

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

## **Summary of Area Specific Representations.**

**Southway, Eggbuckland and Estover 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 Southway, Eggbuckland and Estover Wards: Cumulative totals.*

*Table 3. Summary of area and site specific representations relating to more than one of the wards of Southway, Eggbuckland and Estover.*

*Table 4. Summary of area and site specific representations. Southway.*

*Table 5. Summary of area and site specific representations. Eggbuckland.*

*Table 6. Summary of area and site specific representations. Estover.*

## 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 25<sup>th</sup> January to 15<sup>th</sup> 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 *Southway, Eggbuckland and Estover* 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,
- *Stoke, Trelawny and Drake* 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](mailto: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 2   map 3   map 4   map 5   map 6   map 7   map 10   map 11   map 16

map 17   map 22   map 29

# 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.**

<b>Part of Plan</b>	<b>Total representations</b>	<b>Objections</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Representations in support</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
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%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3569</b>	<b>2281</b>	<b>64%</b>	<b>1288</b>	<b>36%</b>

**Table 2. Local Plan Representations for Southway, Eggbuckland and Estover Wards: Cumulative totals.**

<b>Table 2. Local Plan Representations for Southway, Eggbuckland and Estover Wards: Cumulative totals.</b>			
<b>Part of Plan</b>	<b>Objections</b>	<b>Representations in support</b>	<b>Total representations</b>
<b>1. Representations relating to Part One: Local Plan Purpose and Context.</b>			
No area or site specific representations for Southway, Eggbuckland or Estover Wards relating to this part of the Plan.			
<b>2. Representations relating to Part Two: Local Plan Strategy.</b>			
No area or site specific representations for Southway, Eggbuckland or Estover Wards relating to this part of the Plan.			
<b>3. Representations relating to Part Three: Local Plan Proposals.</b>			
Proposal 67. Land at Hallerton Close.	10	0	10
Proposal 68. Plymbridge Lane.	4	0	4
Proposal 69. Looseleigh.	3	0	3
Proposal 72. Derriford Hospital.	3	1	4
Proposal 73. Derriford Science Park.	5	1	6
Proposal 74. Plymouth International Business Park.	4	1	5
Proposal 75. Plymouth City Airport.	14	4	18
Proposal 76. Land at Plymbridge Road / Glenfield Road.	3	2	5
Proposal 77. Land at Tavistock Road / Plymbridge Road.	6	2	8
Proposal 78. Tavistock Road (A386) and 'The George' junction.	11	2	13
Proposal 79. Land at Plymbridge Road / Buena Vista Drive.	15	0	15
Proposal 80. Land at Powisland Drive.	1	0	1
Proposal 81. Land at Looseleigh Lane.	2	0	2
Proposal 82. Land north of Dunraven Drive.	3	93	96
Proposal 114. Land at South West Water Site, Belliver Way, and land north of Boulter Close.	3	1	4
Proposal 115. Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area.	21	29	50
<b>4. Representations relating to Part Four: Local Plan Policies and allocation of sites under particular policies.</b>			
Policy 1. Established Employment Areas (Christian Mill).	1	0	1
Policy 1. Established Employment Areas (Tavistock Road).	1	0	1

<b>Table 2. Local Plan Representations for Southway, Eggbuckland and Estover Wards: Cumulative totals.</b>			
<b>Part of Plan</b>	<b>Objections</b>	<b>Representations in support</b>	<b>Total representations</b>
Policy 21. Mixed Use Areas (Crownhill Works).	1	0	1
Policy 50. Airport Public Safety Zones.	3	1	4
<b>5. Representations relating to Part Five: Local Plan Appendices.</b>			
No area or site specific representations for Southway, Eggbuckland or Estover Wards relating to this part of the Plan.			
<b>6. Representations relating to Local Plan Proposals Map and Annexes.</b>			
Incorrect boundary (Tavistock Rd Site)	2	0	2
<b>7. Representations relating to Greenscape Areas.</b>			
Greenscape site 66 Field adjacent to Cann Lodge	1	4	5
Greenscape site 66 Land at Cann House	1	0	1
Greenscape site 70 Land north of Southway and Coombe Lane	1	0	1
Greenscape site 71 Widewell Woods	1	0	1
Greenscape site 74 Land between 138 and 150 Dunraven Drive	1	0	1
Greenscape site 74 Land between 22 & 48 Dunraven Drive	1	0	1
Greenscape site 74 Southway Valley		1	1
Greenscape site 86 Powisland Drive open space.	1	0	1
Greenscape site 97 Plym and Glenholt valleys	1	0	1
Greenscape site 103 Estover School Playing Fields	1	0	1
Greenscape site 108 Bircham Valley	1	0	1
Greenscape site 108 Land East of Charlton Crescent	1	0	1
Greenscape site 154 Land west of Forder Battery	1	0	1
<b>8. Representations relating to omissions (i.e. things not included in the First Deposit Version of the Local Plan).</b>			
Proposal Omission Parkway Industrial Estate/St Modwen Road	1	0	1
Proposal Omission Belliver	1	0	1
Proposal Omission Blunts Lane Site	1	0	1
Proposal Omission Coleridge Training Area	1	0	1
Proposal Omission Land adjacent Belliver Industrial Estate	2	0	2
Proposal Omission Land adjacent to Cann Lodge	1	0	1
Proposal Omission Land between 22 & 48 Dunraven Drive	2	0	2
Proposal Omission Land at Forder Valley	1	0	1
Proposal Omission Land between Holly Park and Tamerton Foliot	1	0	1

<b>Table 2. Local Plan Representations for Southway, Egguckland and Estover Wards: Cumulative totals.</b>			
<b>Part of Plan</b>	<b>Objections</b>	<b>Representations in support</b>	<b>Total representations</b>
Proposal Omission Land East of Charlton Crescent	2	0	2
Proposal Omission Land East of Horsham Lane	1	0	1
Proposal Omission Land East of Tamar Science Park	1	0	1
Proposal Omission Land North of Coombe Lane	1	0	1
Proposal Omission Land North of Southway	1	0	1
Proposal Omission Rights of Way Lulworth Drive	1	0	1
Proposal Omission Southway Community College	1	0	1
Proposal Omission Widewell Playing Fields	59	0	59

**Table 3. Summary of area and site specific representations relating to more than one of the wards of Southway, Eggbuckland and Estover.**

<b>Table 3. Summary of area and site specific representations relating to more than one of the wards.</b>			
<b>Reference</b>	<b>Part of Plan</b>	<b>Objector / Supporter</b>	<b>Summary of representation</b>
<b>1. Representations relating to Part One: Local Plan Purpose and Context.</b>			
No area or site specific representations for Southway, Eggbuckland or Estover Wards relating to this part of the Plan.			
<b>2. Representations relating to Part Two: Local Plan Strategy.</b>			
No area or site specific representations for Southway, Eggbuckland or Estover Wards relating to this part of the Plan.			
<b>3. Representations relating to Part Three: Local Plan Proposals.</b>			
No area or site specific representations for Southway, Eggbuckland or Estover Wards relating to this part of the Plan.			
<b>4. Representations relating to Part Four: Local Plan Policies and allocation of sites under particular policies.</b>			
O/4/5211/0294	50 Airport public safety zones.	Mrs Cobbald	Safety zone should be over a more sparsely populated area.
O/4/5370/0499	50 Airport public safety zones.	Mr D Corboy	The Zone is located over houses schools and a factory. This is unacceptable. The airport doesn't need expanding. The money should be spent on upgrading the A38. If it is expanded it should take place at the eastern end.
O/4/6917/3343	50 Airport public safety zones.	Government Office for the South West	Should be re-worded in the negative.
S/4/6251/1659	50 Airport public safety zones.	General Aviation Awareness Council.....Ms A Bloomfield.	Support provided that there is safeguarding policy (recorded as an objection - O/8/6599/2226).
<b>5. Representations relating to Part Five: Local Plan Appendices.</b>			
No area or site specific representations for Southway, Eggbuckland or Estover Wards relating to this part of the Plan.			
<b>6. Representations relating to Local Plan Proposals Map and Annexes.</b>			
No area or site specific representations for Southway, Eggbuckland or Estover Wards relating to this part of the Plan.			
<b>7. Representations relating to Greenscape Areas.</b>			
O/7/6901/3065	74 Land between 138 and 150 Dunraven Drive and part of Southway Valley.	Mr Lippell	The greenscape proposal will make the existing use of the land unworkable. The tree crop will die and as such be detrimental to the environment, local policies and other landowners. The proposal will bring about the loss of a forestry crop.

<b>Table 3. Summary of area and site specific representations relating to more than one of the wards.</b>			
<b>Reference</b>	<b>Part of Plan</b>	<b>Objector / Supporter</b>	<b>Summary of representation</b>
O/7/6557/2091	74 Land between 22 & 48 Dunraven Drive and part of Southway Valley.	Mr Andrew Philip Dart	None of the functions attributed to this greenscape designation are displayed on this site. The part of the site between the houses should be excluded from the greenscape designation. The part of the site to the rear of the housing could be included within the greenscape designation, subject to amendments to the functions attributed to the site.
<b>S/7/6476/1956</b>	<b>74 Southway Valley.</b>	<b>Mrs Jill Short</b>	<b>Approve of the Southway/Derriford Nature Reserve and pleased that proposal 82 might increase its area.</b>
O/7/5566/0752	97 Plym and Glenholt Valleys	Mr K Khan	The functions identified as existing on part of this greenscape site are incorrect and should be amended to reflect the correct situation. Part of the site, which is in private ownership does not have public access and fulfil associated functions that are attributed to it.
<b>8. Representations relating to omissions (i.e. things not included in the First Deposit Version of the Local Plan).</b>			
No area or site specific representations for Southway, Egguckland or Estover Wards relating to this part of the Plan.			

