part of the Plan. (See Table 1 in Annex 1). This compares to 1,188 representations, 89% objecting and 11% in support, for the Local Plan which was adopted in 1996.

This report summarises, in map and table format, representations received relating to site and area-specific issues in *Drake, Stoke and Trelawny* wards. Other reports will summarise site and area-specific representations for:

- *Compton, Efford and Mount Gould* wards,
- *Honicknowle, Budshead, Ham, and St. Budeaux* wards,
- *Plympton Erle and St. Mary* wards,
- *Plymstock Dunstone and Radford* wards,
- *Southway, Eggbuckland and Estover* wards,
- *Sutton, St. Peter and Keyham* wards,

each covering a group of wards represented by an Area Committee of Plymouth City Council.

A *general report* summarising representations on the Plan's strategies and policies, and other representations of a general and city-wide nature, will be produced separately.

In considering the information on representations set out in the maps and tables, the *following should be noted*:

1. The summaries of individual representations made in the tables are written to help the reader have a feel for the nature of the representation submitted. They are not the representation in full, and it is the full representation that the City Council will consider.
2. The information included in the tables represents the best available information at the time of producing the report. As representations are considered it may be that the nature of a representation is clarified. This could result in an adjustment to the summary of the representation and the overall figures. Such fine-tuning of the Local Plan representation database is in the nature of the process.

Next Steps

Having summarised all of the representations made on the Local Plan, Planning Officers need to ***consider all of the comments made and make recommendations to the City Council*** on whether or not to make changes to the Plan. In considering the representations, Officers will contact and have discussions with many of the people and organisations who have objected. Their aim will be to resolve the objection if this is possible. This process will continue into the ***Autumn 2002***. The City Council views the process of considering representations as a very positive one, which will enable the Plan to be improved.

In addition to considering representations, ***additional research*** will be undertaken to ensure that the Plan is based upon sound information and its impacts have been properly assessed. The main areas of research anticipated at this stage include:

- A study into the best practicable environmental option for waste management.
- Assessment of transport implications of Local Plan proposals, including the testing of options for transport improvements.
- An update of the Plymouth Urban Capacity Study to ensure that brownfield development opportunities are maximised, and that such development is achievable and sustainable.
- An update of the Plymouth and South Hams Housing Needs Study.
- Studies into employment and marine employment land requirements.

This research will be completed by ***early 2003***.

A Revised Deposit Version of the Local Plan will then be published in the ***Spring or early Summer of 2004***. This will be placed on public deposit for a 6 week period. It is important to note that the only representations that can be considered at this stage will be ones made to a part of the Plan that has changed from the First Deposit Version.

A Local Public Inquiry to consider all unresolved objections from the First Deposit stage and new objections to the Revised Deposit Plan will be held towards the ***end of 2003, or early 2004***. This will be overseen by a Government-appointed Inspector.

For further information

Contact the Local Plan team on 01752 305473, or at local.plan@plymouth.gov.uk

Annex 1. Maps.

These Maps are extracts from the Local Plan Proposals Map, annotated to identify representations relating to particular sites. Where site boundaries have been provided with representations, these are highlighted. Where not, the general area covered by the representation is indicated. Some representations cover very wide areas and these have not been mapped. The Maps are indicative only, in order to aid the readers consideration of the nature of representations received.

The details of the representations can be found in Tables 3, 4 and 5.

Representations identified on the Maps fall into the following categories:

- Representations relating to particular **Proposals** in the Local Plan. These can be found in the Section of the Tables headed ***3. Representations relating to Part Three: Local Plan Proposals.***
- Representations relating to particular **Policies** in the Local Plan. These can be found in the Section of the Tables headed ***4. Representations relating to Part Four: Local Plan Policies.***
- Representations relating to particular sites designated as **Greenscape Areas**. These can be found in the Section of the Tables headed ***7. Representations relating to Greenscape Areas.***
- Representations relating to the non-allocation of sites for particular types of development (**Proposal Omission sites**). These can be found in the Section of the Tables headed ***8. Representations relating to omissions.***
- Representations relating to the lack of a policy for a particular site / area (**Policy Omission sites**). These can be found in the Section of the Tables headed ***8. Representations relating to omissions***

map 20 map 26 map 27 map 32 map 33

Annex 2. Tables.

These Tables include information about the representations received on the Local Plan, having regard particularly to area and site-specific representations affecting the Plymstock wards.

Representations in support are distinguished from objections by highlighting them in ***bold and italic***.

**Table 1. Local Plan 1995-2011. First Deposit Version.
Overview of representations.**

Part of Plan	Total representations	Objections	Percentage	Representations in support	Percentage
Part One. Purpose and Context	8	4	50%	4	50%
Part Two. Strategy	222	147	66%	75	34%
Part Three. Proposals	1716	1320	77%	396	23%
Part Four. Policies	1078	496	46%	582	54%
Part Five. Appendices	17	12	71%	5	29%
Proposals Map and Annexes	18	11	61%	7	39%
Greenscape Areas	318	99	31%	219	69%
Omissions	192	192	100%	0	0%
TOTAL	3569	2281	64%	1288	36%

Table 2. Local Plan Representations for Drake, Stoke and Trelawny Wards: Cumulative totals.

