

## 11. Issues and Options responses to: Central Park Area Action Plan

**Table 11: Summary of responses to Central Park Area Action Plan Issues and Options.**

Number expressing concern	425
Number expressing support	34
Number of other comments	13
<b>Total</b>	<b>472</b>

### 11.1. Comments in support of the proposed options

There is support for:

- 11.1.1. The redevelopment of Central Park, including the Mayflower Centre and Home Park.
- 11.1.2. A new parking area at Peverell Corner.
- 11.1.3. A new car park behind shops, beside surgery.
- 11.1.4. The provision of a car park on the site of the allotments.
- 11.1.5. A 50m pool and the completion of Home Park Stadium. An Olympic standard pool and a football ground with the capacity appropriate for Premiership games will bring great benefits. Support for extra car parking.
- 11.1.6. Residential development in Central Park.
- 11.1.7. Hotel, conference and exhibition facilities complementary to the existing uses within the park.
- 11.1.8. The loss of the Parks Depot, provided suitable alternative arrangements are made.
- 11.1.9. Improved facilities for Central Park financed by development within the Park, as well as reinvesting surplus assets as appropriate.
- 11.1.10. A transport interchange with the loss of car parking spaces, to encourage the use of public transport.
- 11.1.11. A new swimming pool, sports hall, skating rink, allotments, small car park and sympathetic enhancement of the park.
- 11.1.12. Improvements such as vandal-proof toilets, and zero tolerance on graffiti.
- 11.1.13. The significant enrichment opportunity for all young people.
- 11.1.14. Plymouth Sports Forum supports redevelopment and improvements for recreational use, and also a Life Centre.
- 11.1.15. JUBB Consulting Engineers supports the proposals, and suggests an enhanced boulevard/footpath and cycleway link from the transport hub to the railway station, and beyond the northern fringe to the city centre.

- 11.1.16. Peverell Park Surgery Focus Group supports the retention of Peverell Corner shops with additional parking.
- 11.1.17. Prestige Construction SW Ltd supports the development of a Life Centre for excellent sports and leisure facilities.

## **11.2. Concerns raised**

- 11.2.1. There are concerns about the loss of green space. A pre-printed letter was circulated, which raised the following concerns:
- The unnecessary building of residential development in Central Park on 'greenfield' sites contrary to current planning policies.
  - Hotel, conference and exhibition facilities, which are not complementary to the existing sporting and recreational uses within Central Park.
  - The creation of a transport interchange with the loss of valuable car parking spaces.
  - The loss of the Parks Depot within Central Park, which helps maintain a quality park and provides a presence to users.
  - The City Council's assumption that improved facilities within Central Park can only be financed by development within the Park rather than by reinvesting surplus assets, as was achieved in the redevelopment of Plymouth Argyle's Stadium in 2002.

The letter was signed and sent in by 385 people.

- 11.2.2. Concern about any development in Central Park, and encroaching on greenspace.
- 11.2.3. Concern about the Life Centre and car park at Peverell Corner. The Life Centre is wrong for Central Park, could be built on the bus depot or at Marjons. There are already 2 car parks within a 10-minute walk of Peverell Corner.
- 11.2.4. Concerns about financing by asset stripping.
- 11.2.5. No more land for Plymouth Argyle or shops. Health club, cinema etc. already provided elsewhere in the city. Need more flowerbeds.
- 11.2.6. Concerns about the loss of allotments, or people being forced to move them.
- 11.2.7. Central Park was sold to the Council for a fraction of its market value, with the condition that it would always remain as a green public space. Both parties signed a Deed of Covenant. This expressly forbids any commercial development within the park. With the density of housing and other buildings planned for the city, this green space is vital to the health and well being of the citizens of Plymouth.
- 11.2.8. The permanent loss of greenspace within the park boundaries to residential development is fundamentally unsustainable. These proposals should be removed from an otherwise positive scheme.
- 11.2.9. The city bus depot should not be sold off and developed to fund these proposals. The 'Life Centre' term should be changed to leisure facilities.
- 11.2.10. Concerns about phrases such as 'transport interchange' and 'enabling development' in a document supposedly about enhancing the city's main park.
- 11.2.11. Plymouth and SW Cooperative Society is concerned about retailing being used to enable regeneration in Central Park.

### **11.3. Other comments**

- 11.3.1. There are comments on the use/under use of Central Park.
- 11.3.2. To ease parking and traffic problems, special buses could be run to Home Park on match days under the proposals.
- 11.3.3. Comments on the redevelopment of the bus depot.
- 11.3.4. A leisure centre has some appeal. The attraction of Central Park is that it is an undeveloped area within a city.
- 11.3.5. Better transport within the park is needed, for example a Monorail.
- 11.3.6. Concern about proposals for a hotel. If it were sited at the bus depot, it could still perhaps service the sports facilities.
- 11.3.7. The Cyclist's Touring Club supports the proposals for secure cycle parking, and for access across the roads surrounding the park. However, cycle facilities within the park should only be used by people who have been able to cycle there. The wider context of routes for cyclists to the park should be addressed in the Framework.
- 11.3.8. Sport England comments that the AAP should support the concept of the proposed Life Centre. The facility should be developed carefully in line with the projected playing pitch analysis, because a net loss would occur on the proposed site. Additional playing pitches should be provided within the vicinity to accommodate loss, in case there are not enough pitches to cope with the demand.
- 11.3.9. London & Westcountry Estates comments on the development of the city having an effect on the value of Central Park.
- 11.3.10. The Conservative Group Forum made a number of comments:
  - Support proposals for 50 metre swimming pool, and accept that there will be commercial sporting facilities placed in the Park.
  - Many of the other leisure facilities proposed would be better placed in the Millbay regeneration area.
  - Wish to see Home Park stadium completed, accept that some corporate hospitality facilities would bring extra revenue for Argyle.
  - Concerns regarding any other commercial development of the Park.
  - Concerns regarding residential development in Central Park.
  - Concerns regarding where the Milehouse bus depot would be relocated.
  - Do not see the need to create new footpaths through the Park, but support plans to improve existing paths. Also concerns regarding improving links between Ford Park cemetery and Central Park. Adequate lighting will be needed to protect users of the path and the graves themselves.