**Table 4. Summary of area and site specific representations. Southway.**

<b>Table 4. Summary of area and site specific representations. Southway.</b>			
<b>Reference</b>	<b>Part of Plan</b>	<b>Objector / Supporter</b>	<b>Summary of representation</b>
<b>1. Representations relating to Part One: Local Plan Purpose and Context.</b>			
No area or site specific representations for Southway Ward relating to this part of the Plan.			
<b>2. Representations relating to Part Two: Local Plan Strategy.</b>			
No area or site specific representations for Southway Ward relating to this part of the Plan.			
<b>3. Representations relating to Part Three: Local Plan Proposals.</b>			
O/3/6490/1973	114 Land at SWWA and North of Boulter Close	Mr C M L Bowler	Do not wish to see development on the outskirts of Tamerton Foliot.
O/3/6584/2170	114 Land at SWWA and North of Boulter Close	Persimmon Homes South West Limited	Object to lifetime homes on the site in the absence of any justification. Internal arrangements are a building regulation , not a planning matter.
O/3/6790/2680	114 Land at SWWA and North of Boulter Close	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.
<b>S/3/6910/3197</b>	<b>114 Land at SWWA and North of Boulter Close</b>	<b>Trustees of the Cann Estate</b>	<b>Support allocation . Wish to see reference in text to current planning application, and reference to strengthening of community , and the provision of a footpath route.</b>
O/3/5019/2472	115 Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area.	Mr D J Camp	Cheshire Drive should remain inside the Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area. There is no logical explanation provided for its withdrawal.
O/3/5152/0213	115 Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area.	Mr Field	The proposed extension to the Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area needs to be enlarged on the north west side of the village to meet the South Hams boundary. This would protect the village from the visual impact of any future development.
O/3/5298/0397	115 Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area.	Tambretone Ltd Miss Donna A Forshaw	Greenscape areas at Tamerton Foliot should not be extended but instead used for residential purposes.
O/3/5340/2427	115 Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area.	Tamerton Foliot Village Conservation Society Mrs B Bebbington	No area of the present Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area should be removed. It could result in creating a precedent, which might lead to pressure for other parts of the boundaries to be contracted.
O/3/6233/1631	115 Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area.	Mr & Mrs M Hernon	Cheshire Drive should remain inside the Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area. Properties bought here were much more expensive due to the conservation area requirements. Reasons for the removal of Cheshire Drive have not been made clear.

<b>Table 4. Summary of area and site specific representations. Southway.</b>			
<b>Reference</b>	<b>Part of Plan</b>	<b>Objector / Supporter</b>	<b>Summary of representation</b>
O/3/6357/1792	115 Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area.	Mrs Susan Griffiths	Cheshire Drive should remain inside the Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area. The plan does not make clear that Cheshire Drive is to be removed as only maps illustrate this.
O/3/6489/1972	115 Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area.	Mr William Nicholson	Cheshire Drive should remain inside the Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area. Properties were bought here in the belief that they had some protection because they were in a conservation area. Those supporting the expansion of the conservation area should be informed that Cheshire Drive is to be removed, as this is not made clear.
O/3/6683/2424	115 Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area.	The Lord Of Warleigh	Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area should not be extended. Its extension would cover areas of land which effect the Warleigh Estate which is already over protected, with possibly only 20% of the village having any architectural or historic interest.
O/3/6696/2467	115 Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area.	Mr William Ednie	Cheshire Drive should remain inside the Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area
O/3/6743/2524	115 Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area.	Ms Margaret Nicholson	Cheshire Drive should remain inside the Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area.
O/3/6783/2580	115 Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area.	Miss Sarah Hernon	Cheshire Drive should remain inside the Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area. If it is withdrawn it will detract from the historic nature of the area, it will not benefit the community in any way and will be financially detrimental for future house sales.
O/3/6788/2588	115 Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area.	Mr & Mrs A Kent	The proposed extension of the conservation area is not necessary as it will serve no useful purpose. The land would be more appropriately designated under Policy 69 as a Greenscape Area. Limited development on Horsham lane is also suggested in exchange for this public open space and amenity land.
O/3/6808/2764	115 Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area.	Miss Louise Cordon	Cheshire Drive should remain inside the Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area. Its removal would create more disadvantages than advantages, it would penalise residents who bought new properties in a conservation area. Reasons for its removal are not given.
O/3/6822/2812	115 Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area.	Mrs Gene Campbell-White	Cheshire Drive should remain inside the Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area. Its removal would create more disadvantages than advantages, it would penalise residents who bought new properties in a conservation area. Reasons for its removal are not given.
O/3/6823/2813	115 Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area.	Mrs Lynne Cordon	Cheshire Drive should remain inside the Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area. Its removal would create more disadvantages than advantages, it would penalise residents who bought new properties in a conservation area. Reasons for its removal are not given.

<b>Table 4. Summary of area and site specific representations. Southway.</b>			
<b>Reference</b>	<b>Part of Plan</b>	<b>Objector / Supporter</b>	<b>Summary of representation</b>
O/3/6856/3234	115 Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area.	Mrs Peggy Irene Radmore	Cheshire Drive should remain inside the Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area.
O/3/6856/3235	115 Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area.	Mrs Peggy Irene Radmore	Cheshire Drive should remain inside the Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area.
O/3/6860/2941	115 Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area.	Mrs Vera Atrill	Cheshire Drive should remain inside the Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area. Homes were designed to be part of the Conservation Area and premium prices were paid for these properties.
O/3/6861/2942	115 Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area.	Dr & Mrs Andrew R A Rushton	Cheshire Drive should remain inside the Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area. Houses built here 2 years ago incurred major cost regulations and much inconvenience due to conservation area regulations. Loss of such status would be reflected in property values and may lead in less regulated development in the adjacent field. No justification is given for this change.
O/3/6876/2984	115 Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area.	Dr Peter Atrill	Cheshire Drive should remain inside the Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area. Its designation as a conservation area influenced the purchasing of property here and its removal would pose a threat to the residents environment.
O/3/6910/3194	115 Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area.	Trustees of the Cann Estate	The extension to the Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area should not include open land within the Coombe Valley. This area is not of sufficient architectural or historic interest to warrant designation, and is adequately protected by a combination of Greenscape policy 69 and Policy 77.
<b>S/3/5019/0024</b>	<b>115 Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area.</b>	<b>Mr D J Camp</b>	<b>Fully supports the proposal. It will assist in preserving the historic centre of the village provided the constraints on permitted development are adhered to rigidly.</b>
<b>S/3/5340/0459</b>	<b>115 Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area.</b>	<b>Tamerton Foliot Village Conservation Society Mrs B Bebbington</b>	<b>Generally supports the proposal. The new boundary supported is of that shown on Map 3, the boundary on Map 4 differs slightly leaving a section of hedge unprotected. The boundary on Map 3 should be extended to the north and west to where it meets the South Hams.</b>
<b>S/3/5412/0541</b>	<b>115 Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area.</b>	<b>Mr Derek Tooze</b>	<b>Fully support the proposal to extend Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area.</b>
<b>S/3/5511/0696</b>	<b>115 Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area.</b>	<b>Tamerton Foliot Village Conservation Society Mrs Sybil Jennings</b>	<b>Fully support the proposal. It would be nice to keep the green belt around Tamerton Foliot village.</b>
<b>S/3/5536/0722</b>	<b>115 Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area.</b>	<b>Mrs Rosanne Silverwood</b>	<b>Generally support the proposal. Land presently occupied by Tamerton Vale School and the land between the school and Tamerton Foliot Road should also go into the new conservation area boundary, along with the remaining single field which reaches the South Hams district boundary.</b>

<b>Table 4. Summary of area and site specific representations. Southway.</b>			
<b>Reference</b>	<b>Part of Plan</b>	<b>Objector / Supporter</b>	<b>Summary of representation</b>
<i>S/3/5537/0723</i>	<i>115 Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area.</i>	<i>Mr Peter Silverwood</i>	<i>Generally support the proposal. Conservation area could be improved if the land opposite Cann House (Tamerton Vale Primary School ) and the fields bordering the South Hams boundary were also included within the boundary.</i>
<i>S/3/5538/0724</i>	<i>115 Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area.</i>	<i>Mr D L Silverwood</i>	<i>Generally support the proposal. The area boundary should not be changed to exclude the Oak Vale development.</i>
<i>S/3/5539/0725</i>	<i>115 Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area.</i>	<i>Mr G Thomas</i>	<i>Fully support the proposal to extend Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area.</i>
<i>S/3/5540/0726</i>	<i>115 Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area.</i>	<i>Mrs Vera Wynn</i>	<i>Support is given because it is important to maintain the countryside in some areas of Plymouth for the benefit of the community. Nature and wildlife should be respected and building should only take place in areas of regeneration.</i>
<i>S/3/5541/0727</i>	<i>115 Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area.</i>	<i>Mrs Christine McGowan</i>	<i>Support the proposal as the countryside surrounding Tamerton Foliot is important to many members of the community and a valuable asset to Plymouth. It must be preserved at all costs as once built on can never revert to its natural form.</i>
<i>S/3/5542/0728</i>	<i>115 Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area.</i>	<i>Mr K Townsend</i>	<i>Fully support the proposal. In favour of keeping rural atmosphere.</i>
<i>S/3/5543/0729</i>	<i>115 Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area.</i>	<i>Mrs Townsend</i>	<i>Fully support the proposal. In favour of keeping rural atmosphere</i>
<i>S/3/5549/0735</i>	<i>115 Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area.</i>	<i>Mrs Ephra Bowhay</i>	<i>Support the proposal. The area should be protected from further development or its character will be lost. Flooding has increased because of the building that has taken place.</i>
<i>S/3/5550/0736</i>	<i>115 Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area.</i>	<i>Mr Bryan Chillery</i>	<i>Support the proposal. Protection of green field areas is vital. There has already been too much building in the area, the drainage system can not cope at times and the traffic through the village is dangerous.</i>
<i>S/3/5951/1265</i>	<i>115 Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area.</i>	<i>Mrs Jill Tooze</i>	<i>Fully support the proposal to extend Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area.</i>
<i>S/3/5952/1266</i>	<i>115 Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area.</i>	<i>Mr David Bailey</i>	<i>Fully supports the proposal to extend Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area.</i>
<i>S/3/5953/1267</i>	<i>115 Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area.</i>	<i>Mrs Jane Bailey</i>	<i>Fully supports the proposal to extend Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area.</i>