Table 2. Local Plan Representations for Drake, Stoke and Trelawny Wards: Cumulative totals.			
Part of Plan	Objections	Representations in support	Total representations
1. Representations relating to Part One: Local Plan Purpose and Context.			
No area or site specific representations for Drake, Stoke or Trelawny Wards relating to this part of the Plan.			
2. Representations relating to Part Two: Local Plan Strategy.			
No area or site specific representations for Drake, Stoke or Trelawny Wards relating to this part of the Plan.			
3. Representations relating to Part Three: Local Plan Proposals.			
Proposal 61. Royal Eye Infirmary.	4	0	4
Proposal 62. Land at Alma Road, Pennycomequick.	4	0	4
Proposal 63. Land at Western Park Road / Home Park Avenue.	5	0	5
Proposal 64. Land at Central Park.	41	5	46
Proposal 116. Stuart Road, Pennycomequick.	0	1	1
Proposal 117. Land at Amey Depot, Valletort Road.	6	3	9
Proposal 118. Fitzroy Joinery Works, Fitzroy Road.	3	3	6
Proposal 119. Stoke and Millbridge Conservation Area.	1	2	3
Proposal 121. Land at Recreation Road.	21	14	35
Proposal 122. Car park at Peverell Park Road.	15	11	26
4. Representations relating to Part Four: Local Plan Policies and allocation of sites under particular policies.			
Policy 26. Established Residential Areas (St Levans Road Gas Site).	1	0	1
Policy 55. University of Plymouth campus and surrounding area.	3	1	4
5. Representations relating to Part Five: Local Plan Appendices.			
Appendix 4 (Drake Ward)	0	1	1
6. Representations relating to Local Plan Proposals Map and Annexes.			
Annex 1 Mutley Plain District Shopping Centre Prime Frontages.	1	0	1

Table 2. Local Plan Representations for Drake, Stoke and Trelawny Wards: Cumulative totals.			
Part of Plan	Objections	Representations in support	Total representations
<i>7. Representations relating to Greenscape Areas.</i>			
Greenscape site 145 Vets & Kennels, Central Park.	1	0	1
Greenscape site 256 Stoke Damerel Church.	1	0	1
Greenscape site 314 Drakes Place Gardens.	1	0	1
<i>8. Representations relating to omissions (i.e. things not included in the First Deposit Version of the Local Plan).</i>			
Proposal Omission Land adjoining Amey Rail Depot	1	0	1
Proposal Omission North Hill Headland Park	1	0	1

Table 3. Summary of area and site specific representations relating to more than one of the wards of Drake, Stoke and Trelawny.

Table 3. Summary of area and site specific representations relating to more than one of the wards.			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
1. Representations relating to Part One: Local Plan Purpose and Context.			
No area or site specific representations for Drake, Stoke or Trelawny Wards relating to this part of the Plan.			
2. Representations relating to Part Two: Local Plan Strategy.			
No area or site specific representations for Drake, Stoke or Trelawny Wards relating to this part of the Plan.			
3. Representations relating to Part Three: Local Plan Proposals.			
O/4/5411/0540	55. University of Plymouth campus and surrounding area.	Mr Robin Midgley	The University campus and surrounding areas is identified as Established Residential Area. This is misleading. This should be corrected to identify present and planned university development. Further development by the University should only be permitted following publication of a strategic development plan for the area.
O/4/6775/2570	55. University of Plymouth campus and surrounding area.	Greenbank Community Association Mrs Lynn Fearon	Disagrees with the extent of the University campus designation. The area to the north of Drake's Reservoir and Elizabeth Place is exclusively residential / business and should not be included within it.
O/4/6815/2800	55. University of Plymouth campus and surrounding area.	Mutley Community Association Ms Margaret Taylor	The criteria relating to "impact of the proposal on residential areas" should be the first listed. Drake's Reservoir should be kept as public greenspace.
S/4/6903/3091	55. University of Plymouth campus and surrounding area.	University of Plymouth Mr Mark Harvey	The policy acknowledges the important role the University plays in the city. The policy is supported.
4. Representations relating to Part Four: Local Plan Policies and allocation of sites under particular policies.			
No area or site specific representations for Drake, Stoke or Trelawny Wards relating to this part of the Plan.			
5. Representations relating to Part Five: Local Plan Appendices.			
No area or site specific representations for Drake, Stoke or Trelawny Wards relating to this part of the Plan.			
6. Representations relating to Local Plan Proposals Map and Annexes.			
O/6/6908/3174	Annex 1 Mutley Plain District Shopping Centre Prime Frontage.	Plymouth & South West Co-operative	Considers 24 Mutley Plain should be excluded from the proposed 'prime frontage'.

Table 3. Summary of area and site specific representations relating to more than one of the wards.			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
<i>7. Representations relating to Greenscape Areas.</i>			
O/7/6580/2157	145 Vets and Kennels in Central Park.	Mr K R Watson.	The land holding including the kennels and veterinary surgery is developed in nature and does not form part of the park land. Therefore it does not demonstrate any of the functions attributed to it under the greenscape policy. The site should be excluded from the greenscape designation and included under a more appropriate general policy area designation, such as 'Mixed Use Area'
<i>8. Representations relating to omissions (i.e. things not included in the First Deposit Version of the Local Plan).</i>			
No area or site specific representations for Drake, Stoke or Trelawny Wards relating to this part of the Plan.			

Table 4. Summary of area and site specific representations. Drake.

Table 4. Summary of area and site specific representations. Drake.			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
1. Representations relating to Part One: Local Plan Purpose and Context.			
No area or site specific representations for Drake Ward relating to this part of the Plan.			
2. Representations relating to Part Two: Local Plan Strategy.			
No area or site specific representations for Drake Ward relating to this part of the Plan.			
3. Representations relating to Part Three: Local Plan Proposals.			
O/3/5099/0151	61 Royal Eye Infirmary.	Mr Norman John Horton	The UCS shows potential for greater number of units through the demolition of recent additions to the Infirmary and building new accommodation in its place. No objection to conversion but opposed to any new buildings in the landscaped grounds – would ruin the setting.
O/3/5446/0584	61 Royal Eye Infirmary.	Mr William George Doidge	Opposed to any student housing – concentration of students already harming the areas amenities. Wouldn't object to conversion to general accommodation, hospital or offices. Do not extend, but demolition and low density housing acceptable.
O/3/5916/1223	61 Royal Eye Infirmary.	Mr & Mrs M Laws	Opposed to moving the Eye Hospital to Derriford. Will cause congestion and inconvenience for patients. Should find money to upgrade the existing Eye Infirmary.
O/3/6790/2658	61 Royal Eye Infirmary.	House Builders Federation Ms Jo Hanslip	Objection to affordable housing requirement of proposal. Considered to be contrary to Circular 6/98. Not justified in Local Plan. Lack of a robust Housing Needs Assessment. Requirement prejudices the viability of development.
O/3/5102/0157	62 Land at Alma Road Pennycomequick.	Mr A Romilly	Density is too high. There should be fewer dwellings. Should not be any social housing.
O/3/6601/2255	62 Land at Alma Road Pennycomequick.	Transport 2000 Cornwall/Plymouth & District Group Mr Don Allen	Should be a car free development. All dwellings should be affordable units.
O/3/6790/2659	62 Land at Alma Road Pennycomequick.	House Builders Federation Ms Jo Hanslip	Objection to affordable housing requirement of proposal. Considered to be contrary to Circular 6/98. Not justified in Local Plan. Lack of a robust Housing Needs Assessment. Requirement prejudices the viability of development.
O/3/6863/3229	62 Land at Alma Road Pennycomequick.	Mrs Heather Crocker	Supports principle. Houses should be architecturally designed with a variety of styles and a range of prices.
O/3/5017/0020	63 Land at Western Park Road / Home Park Avenue.	Mrs Carolyn Peard	Will increase traffic on Western Park Road which is prone to accidents. Affects journey to school. No pedestrian crossing.

Table 4. Summary of area and site specific representations. Drake.			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/3/5022/0028	63 Land at Western Park Road / Home Park Avenue.	Mr J Harper	Will exacerbate existing parking problems in the area.
O/3/6424/1895	63 Land at Western Park Road / Home Park Avenue.	Mr R Widdecombe	Support principle. It will be expensive to develop because of demolition and probable de-contamination works. It should be a high density development. Educational contribution might not be viable.
O/3/5017/2124	63 Land at Western Park Road / Home Park Avenue.	Mrs Carolyn Peard	Unacceptable increase in traffic. Increased danger especially to children.
O/3/6790/2660	63 Land at Western Park Road / Home Park Avenue.	House Builders Federation Ms Jo Hanslip	Objection to affordable housing requirement of proposal. Considered to be contrary to Circular 6/98. Not justified in Local Plan. Lack of a robust Housing Needs Assessment. Requirement prejudices the viability of development.
O/3/5063/0084	64 Land at Central Park.	Mr Derek Unitt	Against building facilities such as a multiplex which are unrelated to outdoor pursuits. No changes suggested but presumably to remove any reference to building facilities unrelated to outdoor pursuits.
O/3/5079/0122	64 Land at Central Park.	Mr David J Townsend	Object to building on open spaces. Change sought is to scrap proposal to build a new sports centre. Also supports proposal 122 (construction of new car park at Peverell Corner).
O/3/5125/0181	64 Land at Central Park.	Mrs Janet Creese	Against any commercial development in the park. No change suggested but presumably to remove commercial development from proposals.
O/3/5138/0195	64 Land at Central Park.	Mr Simon Searl	No new development except upgrading of existing sites. No changes suggested but presumably to allow only for up grading of existing sites. Also objects to proposal 122 (new car park at Peverell Corner).
O/3/5143/0200	64 Land at Central Park.	Mrs Susan Walker	Objects to indoor commercial leisure development and questions viability of a cinema. Change suggested is not to allow provision of new shops or a cinema.
O/3/5146/0203	64 Land at Central Park.	Save Central Park Committee Petition of 1090 signatures	Objects to the loss of green space and the introduction of commercial development into the park. Supports enhancement of outdoor sports facilities and environmental improvements. Would like to use the text of the Save Central Park Committee charter as the basis for the local plan policy.
O/3/5163/0225	64 Land at Central Park.	Mrs Katherine Salisbury	Objects to commercial development. No changes suggested but presumably to remove commercial development from proposals.
O/3/5164/0226	64 Land at Central Park.	Mr J Duook	Objects to building on the green space and for commercial exploitation of the park within its boundaries. Change suggested is to keep park green and free for all Plymothians.