<b>Table 4. Summary of area and site specific representations. Southway.</b>			
<b>Reference</b>	<b>Part of Plan</b>	<b>Objector / Supporter</b>	<b>Summary of representation</b>
<i>S/3/6230/1627</i>	<i>115 Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area.</i>	<i>Conservation Society Mrs Maureen Sinclair</i>	<i>Generally supports the proposal. The conservation boundary round Oak Vale should include the trees bordering the road to preserve the appearance of the entrance to the village.</i>
<i>S/3/6231/1628</i>	<i>115 Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area.</i>	<i>Mr Michael Trend</i>	<i>Fully supports the proposal. The inclusion of the extra areas will help to safeguard and enhance the local conservation area.</i>
<i>S/3/6233/1630</i>	<i>115 Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area.</i>	<i>Mr &amp; Mrs M Hernon</i>	<i>Generally support the proposal. Cheshire Drive should remain inside the conservation area boundary.</i>
<i>S/3/6233/1633</i>	<i>115 Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area.</i>	<i>Mr &amp; Mrs M Hernon</i>	<i>Fully support the proposal for the green field area to remain between Cheshire Drive and Cann House. Plymouth is very lacking in attractive open spaces, all green fields must be protected.</i>
<i>S/3/6357/1791</i>	<i>115 Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area.</i>	<i>Mrs Susan Griffiths</i>	<i>Generally supports the proposal. Cheshire Drive should be included within the conservation area. It has not been made clear that Cheshire Drive is being removed.</i>
<i>S/3/6487/1968</i>	<i>115 Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area.</i>	<i>Mr R Vander Schouw</i>	<i>Generally supports proposal. Should include green field areas from the already established conservation areas.</i>
<i>S/3/6488/1969</i>	<i>115 Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area.</i>	<i>Mr R J Matthams</i>	<i>Supports the extension of the conservation area. Should be extended further to include the South Hams boundary on the north side of Tamerton Foliot and up to the housing in Holly Park and Milford Lane.</i>
<i>S/3/6489/1971</i>	<i>115 Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area.</i>	<i>Mr William Nicholson</i>	<i>Generally supports the proposal. Cheshire Drive should be included within the conservation area. It is not made very clear that Cheshire Drive is being removed.</i>
<i>S/3/6696/2466</i>	<i>115 Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area.</i>	<i>Mr William Ednie</i>	<i>Generally supports the proposal. Cheshire Drive should be included within the conservation area. It is not made very clear that Cheshire Drive is being removed.</i>
<i>S/3/6809/2765</i>	<i>115 Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area.</i>	<i>Mr R H Hall</i>	<i>The proposal is strongly supported. The additional areas compliment and enhance the existing conservation area.</i>
<i>S/3/6860/2940</i>	<i>115 Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area.</i>	<i>Mrs Vera Atrill</i>	<i>Supports the extension of Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area. Cheshire Drive should remain within this area.</i>
<i>S/3/6876/2983</i>	<i>115 Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area.</i>	<i>Dr Peter Atrill</i>	<i>Supports the extension of Tamerton Foliot Conservation Area. Cheshire Drive should remain within this area.</i>
<b><i>4. Representations relating to Part Four: Local Plan Policies and allocation of sites under particular policies.</i></b>			
No area or site specific representations for Southway Ward relating to this part of the Plan.			
<b><i>5. Representations relating to Part Five: Local Plan Appendices.</i></b>			

<b>Table 4. Summary of area and site specific representations. Southway.</b>			
<b>Reference</b>	<b>Part of Plan</b>	<b>Objector / Supporter</b>	<b>Summary of representation</b>
No area or site specific representations for Southway Ward relating to this part of the Plan.			
<b>6. Representations relating to Local Plan Proposals Map and Annexes.</b>			
No area or site specific representations for Southway Ward relating to this part of the Plan.			
<b>7. Representations relating to Greenscape Areas.</b>			
O/7/6910/3192	66 Field adjacent to Cann Lodge.	Trustees of the Cann Estate	This small part of the large greenscape designation is not of the same quality and merit as the larger area. This part of the greenscape site could be developed for housing with out giving rise to significant harm.
<b>S/7/6357/2023</b>	<b>66 Field adjacent to Cann Lodge.</b>	<b>Mrs Susan Griffiths</b>	<b>Supports designation.</b>
<b>S/7/6489/1970</b>	<b>66 Field adjacent to Cann Lodge.</b>	<b>Mr William Nicholson</b>	<b>Green lungs should be protected. The woods are protected so should the field be.</b>
<b>S/7/6696/2465</b>	<b>66 Field adjacent to Cann Lodge.</b>	<b>Mr William Ednie</b>	<b>The area should have the same protection as the adjacent woodland and it should remain a green field site. No development should be allowed to happen on these fields.</b>
<b>S/7/6856/2934</b>	<b>66 Field adjacent to Cann Lodge.</b>	<b>Mrs Peggy Irene Radmore</b>	<b>No development should be allowed on these fields. Some green fields in the city should be retained. The woods are protected and so should the fields be.</b>
O/7/5563/0749	66 Land at Cann House.	Premiere Health Mr Kevin Briscoe	To maintain the high standards of care that currently exist at the care home planning consent is required for sheltered housing.
O/7/6910/3188	70 Land north of Southway and land north of Coombe Lane.	Trustees of the Cann Estate	The land has development potential to meet future housing needs and could form part of a mix of residential and community uses. The functions attributed to the site are incorrectly described and relate to an arbitrary administrative boundary. This does not reflect the true character of the area. Other functions can be accommodated in the development of the area. The development would lead to the provision of community benefits, particularly recreational. The site is well contained and would not have an adverse impact on a wider visual area, particularly the AONB to the north.
O/7/6910/3193	71 Widewell Woods.	Trustees of the Cann Estate	Object to designation of land to the west of the Belliver Industrial estate as a Greenscape area. This land was identified in the previous adopted local plan for industrial development. The site is well contained and is not of significant merit in relation to the functions attributed to it and the land can make a valuable contribution to employment land needs. The site should be reallocated as employment land.

<b>Table 4. Summary of area and site specific representations. Southway.</b>			
<b>Reference</b>	<b>Part of Plan</b>	<b>Objector / Supporter</b>	<b>Summary of representation</b>
<b><i>8. Representations relating to omissions (i.e. things not included in the First Deposit Version of the Local Plan).</i></b>			
O/8/6910/3196	Proposal Omission Belliver	Trustees of the Cann Estate	Objects to the 'de-allocation' of land at Belliver for employment use
O/8/6584/2171	Proposal Omission Land adjacent Belliver Ind Est	Persimmon Homes South West Limited	Brownfield Land should be allocated for housing, and not as extension to industrial estate.
O/8/6584/2172	Proposal Omission Land adjacent Belliver Ind Est	Persimmon Homes South West Limited	Allocate for housing not employment eastern part to be retained by SWWA at the present time.
O/8/6910/3191	Proposal Omission Land adjacent to Cann Lodge	Trustees of the Cann Estate	Providing additional housing on green fields within the city is more sustainable than green field development outside the city. Urban expansion sites, such as this, have a greater role to play in meeting housing needs in a sustainable manner than is acknowledge in the plan and its preparation method. This site performs better than many the previously developed sites. The site is visually well contained and would not be harmful to the historic core of Tamerton Foliot. The site is well located to existing to facilities and services. This site should be allocated for housing development.
O/8/5298/0396	Proposal Omission Land between Holly Park and Tamerton Foliot.	Tambretone Ltd Miss Donna A Forshaw	This area should be allocated for residential development. The development can provide for a range of dwelling needs. The site is well served by existing infrastructure, particularly roads. The is no adverse impact on the landscape quality of the area. The impact on privacy of existing dwellings will not be significant. The development is considered to a natural in-fill/rounding off between existing development.
O/8/6788/2589	Proposal Omission Land east of Horsham Lane.	Mr & Mrs A Kent	The site should be allocated for residential development. Development can be undertaken in a sensitive manner that will improve the view of the existing developed area as viewed from sensitive areas of countryside to the north which are designated for their nationally important scenic quality.

<b>Table 4. Summary of area and site specific representations. Southway.</b>			
<b>Reference</b>	<b>Part of Plan</b>	<b>Objector / Supporter</b>	<b>Summary of representation</b>
O/8/6910/3189	Proposal Omission Land North of Coombe Lane.	Trustees of the Cann Estate	Providing additional housing on green fields within the city is more sustainable than green field development outside the city. Urban expansion sites, such as this, have a greater role to play in meeting housing needs in a sustainable manner than is acknowledge in the plan and its preparation method. The development would provide community benefits and allow enhancement of the conservation area. The development would not affect the character or quality of the area. The development would be well located in relation to services and facilities.
O/8/6910/3190	Proposal Omission Land north of Southway.	Trustees of the Cann Estate	Providing additional housing on green fields within the city is more sustainable than green field development outside the city. Urban expansion sites, such as this, have a greater role to play in meeting housing needs in a sustainable manner than is acknowledge in the plan and its preparation method. The land is well contained visually, in relation to the AONB or adjoining urban area at Southway. Development would improve the hard edge between Southway and the countryside to the north. The site would provide a sustainable development allocation given its location and proximity to exiting facilities, services and employment opportunities. The development would provide community benefits, particularly in relation to improved recreational provision through access to open land. The site would perform well against the Governments policy tests for new residential development.
O/8/6806/2762	Proposal Omission Rights of Way Lulworth Drive	Mr R D Stockman	The Right of Way across the fields has existed for over 30 years and should be retained along with the field's use as playing fields.
O/8/5211/0292	Proposal Omission Southway Community College	Mrs Cobbald	The part of the school site not designated as Greenscape should be designated for community use to include sport and recreation and community events. The area is lacking community facilities and the community college has played an important role in this respect. The local community supports a community facility and there is a danger that the site could be allocated for housing before the community have formalised their plans.
O/8/5019/2471	Proposal Omission Widewell Playing Fields	Mr D J Camp	Allocate as a District Park. Area short of Public Open Space. Supported by Southway CPS and minute E1 01/02 of the Education Committee.
O/8/5562/0748	Proposal Omission Widewell Playing Fields	Professor K R Clarke	Allocate as District Park. Need to value and protect important green space. Protect from development.
O/8/5568/0762	Proposal Omission Widewell Playing Fields	Ms J Calliss	Allocate as District Park.

<b>Table 4. Summary of area and site specific representations. Southway.</b>			
<b>Reference</b>	<b>Part of Plan</b>	<b>Objector / Supporter</b>	<b>Summary of representation</b>
O/8/5569/0763	Proposal Omission Widewell Playing Fields	Mr R G Leonard	Allocate as District Park. Should remain as playing fields.
O/8/5570/0764	Proposal Omission Widewell Playing Fields	Mrs Patricia Whelpton	Allocate as District Park. Keep green.
O/8/5571/0765	Proposal Omission Widewell Playing Fields	Mrs J A Gliddon	Allocate as District Park. Keep green.
O/8/5572/0766	Proposal Omission Widewell Playing Fields	Mrs J P Martin	Allocate as District Park. Keep green.
O/8/5574/0768	Proposal Omission Widewell Playing Fields	Mrs B V Carroll	Allocate as District Park. Keep green. Need grass areas for children to play – cuts down anti-social behaviour and reduces travel. The north of Plymouth has received little recreation provision compared to nearby areas out of the city.
O/8/5575/0769	Proposal Omission Widewell Playing Fields	Mrs R Dawes	Allocate as District Park
O/8/5576/0770	Proposal Omission Widewell Playing Fields	Mr S M Dawes	Allocate as District Park
O/8/5577/0771	Proposal Omission Widewell Playing Fields	Mr Raymond England	Allocate as District Park
O/8/5578/0772	Proposal Omission Widewell Playing Fields	Mr S W Pateman	Allocate as District Park. Keep green.
O/8/5579/0773	Proposal Omission Widewell Playing Fields	Mr & Mrs A Smith	Allocate as District Park. Keep green. PCC acting in an underhand way.
O/8/5580/0774	Proposal Omission Widewell Playing Fields	Mr R Butland	Allocate as District Park. Keep green. Community support.
O/8/5581/0775	Proposal Omission Widewell Playing Fields	Mrs H F Favell	Allocate as District Park. Keep green. No consideration given to cars when new houses are built.
O/8/5582/0776	Proposal Omission Widewell Playing Fields	Mrs B D Gibson	Allocate as District Park. Keep green. Community support. New estate at Holne Chase makes it more desirable.
O/8/5583/0777	Proposal Omission Widewell Playing Fields	Mr M J Gibson	Allocate as District Park. Keep green. Community support. Already well used.
O/8/5763/1596	Proposal Omission Widewell Playing Fields	Mr John W Watkins	Allocate as District Park. Keep green. Use for recreation will reduce anti-social behaviour.
O/8/6218/1594	Proposal Omission Widewell Playing Fields	Mr D S Beake	Allocate as District Park. Keep green. Community support. No large park north of the A38.
O/8/6219/1595	Proposal Omission Widewell Playing Fields	Mr Ronald Eaton	Allocate as District Park. Keep green

<b>Table 4. Summary of area and site specific representations. Southway.</b>			
<b>Reference</b>	<b>Part of Plan</b>	<b>Objector / Supporter</b>	<b>Summary of representation</b>
O/8/6416/1884	Proposal Omission Widewell Playing Fields	Mr & Mrs C Trend	Allocate as District Park. Keep green. Should allow for access on to the A386 rather than having to contend with unlit and pot holed Widewell Road.
O/8/6417/1885	Proposal Omission Widewell Playing Fields	Mrs Hazel Christine Davies	Allocate as District Park.
O/8/6418/1886	Proposal Omission Widewell Playing Fields	Miss Helen Christine Davis	Allocate as District Park.
O/8/6419/1887	Proposal Omission Widewell Playing Fields	Mr George W Davis	Allocate as District Park.
O/8/6473/1950	Proposal Omission Widewell Playing Fields	Mr Brian Bale	Allocate as District Park.
O/8/6496/1988	Proposal Omission Widewell Playing Fields	Mrs Susan Whitby	Allocate as District Park. Keep green. Long term benefits for children's health and the environment.
O/8/6497/1989	Proposal Omission Widewell Playing Fields	Mr Colin Whitby	Allocate as District Park. Keep green. Long term benefits for children's health and the environment.
O/8/6498/1990	Proposal Omission Widewell Playing Fields	Mrs P J Eyre	Allocate as District Park. Community desire.
O/8/6499/1991	Proposal Omission Widewell Playing Fields	Ms Mayne Sunderwall-Hopkins	Allocate as District Park.
O/8/6500/1992	Proposal Omission Widewell Playing Fields	Mr David Hopkins	Allocate as District Park.
O/8/6501/1993	Proposal Omission Widewell Playing Fields	Mr & Mrs Blanchard	Allocate as District Park. Community desire.
O/8/6502/1994	Proposal Omission Widewell Playing Fields	Mr & Mrs Hall	Allocate as District Park. Lack of facilities in the area. This part of Plymouth is forgotten by the Council.
O/8/6503/1995	Proposal Omission Widewell Playing Fields	Mr R Eyre	Allocate as District Park. Community desire highlighted through consultation.
O/8/6504/1996	Proposal Omission Widewell Playing Fields	Mr D Evans	Allocate as District Park. Lack of recreation areas for youngsters. Opposed to a right of way being created between Lulworth Drive and the A386 – will bring in outsiders.
O/8/6505/1997	Proposal Omission Widewell Playing Fields	Councillor Janice S Harden	Allocate as District Park. Community support highlighted through consultation.
O/8/6506/1998	Proposal Omission Widewell Playing Fields	Mr M L Crew	Allocate as District Park. Keep green. Opposed to development.
O/8/6660/2390	Proposal Omission Widewell Playing Fields	Mr R I Nunn	Allocate as District Park.

<b>Table 4. Summary of area and site specific representations. Southway.</b>			
<b>Reference</b>	<b>Part of Plan</b>	<b>Objector / Supporter</b>	<b>Summary of representation</b>
O/8/6684/2425	Proposal Omission Widewell Playing Fields	Mr J Bennett	Allocate as District Park.
O/8/6685/2426	Proposal Omission Widewell Playing Fields	Cllr G T Horler	Allocate as District Park. Community support highlighted through consultation.
O/8/6686/2468	Proposal Omission Widewell Playing Fields	Mr Paul Harvey	Community desire highlighted through consultation.
O/8/6740/2519	Proposal Omission Widewell Playing Fields	Mr A J Watchman	Allocate as a District Park. Plympton and Plymstock are favoured. Any development on site should require a public enquiry.
O/8/6777/2573	Proposal Omission Widewell Playing Fields	Mrs G A Camp	Allocate as a District Park as at Chaddlewood. Widewell has no other public open space and fields need to be a guaranteed community leisure facility. Supported in LE14 of Southway CPS.
O/8/6778/2574	Proposal Omission Widewell Playing Fields	Mr Cyril Meek	Suspect city under provided with school playing fields. Widewell playing fields were created as houses were built on land that was to be Southway CC's playing fields. Southway is equivalent to a major town – only breathing spaces are between Southway Lane and Southway Drive and Widewell fields.
O/8/6779/2575	Proposal Omission Widewell Playing Fields	Mr David Husband	Allocate as a District Park.
O/8/6787/2587	Proposal Omission Widewell Playing Fields	Ms C Perring	Allocate as a District Park. Do not allocate a public right of way from the A386 to Lulworth Drive – will attract undesirables.
O/8/6794/2722	Proposal Omission Widewell Playing Fields	Mrs D A Wisdom	Allocate as a District Park.
O/8/6813/2794	Proposal Omission Widewell Playing Fields	Mr Alfred Gerrard Pullin	Allocate as a District Park. Community support. Opposed to development. Should keep it green for community uses.
O/8/6814/2795	Proposal Omission Widewell Playing Fields	Mrs Jean Rose Pullin	Allocate as a District Park. It is important for recreation. Should have cricket, football, bowling etc.
O/8/6843/2883	Proposal Omission Widewell Playing Fields	Mr Henry Felgate	Allocate as a District Park. Stop pillaging our very best asset.
O/8/6868/2974	Proposal Omission Widewell Playing Fields	Mr E J Willey	Allocate as a District park and not Greenscape.
O/8/6869/2975	Proposal Omission Widewell Playing Fields	Mrs E Willey	Allocate as a District park and not Greenscape.
O/8/6870/2976	proposal Omission Widewell Playing Fields	Widewell Residence Association Mr T M Browne	Allocate as a District Park. Area lacks open space and needs a park for recreation. Has community support.
O/8/6871/2978	Proposal Omission Widewell Playing Fields	Mrs Tamsyn Taylor	Allocate as a District Park. Area lacks open space and needs a park for recreation. Support in the Community Planning Study.

<b>Table 4. Summary of area and site specific representations. Southway.</b>			
<b>Reference</b>	<b>Part of Plan</b>	<b>Objector / Supporter</b>	<b>Summary of representation</b>
O/8/6872/2979	Proposal Omission Widewell Playing Fields	Ex-Services Federation Mrs Brenda Browne	Allocate as a District Park. Area lacks open space and needs a park for recreation. Support in the Community Planning Study.
O/8/6873/2980	Proposal Omission Widewell Playing Fields	Mrs M J Green	Object to the sale of fields – need recreational facilities given the shortage.
O/8/6874/2981	Proposal Omission Widewell Playing Fields	Dr J C Green	One of the few open spaces left in north Plymouth. Regularly used. Need to look at long term health rather than short term financial gain.
O/8/6875/2982	Proposal Omission Widewell Playing Fields	Mrs S H Steele	Allocate as a District Park. Area lacks open space and needs a park for recreation. Support in the Community Planning Study.
O/8/6912/3213	Proposal Omission Widewell Playing Fields	Mrs Yvonne Robins	Allocate as a District Park.
O/8/6947/2977	Proposal Omission Widewell Playing Fields	Widewell Residence Association Mr Thomas Browne	Allocate as a District Park. Area lacks open space and needs a park for recreation. Has community support.