Table 4. Summary of area and site specific representations. Drake.			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/3/5190/0263	64 Land at Central Park.	Mrs V J Facey	Objects to loss of green spaces and commercial development on the present Mayflower Centre site. Changes sought are either to build the sports centre on the existing Mayflower Centre site or else if not, to return the Mayflower Centre site back into green space. Also seeks removal of commercial development proposals. Supports proposal 122 to construct a new car park at Peverell Corner.
O/3/5193/0266	64 Land at Central Park.	Mrs Jane Gourlay	Objects to building the new sports centre on green land. No changes suggested but presumably that the development takes place on the same site as it is now.
O/3/5241/0329	64 Land at Central Park.	Mr Hedley W Miller	Objects to further erection of very large buildings in Central Park. So long as total area developed is the same as now (even if in a different location) would not object. Change sought is either (1) to provide indoor sports facilities elsewhere (brown areas at Millbay and Coxside and Brickfields suggested) and then allow commercial leisure on the existing Mayflower Site or (2) to forget commercial leisure and only build new sports centre. Supports proposal 122 if total number of allotments maintained (even if smaller plots)
O/3/5249/0337	64 Land at Central Park.	Mrs & Mr L Hart	Objects to loss of green space, and does not agree that improvements required. Change suggested is the complete deletion of the policy.
O/3/5258/0346	64 Land at Central Park.	Ms Angela Perkins	Agrees that it is necessary to rebuild the Mayflower Centre, but only on the same site. Does not agree with building on any vacated Mayflower Centre site. Change sought is for the new sports centre to be built on the same site as the existing sports centre and no commercial development.
O/3/5266/0355	64 Land at Central Park.	Mr C Dally	Objects to the commercial development of the existing Mayflower Centre site. Changes sought would be to either rebuild sports centre on existing site or a new site so long as the previous site was returned to open space. The proposal for commercial leisure development should be deleted.
O/3/5278/0374	64 Land at Central Park.	Mr David Santillo	Objects to the use of the existing Mayflower Centre site for commercial development as the park is for the people of Plymouth not a business chain This would lead to a need to increase parking and the consequent loss of green spaces. Change sought would be the removal of the commercial element of the scheme.
O/3/5276/0420	64 Land at Central Park.	Mrs Lorna Meldrum	Objects to the commercial development of Central Park. Change sought is to rebuild the Mayflower Centre on its present site and delete the commercial leisure development.
O/3/5359/0482	64 Land at Central Park.	Mr Stephen Cox	Only objects to development which is not for sport or recreational development such as cinema or retail outlets. Change sought is clarification of the policy's wording to only allow sports and recreational use.

Table 4. Summary of area and site specific representations. Drake.			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/3/5416/0548	64 Land at Central Park.	Mr W R Smale	Objects to further encroachment on the green areas of central park. Change sought is for the new sports centre to be built on its existing site and no development adjoining the swimming pool.
O/3/5437/0574	64 Land at Central Park.	Ms Susan Sharp	Objects to the loss of green space and the vague nature of the policy. Suggested change is for the new sports centre to be built on its existing site and no development adjoining the swimming pool.
O/3/5474/0659	64 Land at Central Park.	Mrs Doreen Irving	Objects to development (especially commercial development) in the park. Change sought is for the new sports centre to be built on its existing site and no development adjoining the swimming pool. Also no commercial leisure development.
O/3/5911/1218	64 Land at Central Park.	Ms Joan Phillips	Concerned about council selling off land in Central Park.
O/3/5912/1219	64 Land at Central Park.	Mr Coombes	Objects to further commercial development in the park. Change sought is presumably no commercial leisure development.
O/3/5913/1220	64 Land at Central Park.	Mr David Smith	General objection with no reasons. No changes suggested.
O/3/5914/1221	64 Land at Central Park.	Mr R J Mahony	Objects to commercial development on the Mayflower Centre site or elsewhere which would generate a lot of traffic/cars/additional parking/noise and late night hours.
O/3/6269/1679	64 Land at Central Park.	Ms C Maddock	Objects to commercial development in a public park, concerned about precedent. Change sought is the removal of the commercial development scheme.
O/3/6270/1680	64 Land at Central Park.	Mr J Collins	Objects to commercial development. Change sought is to delete commercial leisure development and only provide new sports centre on the existing site, the site adjacent to swimming pool remaining green space.
O/3/6236/1681	64 Land at Central Park.	Save The Central Park Committee Mr L W M Stephens	Objects to re-siting of the sports centre and commercial development. Change sought is to delete commercial leisure development and only provide new sports centre on the existing site, the site adjacent to swimming pool remaining green space.
O/3/6507/2008	64 Land at Central Park.	Plymouth Friends of the Earth Miss Sheila V Evans	Objects to loss of green space and additional traffic, car movements, air pollution associated with commercial facilities. Change sought is to delete commercial development.
O/3/6437/2108	64 Land at Central Park.	CTC Mr Colin Woodman	Objects to wording of the proposal. Change sought is the rewording of the proposal to refer specifically to the need to encourage access by cycling.

Table 4. Summary of area and site specific representations. Drake.			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/3/6564/2122	64 Land at Central Park.	Mr Richard Bray	Objects to the lack of justification for the commercial development. Considers that the commercial leisure use is drawn too widely. Change sought is that there should be assurances that the development will not take place without all aspects of the development having been subject to public consultation and details given about how much funding will go into the park from the commercial development. The nature of the commercial development should be more clearly defined.
O/3/6565/2123	64 Land at Central Park.	Miss K H Drechsler	Objects to loss of green space. Change sought is no building development on green areas of the park.
O/3/6570/2135	64 Land at Central Park.	Warner Village Cinemas	Objects to commercial leisure as site is out of centre and need for sequential test to be applied. Change sought is either deletion of proposal or justification for the commercial leisure development allocation based on need or lack of alternative sites.
O/3/6682/2423	64 Land at Central Park.	Mrs N Thompson	Objects to commercial development and loss of green space. Change sought is to rebuild the sports centre on its existing site and delete commercial leisure development.
O/3/6796/2724	64 Land at Central Park.	Ms Emma Macleod-Johnstone	Objects to commercial development and loss of green space. Change sought is to rebuild the sports centre on its existing site and delete commercial leisure development.
O/3/6798/2727	64 Land at Central Park.	Ms Elizabeth Robbins	Objects to commercial development and loss of green space. Change sought is to rebuild the sports centre on its existing site and to same height .
O/3/6799/2728	64 Land at Central Park.	Miss Elizabeth Jamieson	Objects to loss of green space and scale of commercial development. Change sought is to upgrade the sports centre on the existing site.
O/3/6800/2732	64 Land at Central Park.	Mr A J S Burnett	Objects to loss of green space and commercial development. Change sought is to stress improvements to natural habitats.
O/3/6825/2815	64 Land at Central Park.	Mrs Janice Hunt	Objects to loss of green space and commercial development. Change sought is to delete any proposals which reduce green areas.
O/3/5063/2866	64 Land at Central Park.	Mr Derek Unitt	Objects to lack of parking at the south of the park. Change sought is to include an additional car park at the south of the park by the old post office sorting office
O/3/6908/3173	64 Land at Central Park.	Plymouth & South West Co-operative	Objects to large scale retail. Change sought is that the supporting text makes it clear that any retail should only be permitted if it is small scale and ancillary to leisure, entertainment, sports or cultural activities.
S/3/6800/2730	64 Land at Central Park.	Mr A J S Burnett	Supports Action Plan details.

Table 4. Summary of area and site specific representations. Drake.			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
S/3/5063/2867	64 Land at Central Park.	Mr Derek Unitt	Objects to lack of toilet facilities at the north of the park. Change sought is to include an additional toilets by Plymouth Sports Club/Plymouth Nursery or centre of park area.
S/3/6900/3047	64 Land at Central Park.	Sport England South West Region Mr Gary Parsons	Supports the replacement of the Mayflower Centre, and preferably that new leisure centre built before old one closed.
S/3/6903/3089	64 Land at Central Park.	University of Plymouth Mr Mark Harvey	Supports proposal and welcomes discussions with PCC regarding how it can help produce co-ordinated master plan.
S/3/6863/3230	64 Land at Central Park.	Mrs Heather Crocker	Supports full use of central park which avoid destruction of trees and hedges.
O/3/6601/2254	64 Land at Central Park.	Transport 2000 Cornwall/Plymouth & District Group Mr Don Allen	Objects to commercial development and loss of green space. Change sought is to promote outdoor sports as opposed to the creation of building provision for indoor sports.
4. Representations relating to Part Four: Local Plan Policies and allocation of sites under particular policies.			
No area or site specific representations for Drake Ward relating to this part of the Plan.			
5. Representations relating to Part Five: Local Plan Appendices.			
S/5/6775/3428	Appendix 4 (Drake Ward).	Greenbank Community Association Mrs Lynn Fearon	Supports the Drake Ward Vision Statement, particularly the reference to having residential areas free from unacceptable noise and disturbance.
6. Representations relating to Local Plan Proposals Map and Annexes.			
No area or site specific representations for Drake Ward relating to this part of the Plan.			
7. Representations relating to Greenscape Areas.			
O/7/6775/2571	314 Drake's Place Gardens.	Greenbank Community Association Mrs Lynn Fearon	The greenscape designation should be extended to include the whole of Drake's Reservoir, not least because the reservoir is listed as an important historic structure. The reservoir also fulfils other important greenscape functions in the area.
8. Representations relating to omissions (i.e. things not included in the First Deposit Version of the Local Plan).			
O/8/6862/2943	Proposal Omission North Hill Headland Park.	Mr Mike Stone	There has been a switch from commercial to residential character in this area that has been stimulated by growth in the university. To assist the local plans objective of community regeneration the designation of this site for residential development would remove a major source of uncertainty.

Table 5. Summary of area and site specific representations. Stoke.

Table 5. Summary of area and site specific representations. Stoke.			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
1. Representations relating to Part One: Local Plan Purpose and Context.			
No area or site specific representations for Stoke Ward relating to this part of the Plan.			
2. Representations relating to Part Two: Local Plan Strategy.			
No area or site specific representations for Stoke Ward relating to this part of the Plan.			
3. Representations relating to Part Three: Local Plan Proposals.			
S/3/6475/2021	116 Stuart Road, Pennycomequick.	Ms Val Woodward	Supports the allocation because of the need for local employment.
O/3/5453/0601	117 Land at Amey Depot, Valletort Road.	Penlee Vale Residents Association Brigadier P C Bowser	Support the principle. The adjoining builder's yard is inappropriate and will harm the proposed residential use.
O/3/5454/0619	117 Land at Amey Depot, Valletort Road.	Stoke Damerel Conservation Society Mr Robin Midgley	Needs a high quality of design appropriate to a conservation area unlike the development at Fitzroy Joinery.
O/3/6790/2681	117 Land at Amey Depot, Valletort Road.	House Builders Federation Ms Jo Hanslip	Objection to affordable housing requirement of proposal. Considered to be contrary to Circular 6/98. Not justified in Local Plan. Lack of a robust Housing Needs Assessment. Requirement prejudices the viability of development.
O/3/6845/2886	117 Land at Amey Depot, Valletort Road.	Ms Deborah McLaren	Site is prominent and visible. Need for high quality of design to enhance the conservation area to avoid the pastiche approach at the Fitzroy site.
O/3/6846/2887	117 Land at Amey Depot, Valletort Road.	Mr Chris Brown	Loss of employment site. Need a comprehensive plan to include adjoining land. Excessive hard surfacing to be avoided to prevent run-off problems. Density and quality to reflect the surroundings.
O/3/6584/3456	117 Land at Amey Depot, Valletort Road.	Persimmon Homes South West Limited	Need for contributions for alternative employment facilities is too onerous. Proposed contribution to educational facilities is too onerous. Requirement for life long houses is too restrictive. Affordable housing requirement is too onerous.
S/3/6234/1634	117 Land at Amey Depot, Valletort Road.	Mr D J Hooper	Support but should be to a high quality design and trees should be retained.
S/3/6475/2022	117 Land at Amey Depot, Valletort Road.	Ms Val Woodward	Supports.
S/3/6863/2944	117 Land at Amey Depot, Valletort Road.	Mrs Heather Crocker	Need for a range of prices for local people to afford. Should be architecturally designed.
O/3/6358/1890	118 Fitzroy Joinery Works, Fitzroy Road.	Plymouth College of Further Education	Support inclusion of part of their land in the proposal area. Have concerns about the SW part as this is an essential parking area.