**Table 5. Summary of area and site specific representations. Egguckland.**

<b>Table 5. Summary of area and site specific representations. Egguckland.</b>			
<b>Reference</b>	<b>Part of Plan</b>	<b>Objector / Supporter</b>	<b>Summary of representation</b>
<b>1. Representations relating to Part One: Local Plan Purpose and Context.</b>			
No area or site specific representations for Egguckland Ward relating to this part of the Plan.			
<b>2. Representations relating to Part Two: Local Plan Strategy.</b>			
No area or site specific representations for Egguckland Ward relating to this part of the Plan.			
<b>3. Representations relating to Part Three: Local Plan Proposals.</b>			
O/3/5003/0004	67 Land at Hallerton Close.	Mrs Joyce Whitehead	Proposal would add traffic on to existing busy roads and exacerbate existing parking problems.
O/3/5004/0005	67 Land at Hallerton Close.	Mrs Caroline Tookey	This is the only area of grass where children can safely play and be watched by parents. There is an existing parking problem.
O/3/5029/0040	67 Land at Hallerton Close.	Mr & Mrs D Bazley	Existing sever parking problem. Young children use the area for informal play.
O/3/5036/0048	67 Land at Hallerton Close.	Mr David Taylor	This is the only area of grass where children can safely play and be watched by parents. There is little greenery in the estate and its loss will not be appreciated. The estate is already heavily built up, the impact will result in more traffic and danger and worry for children in the area.
O/3/5038/0050	67 Land at Hallerton Close.	Mr & Mrs J Zammit	The grass area is especially enjoyed for playing on by children. More cars in the close would not be welcomed.
O/3/5040/0055	67 Land at Hallerton Close.	Mrs Boobier	Children play on this grassed area. Development would spoil the environment.
O/3/5066/0087	67 Land at Hallerton Close.	Mr & Mrs Goss	The close is already suffers heavy on-street parking, additional parking would be dangerous. Nuisance/ danger during construction. Loss of safe play area for local children, where parents can watch over them. Proposal would de-value existing property.
O/3/5111/0166	67 Land at Hallerton Close.	Mrs Rachel Roe	Loss of green play area for children. Loss of light to existing property. The close is already suffers heavy on-street parking, additional parking would be dangerous.

<b>Table 5. Summary of area and site specific representations. Egguckland.</b>			
<b>Reference</b>	<b>Part of Plan</b>	<b>Objector / Supporter</b>	<b>Summary of representation</b>
O/3/5373/0502	67 Land at Hallerton Close.	Mrs J P Carthy	Novorrosisk Road is already very busy and is due to be widened. Loss of green area for children to play on. Noise levels and parking are already problems in the area.
O/3/6790/2663	67 Land at Hallerton Close.	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.
<b>4. Representations relating to Part Four: Local Plan Policies and allocation of sites under particular policies.</b>			
No area or site specific representations for Egguckland Ward relating to this part of the Plan.			
<b>5. Representations relating to Part Five: Local Plan Appendices.</b>			
No area or site specific representations for Egguckland Ward relating to this part of the Plan.			
<b>6. Representations relating to Local Plan Proposals Map and Annexes.</b>			
No area or site specific representations for Egguckland Ward relating to this part of the Plan.			
<b>7. Representations relating to Greenscape Areas.</b>			
O/7/6745/2526	154 Land west of Forder Battery.	Mr Stachan	The site already has planning consent for development of a dwelling house and other development proposals are subject to current planning appeal. The site does not demonstrate the functions set out in the greenscape policy. This part of the site should be excluded from Greenscape designation 154.
<b>8. Representations relating to omissions (i.e. things not included in the First Deposit Version of the Local Plan).</b>			
O/8/6573/2140	Proposal Omission Land at Forder Valley	Mr R S Gilbert	This site would make a better housing allocation than the new settlement proposed at Sherford. The site is within the residential area. The site is of little merit in its natural state for either recreational or agricultural purposes. Development of this site would comply with Government guidance.
O/8/6923/3432	Proposal Omission St Modwen Road / Parkway Industrial Estate	Granite Asset Management	Land including the Parkway Industrial Estate and Greenscape site 276 should be identified with land to the south as a Mixed Use Area. In particular, this designation should apply to a site on the east side of St. Modwen Road. The inclusion of this area/site would be a logical reflection of existing development and planning consents.

**Table 6. Summary of area and site specific representations. Estover.**

<b>Table 6. Summary of area and site specific representations. Estover.</b>			
<b>Reference</b>	<b>Part of Plan</b>	<b>Objector / Supporter</b>	<b>Summary of representation</b>
<b>1. Representations relating to Part One: Local Plan Purpose and Context.</b>			
No area or site specific representations for Estover Ward relating to this part of the Plan.			
<b>2. Representations relating to Part Two: Local Plan Strategy.</b>			
No area or site specific representations for Estover Ward relating to this part of the Plan.			
<b>3. Representations relating to Part Three: Local Plan Proposals.</b>			
O/3/6507/2007	68 Plymbridge Lane	Plymouth Friends of the Earth Miss Sheila V Evans	Considers the development would result in more traffic, congestion, and air pollution
O/3/6535/2061	68 Plymbridge Lane	Mr Andrew Osborne	Should be used as a helicopter base
O/3/6536/2062	68 Plymbridge Lane	Mr Robert Osborne	Should be used as a helicopter base
O/3/6927/3555	68 Plymbridge Lane	South West of England Regional Development Agency	Considers the site should be shown as a commitment, to reflect planning permission previously granted
O/3/6203/1570	69 Looseleigh	Six Continents Retail Ltd	Considers the site should be allocated for mixed use development, not simply employment, to reflect the various planning permissions granted, and the tender brief
O/3/6507/2006	69 Looseleigh	Plymouth Friends of the Earth Miss Sheila V Evans	Considers the development would result in increased traffic congestion, and reduced air quality etc. Suggests that at least part of the site should become a 'wildlife area'.
O/3/6601/2253	69 Looseleigh	Transport 2000 Cornwall/Plymouth & District Group Mr Don Allen	Considers the development would result in more traffic on the already congested Tavistock Road. Would prefer the site to become a 'wildlife area'.
O/3/6437/2111	72 Derriford Hospital	CTC Mr Colin Woodman	No mention made of cycling as a means of access to or between the Derriford Hospital, Plymouth International Business Park and Tamar Science Park sites. Need to develop and improve cycle links, making them convenient. Need to provide cycle parking.
O/3/6695/2456	72 Derriford Hospital	Derriford Hospital	Proposal generally supported. Concern at suggestion that development proposals should be made in the context of a comprehensive development strategy for the site. Wants this requirement deleted.

<b>Table 6. Summary of area and site specific representations. Estover.</b>			
<b>Reference</b>	<b>Part of Plan</b>	<b>Objector / Supporter</b>	<b>Summary of representation</b>
O/3/5092/0137	72 Derriford Hospital	Mr Bill Arkle	Generally supports the proposal. Cycle and pedestrian access is important. Would like to see more car parking, perhaps a multi-storey car park.
<b>S/3/6601/2250</b>	<b>72 Derriford Hospital</b>	<b>Transport 2000 Cornwall/Plymouth &amp; District Group Mr Don Allen</b>	<b>Fully support a public transport interchange at Derriford Hospital, particularly if it had links to Tamar Science Park and Plymouth International Business Park. (Note: The Proposal provides for public transport links between the 3 sites)</b>
O/3/5359/0480	73 Tamar Science Park	Mr Stephen Cox	Valley south of the Hospital has developed into a wonderful wildlife haven. It is valuable in its undisturbed state. Wildlife enhancement (as advocated in the Proposal) will not in reality improve its wildlife value. Greater consideration should be given to protecting an area or two on the site for wildlife.
O/3/6437/2110	73 Tamar Science Park	CTC Mr Colin Woodman	No mention made of cycling as a means of access to or between the Derriford Hospital, Plymouth International Business Park and Tamar Science Park sites. Need to develop and improve cycle links, making them convenient. Need to provide cycle parking.
O/3/6907/3120	73 Tamar Science Park	Environment Agency Mr Mike Robins	The watercourse, which presently runs through the site, must remain open and should be integrated into the development. Surface water from development should be drained via infiltration methods or restricted to existing greenfield run off given flooding problems downstream.
O/3/6927/3556	73 Tamar Science Park	South West of England Regional Development Agency	Support the proposal generally.
O/3/5092/0138	73 Tamar Science Park	Mr Bill Arkle	Generally supports the proposal. Cycle and pedestrian access is important. Would like to see more car parking, perhaps a multi-storey car park.
<b>S/3/6601/2251</b>	<b>73 Tamar Science Park</b>	<b>Transport 2000 Cornwall/Plymouth &amp; District Group Mr Don Allen</b>	<b>Fully support a public transport interchange at Derriford Hospital, particularly if it had links to Tamar Science Park and Plymouth International Business Park. (Note: The Proposal provides for public transport links between the 3 sites).</b>
O/3/6437/2109	74 Plymouth International Business Park	CTC Mr Colin Woodman	No mention made of cycling as a means of access to or between the Derriford Hospital, Plymouth International Business Park and Tamar Science Park sites. Need to develop and improve cycle links, making them convenient. Need to provide cycle parking.

<b>Table 6. Summary of area and site specific representations. Estover.</b>			
<b>Reference</b>	<b>Part of Plan</b>	<b>Objector / Supporter</b>	<b>Summary of representation</b>
O/3/6695/2455	74 Plymouth International Business Park	Derriford Hospital	Proposal generally supported. Concern at suggestion that development proposals should be made in the context of a comprehensive development strategy for the site. Wants this requirement deleted.
O/3/6907/3121	74 Plymouth International Business Park	Environment Agency Mr Mike Robins	Local streams do not have sufficient capacity to accept extra flows generated by development. Disposal should be via infiltration or limitation to existing Greenfield run off rates.
O/3/6927/3557	74 Plymouth International Business Park	South West of England Regional Development Agency	Allocation of PIBP for employment purposes is welcomed. At this early stage the future development of PIBP should not be restricted to medical / biotechnology cluster. The feasibility of the cluster is currently being researched and until this is concluded it is important to retain maximum flexibility for marketing of the site. The proposal should therefore make reference to the <u>potential</u> for developing a medical / biotechnology cluster. Additionally, the site should be identified as an existing commitment on the Proposals Map as planning permission has been received.
<b>S/3/6601/2252</b>	<b>74 Plymouth International Business Park</b>	<b>Transport 2000 Cornwall/Plymouth &amp; District Group Mr Don Allen</b>	<b>Fully support a public transport interchange at Derriford Hospital, particularly if it had links to Tamar Science Park and Plymouth International Business Park. (Note: The Proposal provides for public transport links between the 3 sites)</b>
O/3/6507/2005	75 Plymouth City Airport	Plymouth City Airport Plymouth Friends of the Earth Miss Sheila V Evans	Further development would lead to further congestion.
O/3/6535/2059	75 Plymouth City Airport	Mr Andrew Osborne	Will exacerbate an existing unacceptable noise problem.
O/3/6536/2063	75 Plymouth City Airport	Mr Robert Osborne	Will exacerbate an existing unacceptable noise problem.
O/3/6567/2126	75 Plymouth City Airport	DEBRA Mr J Trendell	Will exacerbate an existing unacceptable noise problem.