Table 5. Summary of area and site specific representations. Stoke.			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/3/6515/2024	118 Fitzroy Joinery Works, Fitzroy Road.	Mrs E H Lamble	Would worsen parking problems on adjoining roads.
O/3/6790/2682	118 Fitzroy Joinery Works, Fitzroy Road.	House Builders Federation Ms Jo Hanslip	Objection to affordable housing requirement of proposal. Considered to be contrary to Circular 6/98. Not justified in Local Plan. Lack of a robust Housing Needs Assessment. Requirement prejudices the viability of development.
S/3/5453/0602	118 Fitzroy Joinery Works, Fitzroy Road.	Penlee Vale Residents Association Brigadier P C Bowser	Support. Appears that the PCFE car park is included.
S/3/6475/2131	118 Fitzroy Joinery Works, Fitzroy Road.	Ms Val Woodward	Support.
S/3/6863/2945	118 Fitzroy Joinery Works, Fitzroy Road.	Mrs Heather Crocker	Support a range of prices so affordable for local people. Houses should be architecturally designed.
O/3/5454/0620	119 Stoke and Millbridge Conservation Area.	Stoke Damerel Conservation Society Mr Robin Midgley	Seeking addition of small terrace to North of Masterman Rd to area of proposed Stoke Conservation Area.
S/3/5453/0603	119 Stoke and Millbridge Conservation Area.	Penlee Vale Residents Association Brigadier P C Bowser	Welcomes proposed extension of Stoke Cons. Area, but keen to ensure no further development of Stoke Business Park.
S/3/5454/0610	119 Stoke and Millbridge Conservation Area.	Stoke Damerel Conservation Society Mr Robin Midgley	Strongly supports proposed revisions and extension of Stoke Cons. Area, and proposed creation of new Millbridge Cons. Area.
4. Representations relating to Part Four: Local Plan Policies and allocation of sites under particular policies.			
O/4/6925/3472	26 Established Residential Area (St. Levan's Road)	Lattice Property Holdings	The Proposals Map identifies this site as part of an established residential area. This is being unduly restrictive.
5. Representations relating to Part Five: Local Plan Appendices.			
No area or site specific representations for Stoke Ward relating to this part of the Plan.			
6. Representations relating to Local Plan Proposals Map and Annexes.			
No area or site specific representations for Stoke Ward relating to this part of the Plan.			
7. Representations relating to Greenscape Areas.			
O/7/5462/0635	256 Stoke Damerel Church.	Stoke Damerel Church Council Mr J C Mitchelmore	The boundary of the greenscape designation should be amended to include the whole church area less the "foot print" of the church buildings.
8. Representations relating to omissions (i.e. things not included in the First Deposit Version of the Local Plan).			

Table 5. Summary of area and site specific representations. Stoke.			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/8/6584/3455	Proposal Omission Land adjoining Amey Rail Depot	Persimmon Homes South West Limited	The land wrapping around the southern part of the site should be included in the proposal site.

Table 6. Summary of area and site specific representations. Trelawny.

Table 6. Summary of area and site specific representations. Trelawny.			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
1. Representations relating to Part One: Local Plan Purpose and Context.			
No area or site specific representations for Trelawny Ward relating to this part of the Plan.			
2. Representations relating to Part Two: Local Plan Strategy.			
No area or site specific representations for Trelawny Ward relating to this part of the Plan.			
3. Representations relating to Part Three: Local Plan Proposals.			
O/3/5398/0527	121 Land at Recreation Road.	G.M.D Eurotool	Provide a local engineering service that would be forced to move to Plympton or out of town.
O/3/6601/2245	121 Land at Recreation Road.	Transport 2000 Cornwall/Plymouth & District Group Mr Don Allen	It will attract more traffic along an already busy road. Will further increase the need for a pedestrian crossing across Beacon Park Road opposite the 'St Boniface' estate.
O/3/6655/2385	121 Land at Recreation Road.	Autopainter Mr Ronald Powell	The site is important for small organisations. An important source of employment for the local community.
O/3/6656/2386	121 Land at Recreation Road.	Beacon Shed & Fencing Centre Mr David May	It took over 2 years to find a suitable and affordable location for the centre. Have been open less than 12 months and have spent a lot of time and money establishing it.
O/3/6657/2387	121 Land at Recreation Road.	Mr Glyn Davies	Keep the site for industrial use.
O/3/6658/2388	121 Land at Recreation Road.	G & S Components Mr D Wills (Petition – 19 people)	Been here since 1996. Invested a lot of money. There are no alternative commercial units in the area. Would have to cease trading and make staff redundant.
O/3/6659/2389	121 Land at Recreation Road.	Mr R Farrell	Don't want to lose my business.
O/3/6661/2391	121 Land at Recreation Road.	Petworld Mr Charlie Avery (Petition – 150 people)	Do not want the business to close.
O/3/6662/2392	121 Land at Recreation Road.	Mr Keith Preston	Quite happy and not looking to move, but would consider re-location package if costs of moving and relocating/renting were greatly reduced.