<b>Table 6. Summary of area and site specific representations. Estover.</b>			
<b>Reference</b>	<b>Part of Plan</b>	<b>Objector / Supporter</b>	<b>Summary of representation</b>
O/3/6601/2246	75 Plymouth City Airport	Transport 2000 Cornwall/Plymouth & District Group Mr Don Allen	Should be closed apart from purely local services. Don't think it is vital to the local economy
O/3/6797/2725	75 Plymouth City Airport	Mr David W Spittle	Objects to the fact that dwellings and schools will be in the Public safety Zone (PSZ).
O/3/6797/2853	75 Plymouth City Airport	Mr David W Spittle	Their property and other dwellings and schools will be in the PSZ.
O/3/6817/2803	75 Plymouth City Airport	Mr Keith Bodkin	It has reached its capacity. Any enlargement would lead to the demolition of houses and factories.
O/3/6818/2805	75 Plymouth City Airport	Mr Michael Howell	Their property and other dwellings and schools will be in the PSZ.
O/3/6842/3280	75 Plymouth City Airport	Sutton Harbour Community Mr Tim Bacon	Insufficient turnover to generate enough income for adequate investment. Land is under-used. Site should be redeveloped.
O/3/6881/2990	75 Plymouth City Airport	Mrs J Ager	The expense and disruption associated with expansion isn't worthwhile.
O/3/6882/2991	75 Plymouth City Airport	Mr D C Ager	Will damage the environment. Will damage the health of local residents.
O/3/6883/2992	75 Plymouth City Airport	Mr Robert T Sleep	The PSZ covers many houses, schools, surgery, factories and a busy road.
O/3/6907/3122	75 Plymouth City Airport	Environment Agency Mr Mike Robins	Special care needed with surface water drainage.
<b>S/3/5015/0017</b>	<b>75 Plymouth City Airport</b>	<b>Mr R E Johns</b>	<b><i>Airport should be extended eastwards.</i></b>
<b>S/3/5023/0029</b>	<b>75 Plymouth City Airport</b>	<b>Mr &amp; Mrs A Baxter</b>	<b><i>Could it be extended southeastwards?</i></b>
<b>S/3/6251/1658</b>	<b>75 Plymouth City Airport</b>	<b>General Aviation Awareness Council Ms Anna Bloomfield</b>	<b><i>Supports and suggests a safeguarding and a general aviation policy that are dealt with elsewhere as objections.</i></b>
<b>S/3/6927/3558</b>	<b>75 Plymouth City Airport</b>	<b>South West of England Regional Development Agency</b>	<b><i>In line with SWRDA regional strategy and RPG policy SS17.</i></b>

<b>Table 6. Summary of area and site specific representations. Estover.</b>			
<b>Reference</b>	<b>Part of Plan</b>	<b>Objector / Supporter</b>	<b>Summary of representation</b>
O/3/6507/2004	76 Land at Plymbridge Road / Glenfield Road	Plymouth Friends of the Earth Miss Sheila V Evans	Objects – (no reason given).
O/3/6601/2247	76 Land at Plymbridge Road / Glenfield Road	Transport 2000 Cornwall/Plymouth & District Group Mr Don Allen	Objects – (no reason given).
O/3/6907/3123	76 Land at Plymbridge Road / Glenfield Road	Environment Agency Mr Mike Robins	Care required with surface water drainage.
<b>S/3/5015/0018</b>	<b>76 Land at Plymbridge Road / Glenfield Road</b>	<b>Mr R E Johns</b>	<b>Supports</b>
<b>S/3/5023/0030</b>	<b>76 Land at Plymbridge Road / Glenfield Road</b>	<b>Mr &amp; Mrs A Baxter</b>	<b>If no longer required for safety reasons, should be retained as open land for leisure purposes.</b>
O/3/5211/0293	77 Land at Tavistock Road / Plymbridge Road	Mrs Cobbald	Principle is acceptable. Should be located further out. 450 spaces are too few.
O/3/6224/1620	77 Land at Tavistock Road / Plymbridge Road	Bryant Developments	There is a better alternative on the northern edge of the city.
O/3/6507/2003	77 Land at Tavistock Road / Plymbridge Road	Plymouth Friends of the Earth Miss Sheila V Evans	Site is at too busy a location. Should be moved to Roborough.
O/3/6601/2248	77 Land at Tavistock Road / Plymbridge Road	Transport 2000 Cornwall/Plymouth & District Group Mr Don Allen	It should be moved further north.
O/3/6907/3124	77 Land at Tavistock Road / Plymbridge Road	Environment Agency Mr Mike Robins	Care with surface water drainage.
O/3/6922/3429	77 Land at Tavistock Road / Plymbridge Road	Devon County Council	It should be moved further north.
<b>S/3/5023/0031</b>	<b>77 Land at Tavistock Road / Plymbridge Road</b>	<b>Mr &amp; Mrs A Baxter</b>	<b>Integral to all the proposed improvements.</b>

<b>Table 6. Summary of area and site specific representations. Estover.</b>			
<b>Reference</b>	<b>Part of Plan</b>	<b>Objector / Supporter</b>	<b>Summary of representation</b>
<i>S/3/6927/3559</i>	<i>77 Land at Tavistock Road / Plymbridge Road</i>	<i>South West of England Regional Development Agency</i>	<i>Should encourage greater use of public transport and help to reduce congestion and pollution.</i>
O/3/6507/2002	78 Tavistock Road (A386) and "The George" junction.	Plymouth Friends of the Earth Miss Sheila V Evans	No specific reason.
O/3/6535/2060	78 Tavistock Road (A386) and "The George" junction.	Mr Andrew Osborne	Loss of green space.
O/3/6536/2064	78 Tavistock Road (A386) and "The George" junction.	Mr Robert Osborne	Loss of green space.
O/3/6567/2127	78 Tavistock Road (A386) and "The George" junction.	DEBRA Mr J Trendell	Road should not be moved closer to houses.
O/3/6601/2249	78 Tavistock Road (A386) and "The George" junction.	Transport 2000 Cornwall/Plymouth & District Group Mr Don Allen	Money would be better spent on re-opening the Drake Line for modal shift and to reduce pollution.
O/3/6797/2726	78 Tavistock Road (A386) and "The George" junction.	Mr David W Spittle	His property, other houses and 2 schools fall within the proposed Airport Public Safety Zone (PSZ).
O/3/6797/2854	78 Tavistock Road (A386) and "The George" junction.	Mr David W Spittle	His property, other houses and 2 schools fall within the proposed Airport Public Safety Zone (PSZ).
O/3/6817/2804	78 Tavistock Road (A386) and "The George" junction.	Mr Keith Bodkin	The road should not be diverted to make way for the Runway End safety area (RESA).
O/3/6818/2806	78 Tavistock Road (A386) and "The George" junction.	Mr Michael Howell	His property, other houses and 2 schools fall within the proposed Airport Public Safety Zone (PSZ).
O/3/6883/2993	78 Tavistock Road (A386) and "The George" junction.	Mr Robert T Sleep	The PSZ will be over houses, a school, a surgery, factories and a the busiest road into Plymouth.
O/3/6907/3125	78 Tavistock Road (A386) and "The George" junction.	Environment Agency Mr Mike Robins	Special care required with the surface water drainage.

<b>Table 6. Summary of area and site specific representations. Estover.</b>			
<b>Reference</b>	<b>Part of Plan</b>	<b>Objector / Supporter</b>	<b>Summary of representation</b>
S/3/5023/0032	78 Tavistock Road (A386) and "The George" junction.	Mr & Mrs A Baxter	Support
S/3/6927/3560	78 Tavistock Road (A386) and "The George" junction.	South West of England Regional Development Agency	Support. Will enable the provision of the RESA. This will help in the retention of the airport necessary to overcome peripherality problems.
O/3/5023/0033	79 Land at Plymbridge Road / Buena Vista Drive.	Mr & Mrs A Baxter	Prefer it to remain open. If developed the mix is wrong – affordable housing and medium/high cost housing won't mix. Density – (presumably too high).
O/3/5313/0412	79 Land at Plymbridge Road / Buena Vista Drive.	Mr D Campbell	Too many dwellings. Too many affordable houses. Traffic generated will increase congestion.
O/3/5324/0425	79 Land at Plymbridge Road / Buena Vista Drive.	Mr & Mrs L G Downing	Should be used to house the elderly. Mistake for it to be family housing as there are too few facilities locally.
O/3/5414/0543	79 Land at Plymbridge Road / Buena Vista Drive.	Mr P R Holmes	Too many houses. Inappropriate location next to a main road and airport. Will worsen existing congestion.
O/3/5477/0662	79 Land at Plymbridge Road / Buena Vista Drive.	Mr B F Bryant	Loss of green area. Residents will be badly affected by the proposed road works and Park and Ride(PAR) site.
O/3/5492/0677	79 Land at Plymbridge Road / Buena Vista Drive.	Mr B C Gray	Density too high especially when combined with the PAR site and loss of open land. The junction will get too busy with the increase in traffic.
O/3/6267/1677	79 Land at Plymbridge Road / Buena Vista Drive.	LT CDR K E Williams	Too many houses. Would add to congestion at the Tavistock Road / Plymbridge Road junction. A water main and sewer crosses the site.
O/3/6560/2118	79 Land at Plymbridge Road / Buena Vista Drive.	Mrs T J Haskings	It is greenfield. Surrounding roads are too busy. A water main and sewer crosses the site. Trees overhang the road and leaves block drains. Too close to the airport.
O/3/6789/2601	79 Land at Plymbridge Road / Buena Vista Drive.	Land South West Chartered Surveyors Mr M J Holden	Affordable housing requirement of 55% is too high.
O/3/6790/2664	79 Land at Plymbridge Road / Buena Vista Drive.	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.

<b>Table 6. Summary of area and site specific representations. Estover.</b>			
<b>Reference</b>	<b>Part of Plan</b>	<b>Objector / Supporter</b>	<b>Summary of representation</b>
O/3/6830/2826	79 Land at Plymbridge Road / Buena Vista Drive.	Greenside Properties Ltd	Should be public open space and a play area. It should be a Greenscape area. Once developed will lose its potential for public benefit.
O/3/6831/2835	79 Land at Plymbridge Road / Buena Vista Drive.	Prowting Projects Ltd	Should be public open space and a play area. It should be a Greenscape area. Once developed will lose its potential for public benefit.
O/3/6832/2850	79 Land at Plymbridge Road / Buena Vista Drive.	Barratt Homes Exeter Ltd	Should be public open space and a play area. It should be a Greenscape area. Once developed will lose its potential for public benefit.
O/3/6907/3126	79 Land at Plymbridge Road / Buena Vista Drive.	Environment Agency Mr Mike Robins	Special care with surface water drainage.
O/7/6221/1600	79 Land at Plymbridge Road / Buena Vista Drive.	Mr & Mrs B R Kerswill	How can local people use it as it is rented out. As land becomes scarce, green field sites are deemed a luxury. What happens when all green field sites have gone. Should remain as a green field as a nature reserve and play area.
O/3/6790/2665	80 Land at Powisland Drive	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/3/5229/0317	81 Land at Looseleigh Lane.	Mrs Glynis Irene Burnett	Harm caused by an increase in traffic.
O/3/6790/2666	81 Land at Looseleigh Lane.	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/3/6557/2099	82 Land North of Dunraven Drive.	Mr Andrew Philip Dart	Exclude the land between 22 and 48 Dunraven Drive from this proposal. This land has no public access and does not merit protection. The land to the rear of the houses has some natural value and its potential to form part of the public open space should be discussed.
O/3/6681/2422	82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.	Mr Peter Hubble	It would benefit the wildlife if it was kept closed to the public. People do not use the land to its full potential anyway. Dartmoor is only 5 miles away for recreation.
O/3/6901/3067	82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.	Mr Lippell	The land is privately owned and used for forestry purposes as a crop. People currently trespass because of the 'informal open space' proposal in the 1996 Local Plan – this has led to vandalism. Designation between 140-150 Dunraven Drive should be removed so that the land can be used properly.
<b>S/3/5013/0014</b>	<b>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</b>	<b>Mr C W Brady</b>	<b>Support public access, it's an eyesore.</b>

<b>Table 6. Summary of area and site specific representations. Estover.</b>			
<b>Reference</b>	<b>Part of Plan</b>	<b>Objector / Supporter</b>	<b>Summary of representation</b>
<i>S/3/5046/0062</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mr Michael Collier</i>	<i>Support proposal.</i>
<i>S/3/5065/0086</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mrs Anne Ford</i>	<i>Support - a haven for people and wildlife.</i>
<i>S/3/5108/0163</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mrs S Parkinson</i>	<i>Hopefully will mean access path to Southway will be upgraded.</i>
<i>S/3/5148/0209</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mr Darren Patrick Orum</i>	<i>Support - a green oasis. Would like informal recreation/conservation rather than sports, landfill adjacent to 140 should be removed, should be low vegetation so doesn't block out light to properties, the pathway next to 140 should be moved to the middle of gap for amenity reasons, would like to purchase land adjacent to 140 for buffer.</i>
<i>S/3/5175/0239</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mr Donald S Fawbert</i>	<i>Support proposal – should allocate funds for improvements.</i>
<i>S/3/5198/0271</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mr &amp; Mrs Andrew Parkin</i>	<i>Support - a haven for people and wildlife.</i>
<i>S/3/5202/0281</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mr Kevin Norris</i>	<i>Support</i>
<i>S/3/5207/0286</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mr &amp; Mrs R J Pascoe</i>	<i>Support – people and wildlife.</i>
<i>S/3/5340/0443</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Tamerton Foliot Village Conservation Society Mrs B Bebbington</i>	<i>Support</i>
<i>S/3/5429/0565</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mr Anthony William Knowles</i>	<i>Important for wildlife.</i>
<i>S/3/6680/2421</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mrs Rogers</i>	<i>Support</i>
<i>S/3/6698/2473</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Derriford Residents Group Mrs Gwyneth M Bere</i>	<i>Support Public Rights of Way are blocked and important for wildlife.</i>

<b>Table 6. Summary of area and site specific representations. Estover.</b>			
<b>Reference</b>	<b>Part of Plan</b>	<b>Objector / Supporter</b>	<b>Summary of representation</b>
S/3/6698/2567	82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.	Derriford Residents Group Mrs Gweneth M Bere	<i>Support. Land important to communities of Southway and Derriford. The land was originally intended to be adopted as public open space as part of the development of the housing estate. The adoption would honour a longstanding commitment. The Appeal Inspector confirmed the land has no development potential – proposal is thus achievable in financial terms. Pressures for development have caused uncertainty and been a drain on the resources of the Council and local residents. Acquisition of land by Council will allow site to be managed and strike balance between access and conservation. There is wide spread community support for the proposal as indicated by the Estover CPS and Derriford Residents' Groups actions.</i>
S/3/6699/2474	82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.	Derriford Residents Group Mrs Hilary M Blewett	<i>Support</i>
S/3/6700/2475	82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.	Derriford Resident's Group Mrs S M Loder	<i>Support – wide range of wildlife and asset for recreation.</i>
S/3/6701/2476	82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.	Mr John Boulter	<i>Support – wildlife, recreation, green break.</i>
S/3/6702/2477	82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.	Mr & Mrs Bamber	<i>Support</i>
S/3/6703/2482	82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.	Mr Kenneth R Dixon	<i>Support – common sense has prevailed.</i>
S/3/6704/2483	82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.	Mrs D Murray	<i>Support – it's an eyesore.</i>
S/3/6705/2484	82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.	Mr Peter D Hume	<i>Support – recreation benefits.</i>
S/3/6706/2485	82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.	Mr Evens	<i>Support</i>
S/3/6707/2486	82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.	Mr & Mrs P E McKintosh	<i>Support – recreational benefits and will also reduce tipping.</i>
S/3/6708/2487	82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.	Mr & Mrs E A Froggatt	<i>Support</i>
S/3/6709/2488	82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.	Derriford Residents Group Mrs Elizabeth M Dickinson	<i>Support – path key link to services - particularly for children, important recreational area, and possible area for planes to crash land-avoiding housing.</i>
S/3/6710/2489	82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.	Mrs Jones	<i>Support – ease congestion.</i>

<b>Table 6. Summary of area and site specific representations. Estover.</b>			
<b>Reference</b>	<b>Part of Plan</b>	<b>Objector / Supporter</b>	<b>Summary of representation</b>
<i>S/3/6711/2490</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mrs Tracey Eaton</i>	<i>Support – dog walking, children can play without traffic.</i>
<i>S/3/6712/2491</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mr Brian Elision</i>	<i>Support – dog walking, children’s play, wildlife.</i>
<i>S/3/6713/2492</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mrs J A Hole</i>	<i>Support</i>
<i>S/3/6714/2493</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mrs June Jones</i>	<i>Support – benefit to residents and wildlife.</i>
<i>S/3/6715/2494</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mrs Sue John</i>	<i>Support conservation area.</i>
<i>S/3/6716/2495</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mr Andrew Cools</i>	<i>Support</i>
<i>S/3/6717/2496</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mrs D Alabaster</i>	<i>Support – natural beauty and remove eyesore.</i>
<i>S/3/6718/2497</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mrs L Bully</i>	<i>Support</i>
<i>S/3/6719/2498</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mrs Angela Stalled</i>	<i>Support – recreation and conservation.</i>
<i>S/3/6720/2499</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mrs Williams</i>	<i>Support – recreation and conservation.</i>
<i>S/3/6721/2500</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mr Gerald Nevisky</i>	<i>Support – recreation and conservation.</i>
<i>S/3/6722/2501</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mr Colin Robinson</i>	<i>Support – Need green spaces in dense housing areas.</i>
<i>S/3/6723/2502</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mr P C Trehane</i>	<i>Support</i>
<i>S/3/6724/2503</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mr C G F Beaumont</i>	<i>Support protection of green spaces against commercial developers.</i>
<i>S/3/6725/2504</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mr &amp; Mrs R W Stewart</i>	<i>Support protection of green land and trees from development.</i>
<i>S/3/6726/2505</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mrs Marion Wilkes</i>	<i>Support – wildlife and recreation.</i>
<i>S/3/6727/2506</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mrs Rosemarie Robinson</i>	<i>Support – a well used area with many uses.</i>
<i>S/3/6728/2507</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mr &amp; Mrs J Pickerill</i>	<i>Support</i>

<b>Table 6. Summary of area and site specific representations. Estover.</b>			
<b>Reference</b>	<b>Part of Plan</b>	<b>Objector / Supporter</b>	<b>Summary of representation</b>
<i>S/3/6729/2508</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mr &amp; Mrs B Obee</i>	<i>Support</i>
<i>S/3/6730/2509</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mr N H K Stitson</i>	<i>Support – wildlife and quiet recreation. Would support Compulsory Purchase.</i>
<i>S/3/6731/2510</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mrs Helen Rendle</i>	<i>Support – recreation and footpath link.</i>
<i>S/3/6732/2511</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Derriford Residents Group Mrs P D Reeve</i>	<i>Support – needs cleaning, levelling, unsightly fencing removed, path should be safer.</i>
<i>S/3/6733/2512</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mr D E Sumner</i>	<i>Support – wildlife and recreation.</i>
<i>S/3/6734/2513</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mrs M I Savage</i>	<i>Support</i>
<i>S/3/6735/2514</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mr Micheal Smith</i>	<i>Support</i>
<i>S/3/6736/2515</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mrs Lorna Sykes</i>	<i>Support – wildlife and recreation.</i>
<i>S/3/6737/2516</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mrs T Saunders</i>	<i>Support.</i>
<i>S/3/6738/2517</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mr Anthony Warren</i>	<i>Support – well used area, wildlife, children, green lung.</i>
<i>S/3/6747/2538</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mr Keith Morris</i>	<i>Support – recreation and wildlife.</i>
<i>S/3/6748/2539</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mr &amp; Mrs Baptist</i>	<i>Support – environment, path, recreation.</i>
<i>S/3/6749/2540</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mr S Bradford</i>	<i>Support</i>
<i>S/3/6750/2541</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mrs Kathryn E Harding</i>	<i>Support</i>
<i>S/3/6751/2542</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mr T W Meaney</i>	<i>Support – wildlife and recreation.</i>
<i>S/3/6752/2543</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mrs Marjorie F Brown</i>	<i>Support – environment, path, recreation, opportunity to tidy area near Dunraven Drive..</i>
<i>S/3/6753/2544</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mr &amp; Mrs Mitchell</i>	<i>Support</i>
<i>S/3/6754/2545</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mr &amp; Mrs D Bolt</i>	<i>Support – wildlife and recreation.</i>