Table 6. Summary of area and site specific representations. Trelawny.			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/3/6663/2393	121 Land at Recreation Road.	Student Computers Co UK Ltd Mr Simon Carpenter	The Council should realise that the Government is supposed to be encouraging small business. How many businesses will close? Company will incur many costs if have to move. Will also be possibility of higher rent and rates and difficulties for existing staff to access new premises.
O/3/6664/2394	121 Land at Recreation Road.	Volks City Mr Ken Thomas	Re-development will cause my business to close and make 3 people redundant.
O/3/6665/2395	121 Land at Recreation Road.	Garage Mr W J White (Petition – 175 people)	Object to houses. The site should be cleaned up and repairs and improvements carried out. Must of the businesses provide a community service. The site's deeds state that the site must only be used for light industrial use. Up date the site to save 200 jobs.
O/3/6666/2396	121 Land at Recreation Road.	Fred Toms Scaffolding Mr Fred Toms	At present I am renting a unit for scaffolding business.
O/3/6667/2397	121 Land at Recreation Road.	Café Mrs E Vosper (Petition – 55 people)	Do not want the business to close.
O/3/6668/2398	121 Land at Recreation Road.	Andrew Toms Scaffolding Mr A J Toms	Development will make it more difficult to trade effectively.
O/3/6669/2399	121 Land at Recreation Road.	A & R Transmissions Mr Roger J Vickery (Petition – 43 people)	Our business would cease trading with the loss of 4 jobs.
O/3/6670/2400	121 Land at Recreation Road.	Cambridge Removals Mr J A Cambridge	Many companies will go out of business. Have parked lorries here without any problems.
O/3/6671/2401	121 Land at Recreation Road.	Harwood Crane Hire Mr R B Harwood	Loss of business for White's Autos. Possible loss of 4 people's jobs.
O/3/6789/2605	121 Land at Recreation Road.	Land South West Chartered Surveyors Mr M J Holden	Object to the 38-55% affordable housing limit. As the site would be more viable in its existing use the scheme would not proceed – should reduce affordable housing requirement to 15-20%.
O/3/6790/2683	121 Land at Recreation Road.	House Builders Federation Ms Jo Hanslip	Standard Response.
O/3/6864/2946	121 Land at Recreation Road.	Mr William Manley	Will displace much needed light industry and lessen further the city's poor economic base. The proposals will satisfy out-of-town interests at expense of industrial potential for unemployed people in the area. Would add noise, light, traffic and refuse pollution to what is currently a socially balanced and pleasing environment.
S/3/5014/0015	121 Land at Recreation Road.	Mr Michael Joseph O'Connor	Rats, smell of tar, noise from heavy vehicles, hazardous for pedestrians.

Table 6. Summary of area and site specific representations. Trelawny.			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
S/3/5033/0044	121 Land at Recreation Road.	Mrs H T Cartwright	<i>Problems with noise, smells and rubbish. Should ensure that new housing doesn't exacerbate parking problems.</i>
S/3/5081/0124	121 Land at Recreation Road.	Mr David Luscombe	<i>The site is a nuisance in a residential area. Buildings poorly maintained. Rats. Attracts youngsters who break into garages.</i>
S/3/5087/0131	121 Land at Recreation Road.	Mr William D Shelley	<i>Causes a lot of congestion in the area. Also noise, smells and rats.</i>
S/3/5088/0133	121 Land at Recreation Road.	Mr John H Stephens	<i>Causes a lot of congestion in the area. Also noise, smells and rats.</i>
S/3/5112/0167	121 Land at Recreation Road.	Mr Alan Davies	<i>Rat infested, noisy shanty town. Housing would reduce heavy goods vehicles.</i>
S/3/5117/0173	121 Land at Recreation Road.	Mrs Beryl Brown	<i>Site poorly maintained. It's not suitable for a residential area. Nuisance from noise, smells and traffic. Poor access and conflicts with other traffic/pedestrians. Vermin.</i>
S/3/5288/0384	121 Land at Recreation Road.	Mr John E Pinch	<i>The industrial buildings are in a poor state with little maintenance over the years. Problems with rats and flies. Can be a noisy site. Smells when warm. Difficult for large lorries to access the site.</i>
S/3/5336/0438	121 Land at Recreation Road.	Mr Ralph Barkham	<i>Support.</i>
S/3/5914/1268	121 Land at Recreation Road.	Mr R J Mahony	<i>Site rundown and has caused annoyance for residents over years. A sensitive scheme that does not overlook housing would be welcomed.</i>
S/3/6486/1967	121 Land at Recreation Road.	Mr W S Haley	<i>Incongruous that have industry in an area that is predominantly housing.</i>
S/3/6524/2038	121 Land at Recreation Road.	Mrs R.E. Rhodes	<i>Should not have industry in a predominantly residential area.</i>
S/3/6525/2039	121 Land at Recreation Road.	Mr & Mrs Darch	<i>Incongruous that have industry in an area that is predominantly housing.</i>
S/3/6908/3186	121 Land at Recreation Road.	Plymouth & South West Co-operative	<i>The site is entirely suitable for high-density residential accommodation.</i>
O/3/5010/0011	122 Car park at Peverell Park Road.	Mr Graham Emond	<i>Objects to loss of allotments. Change suggested is relocating of car park.</i>
O/3/5031/0042	122 Car park at Peverell Park Road.	Mrs Barbara Allen	<i>Objects to loss of allotments, and concern about additional vehicle movements, pollution and pedestrian safety. Change suggested is the deletion of the proposal.</i>
O/3/5276/0421	122 Car park at Peverell Park Road.	Mrs Lorna Meldrum	<i>Objects to the loss of allotments. Questions need. Change suggested is the deletion of the proposal and making better use of on street parking.</i>