<b>Table 6. Summary of area and site specific representations. Estover.</b>			
<b>Reference</b>	<b>Part of Plan</b>	<b>Objector / Supporter</b>	<b>Summary of representation</b>
<i>S/3/6755/2546</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mrs Carmen Mullard</i>	<i>Support – an eye sore</i>
<i>S/3/6756/2547</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mr Kirvell</i>	<i>Support</i>
<i>S/3/6757/2548</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mr Davison</i>	<i>Support</i>
<i>S/3/6758/2549</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mrs B S Elliott</i>	<i>Support – the gap should be restored to its natural state.</i>
<i>S/3/6759/2550</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mr John Cotton</i>	<i>Support – environment, path, recreation.</i>
<i>S/3/6760/2551</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mr R J Clifton</i>	<i>Support – will enable the area to be better managed.</i>
<i>S/3/6761/2552</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mr John Hill</i>	<i>Support</i>
<i>S/3/6762/2553</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mr &amp; Mrs David Court</i>	<i>Support – wildlife, recreation, path.</i>
<i>S/3/6763/2554</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mrs Phillipa Elms</i>	<i>Support – space for wildlife and relief from city.</i>
<i>S/3/6764/2555</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mrs Susan Kehoe</i>	<i>Support – recreation and wildlife.</i>
<i>S/3/6765/2556</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mrs E J Crocker</i>	<i>Support – path, improve appearance, should make it a level site.</i>
<i>S/3/6766/2557</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mrs Dorothy Jefferson</i>	<i>Support – should improve the path.</i>
<i>S/3/6767/2558</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mr &amp; Mrs A Harvey</i>	<i>Support</i>
<i>S/3/6768/2559</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mrs S J Clark</i>	<i>Support – recreation, shortcut to school.</i>
<i>S/3/6769/2560</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mr &amp; Mrs Roger Hine</i>	<i>Support – green break to development, relaxation, path.</i>
<i>S/3/6770/2561</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mr &amp; Mrs How</i>	<i>Support – eyesore, recreation, improve the path.</i>
<i>S/3/6771/2562</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mr Doran</i>	<i>Support – recreation.</i>
<i>S/3/6809/2766</i>	<i>82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.</i>	<i>Mr R H Hall</i>	<i>Support preservation.</i>

<b>Table 6. Summary of area and site specific representations. Estover.</b>			
<b>Reference</b>	<b>Part of Plan</b>	<b>Objector / Supporter</b>	<b>Summary of representation</b>
S/3/6827/2817	82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.	Mr & Mrs P Woodford	Support – recreation, path reduces car use, certainty.
S/3/6884/2994	82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.	Mr David Watson	Support.
S/3/6885/2995	82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.	Mr M E Blyth-Palk	Support – recreation and short cut.
S/3/6886/2996	82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.	Mr James Holland	Support – recreation.
S/3/6887/2997	82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.	Mrs Patricia Buckingham	Support
S/3/6888/2998	82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.	Mr Derek Wonnacott	Support – birdlife and recreation.
S/3/6889/2999	82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.	Mrs E A Ching	Support – recreation.
S/3/6938/2478	82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.	Mrs Barbara Brocklehurst	Support – enriches life.
S/3/6939/2479	82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.	Dr A M Grace	Support – need a safe path to Southway so that people can access facilities and services.
S/3/6940/2480	82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.	Mr K Jackson	Support – stop dumping.
S/3/6941/2481	82 Land north of Dunraven Drive.	Mrs Foster	Support – enhance area and hopefully improve the path to Southway.
S/3/6819/2807	82 Land North of Dunraven Drive.	Cllr Alexandra Sloggett	Green spaces must be preserved.
S/3/6824/2814	82 Land North of Dunraven Drive.	Cllr Peter Brookshaw	Green spaces must be preserved.
<b>4. Representations relating to Part Four: Local Plan Policies and allocation of sites under particular policies.</b>			
O/4/6603/2272	1 Christian Mill	London & Westcountry Estates Ltd Mr Michael Hockin	Objects to property being included within an Established Employment Area. Wishes designation to be changed to Mixed Use Area, under Policy 21.
O/4/6204/1571	1 Tamerton Foliot Road	BT Group PLC	Objects to site being included within an Established Employment Area. Wishes designation to be changed to Mixed Use Area, under Policy 21.
O/4/6202/1569	21 (Crownhill Works)	Viridor Properties Ltd	The area with planning permission for employment use at Crownhill Works is one of the uses appropriate to a Mixed Use Area. The Mixed-Use Area designation should extend to cover this area.
<b>5. Representations relating to Part Five: Local Plan Appendices.</b>			

<b>Table 6. Summary of area and site specific representations. Estover.</b>			
<b>Reference</b>	<b>Part of Plan</b>	<b>Objector / Supporter</b>	<b>Summary of representation</b>
No area or site specific representations for Estover Ward relating to this part of the Plan.			
<b>6. Representations relating to Local Plan Proposals Map and Annexes.</b>			
O/6/6201/1563	Incorrect boundary (Tavistock Rd Site)	Dawnan Ltd	Crownhill Works. The boundary shown for the area with planning permission for employment uses and the adjacent Mixed Use Area should reflect more accurately the planning permission for employment uses.
O/6/6202/1565	Incorrect boundary (Tavistock Rd Site)	Viridor Properties Ltd	Crownhill Works. 1. The boundary shown for the area with planning permission for employment uses and the adjacent Greenscape Area should reflect more accurately the planning permission for employment uses. 2. The area shown as being an area of floodrisk is different on Maps 10 and 11 and in any case is inappropriate given the planning permission.
<b>7. Representations relating to Greenscape Areas.</b>			
O/7/5299/0398	103 Estover School Playing Fields.	The Governing Body of Estover Community College	The designation of this site as a greenscape area has been put forward without justification. A detailed assessment was undertaken for the suitability of this land for development. Greenscape designation should be removed from the part of the site that has been subject to a planning application for residential development.
O/7/6695/2457	108 Bircham Valley.	Derriford Hospital	The area of designation covered by Greenscape site 108 is too extensive, which is confusing and makes application of the policy uncertain. The boundary of the designation with Proposal 72 at Derriford Hospital is unduly restrictive to the area potentially available for development in the Hospital grounds. The value of the designation does not outweigh the importance of the hospitals expansion to the community. The boundary in this area needs to re-defined.
O/7/6830/2822	108 Land east of Charlton Crescent.	Greenside Properties Ltd	Part of former Royal Marine Barracks, Seaton site should be allocated for residential development. This land is identified in the Supplementary Planning Guidance for the former RMB Seaton as suitable for residential development. Development could take place without having an unacceptable impact on the character of the area. Non of the functions attributed to the site would be seriously effected by the development of the site.
O/7/6901/3066	86 Powisland Drive open space.	Mr Lippell	The site can not legally be used for informal recreation. The site does not form a buffer/separation between significantly different development.
<b>8. Representations relating to omissions (i.e. things not included in the First Deposit Version of the Local Plan).</b>			

<b>Table 6. Summary of area and site specific representations. Estover.</b>			
<b>Reference</b>	<b>Part of Plan</b>	<b>Objector / Supporter</b>	<b>Summary of representation</b>
O/8/5404/3502	Land east of Charlton Crescent.	Defence Estates South West Mr Mike Blowers	The site can accommodate a flagship project for an exemplar sustainable residential development project. The development would contribute towards Plymouth 2020 Partnership vision for the city. Despite the site not being 'previously developed', it will still be a suitable for development as it is well located to provides an excellent sustainable development opportunity.
O/8/6830/2827	Land east of Charlton Crescent.	Greenside Properties Ltd	The site can accommodate a flagship project for an exemplar sustainable residential development project. The development would contribute towards Plymouth 2020 Partnership vision for the city. Despite the site not being 'previously developed', it will still be a suitable for development as it is well located to provides an excellent sustainable development opportunity.
O/8/6927/2121	Proposal Omission Land east of Tamar Science Park	South West of England Regional Development Agency	Include a proposal to extend Tamar Science Park to the east to ensure the long-term requirements of the biotechnology / medical cluster can be accommodated.
O/8/5452/0592	Proposal Omission Blunts Lane Site	Plymouth St Budeaux Kingdom Hall Project Committee Mr F W James	To enable the sale of the Blunts Lane Kingdom Hall to raise finance for a new hall on the proposal 110 site (St Budeaux by-pass) the land where the hall is located should be allocated in the Plan as a community use or employment site. The employment allocation would offset any potential loss at the St Budeaux by-pass employment site.
O/8/6840/2879	Proposal Omission Coleridge Training Area	Maze Consulting Mr Richard May	The land will no longer be a viable agricultural unit, following the splitting up of the larger site into a number of different ownership's. The site could accommodate a significant residential development and the creation of significant areas of new public open space.
O/8/6557/2092	Proposal Omission Land between 22 & 48 Dunraven Drive.	Mr Andrew Philip Dart	The land between the existing houses does not meet the necessary criteria for designation as a greenscape area and it has development potential. The land should be allocated as forming part of the 'Existing Residential Area'.
O/8/6557/2094	Proposal Omission Land between 22 & 48 Dunraven Drive.	Mr Andrew Philip Dart	The local plan should be amended to allow the part of the land between the existing houses to be developed for residential purposes. This to be achieved by some form of positively worded policy or proposal.