Table 6. Summary of area and site specific representations. Trelawny.			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/3/5359/0483	122 Car park at Peverell Park Road.	Mr Stephen Cox	Objects to loss of wildlife site and questions need. Change suggested is the deletion of the proposal
O/3/6236/1636	122 Car park at Peverell Park Road.	Save The Central Park Committee Mr L W M Stephens	Objects to the likely increase in traffic, questions need and loss of green space. Change suggested is the deletion of the proposal.
O/3/6271/1682	122 Car park at Peverell Park Road	Mrs Rachael Tew	Objects to loss of allotments, increased congestion. Change suggested is deletion of proposal or relocation of the car park to rear of Co-op.
O/3/6272/1683	122 Car park at Peverell Park Road	Mrs Juliff	Objects on grounds car park would cause air pollution and would lead to loss of allotment plots. Change sought is the deletion of the proposal.
O/3/6273/1684	122 Car park at Peverell Park Road	Mr S A Mullans	Objects on the grounds that the car park would increase vehicle numbers in the area and the loss of allotments. Change sought is the deletion of the policy.
O/3/6507/1999	122 Car park at Peverell Park Road.	Plymouth Friends of the Earth Miss Sheila V Evans	Objection to loss of allotments. Change sought is deletion of the proposal and better public transport.
O/3/6437/2042	122 Car park at Peverell Park Road.	CTC Mr Colin Woodman	Objects to provision of cycle parking in the car park as contrary to Plymouth Cycle Strategy. Change sought is to provide cycle parking outside shops/library instead of in the car park.
O/3/6528/2045	122 Car park at Peverell Park Road.	Green Party Local Branch Dr Frank Williamson	Objects to loss of allotments and dangerous and anti pedestrian car park. Change suggested is deletion of proposal.
O/3/6601/2242	122 Car park at Peverell Park Road.	Transport 2000 Cornwall/Plymouth & District Group Mr Don Allen	Objects to car park as will generate traffic, lead to loss of allotments. Change suggested is deletion of the policy.
O/3/6564/2340	122 Car park at Peverell Park Road.	Mr Richard Bray	Objects to loss of allotments, questions need. Change suggested is to put policy on hold until a study on whether providing a car park would in fact solve the problems of the area.
O/3/6601/2470	122 Car park at Peverell Park Road.	Transport 2000 Cornwall/Plymouth & District Group Mr Don Allen	Object to increased car parking and loss of allotments. Change sought is the deletion of the policy.
O/3/6799/2729	122 Car park at Peverell Park Road.	Miss Elizabeth Jamieson	Object to the loss of allotments/park for benefit of commercial enterprise. Considers that proposal would encourage traffic. Change sought is the deletion of the policy or the relocation of the car park to the rear of the Jubilee Buildings.
S/3/5014/0016	122 Car park at Peverell Park Road.	Mr Michael Joseph O'Connor	Supports proposal as parking nearby is inconvenient and dangerous.
S/3/5062/0082	122 Car park at Peverell Park Road.	Mrs J Unitt	Supports proposal as area needs the facility.

Table 6. Summary of area and site specific representations. Trelawny.			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
S/3/5063/0083	122 Car park at Peverell Park Road.	Mr Derek Unitt	Supports as agrees with the reasons accompanying the policy.
S/3/5088/0132	122 Car park at Peverell Park Road.	Mr John H Stephens	Supports as would help with traffic which causes obstruction and congestion.
S/3/5117/0172	122 Car park at Peverell Park Road.	Mrs Beryl Brown	Supports as would provide a community facility and support community facilities.
S/3/5288/0385	122 Car park at Peverell Park Road.	Mr John E Pinch	Supports as would deal with congestion, cars parking where they shouldn't. Would support shops.
S/3/5917/1224	122 Car park at Peverell Park Road.	Dr R Benjafield	Supports as would revitalise the local economy.
S/3/5914/1269	122 Car park at Peverell Park Road.	Mr R J Mahony	Supports as necessary to support local community facilities.
S/3/6235/1635	122 Car park at Peverell Park Road.	Mr Michael Holland	Supports as a much needed facility for people using vulnerable community premises, would ease congestion and improve safety.
S/3/6526/2043	122 Car park at Peverell Park Road.	Mrs J E Potter	Supports as will ease congestion caused by people using local facilities and safeguard future of facilities.
S/3/6527/2044	122 Car park at Peverell Park Road.	Mr B W Potter	Supports as will safeguard community facilities and give safer environment for users of the facilities.
4. Representations relating to Part Four: Local Plan Policies and allocation of sites under particular policies.			
No area or site specific representations for Trelawny Ward relating to this part of the Plan.			
5. Representations relating to Part Five: Local Plan Appendices.			
No area or site specific representations for Trelawny Ward relating to this part of the Plan.			
6. Representations relating to Local Plan Proposals Map and Annexes.			
No area or site specific representations for Trelawny Ward relating to this part of the Plan.			
7. Representations relating to Greenscape Areas.			
No area or site specific representations for Trelawny Ward relating to this part of the Plan.			
8. Representations relating to omissions (i.e. things not included in the First Deposit Version of the Local Plan).			
No area or site specific representations for Trelawny Ward relating to this part of the Plan.			