

City of Plymouth Local Plan (1995-2011) First Deposit

Summary of General & Policy Representations

December 2002

Contents

Introduction

Next Steps

For Further Information

Annex 1. Tables

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

Table 2. Local Plan General and Policy Representations. Cumulative totals.

Table 3. Summary of General and Policy representations

Introduction

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

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

This report summarises in table format, representations received relating to General and Policy issues. Other reports, produced in July 2002, summarised site and area-specific representations for:

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

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

In considering the information on representations set out in the 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. 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.

Having concluded the “First Deposit” stage of the Local Plan process, the City Council had intended to proceed to “Second Deposit” stage, followed by a Public Local Inquiry.

However, it is possible that a different process may now be adopted, in view of the changes proposed by Central Government to the development planning system as a whole.

Having very recently received guidelines for preparation of the proposed Local Development Frameworks, and the transitional arrangements for moving to the new system, the City Council will now consider how best to move matters forward. As soon as it is in a position to do so, the Council will then publish a revised timetable, setting out more precisely the future stages in plan preparation.

For further information

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

Annex 1 Tables

These Tables include information about the General and Policy representations received on the Local Plan.

Representations in support are distinguished from objections by being highlighted in ***bold and italic***.

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

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

Table 2. Local Plan Representations relating to general and policy matters

Table 2. Local Plan Representations			
Part of Plan	Objections	Representations in support	Total representations
<i>1. Representations relating to Part One: Local Plan Purpose and Context</i>			
	4	4	8
<i>2. Representations relating to Part Two: Local Plan Strategy</i>			
	148	82	230
<i>3. Representations relating to Part Three: Local Plan Proposals</i>			
	4	4	8
<i>4. Representations relating to Part Four: Local Plan Policies and allocation of sites under particular policies</i>			
	362	570	932
<i>5. Representations relating to Part Five: Local Plan Appendices</i>			
	12	4	16
<i>6. Representations relating to Local Plan Proposals Map and Annexes</i>			
	5	1	6
<i>8. Representations relating to omissions (i.e. things not included in the First Deposit Version of the Local Plan)</i>			
	34	0	34

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
1. Representations relating to Part One: Local Plan Purpose and Context.			
S/1/5075/0117	Foreword	CPRE Plymouth & South Hams Group Mr Roger Gage	No grounds of support stated.
O/1/6197/1575	Purpose Plan Period	Viridor Waste Management Limited Mr M G Oliver	Objects to the Plan Period; it does not allow enough time in which to plan development; it should be extended to 2016.
O/1/6918/3408	Purpose Relationship to Structure Plan	Lee Mill Partnership	Questions whether the local plan reflects the policies of the Devon Structure Plan, particularly on matters concerning housing ie joint-working with South Hams District Council, and identifying more land for housing than is required in the Structure Plan.
O/1/6544/2076	Purpose Plan Period	C P R E Mr J H G Woolcombe (Chairman CPRE)	Objects to the provision of a new settlement in the South Hams. The County Structure Plan is currently being reviewed and should remove the requirement for a new settlement, based on PPGs 3 & 10. This would then have to be a material consideration for the Plymouth Local Plan. Urges the City Council to accommodate housing demand within the city boundary – this can be achieved by extending the plan period to 2016, in line with PPG3 and PPG10.
S/1/6791/2701	Purpose	Plymouth East End Renewal Partnership Mr Phil Mitchell	Supportive of Part 1, particularly in providing a framework for considering planning applications (1.1) and in recognising the importance of public consultation (1.2) in the production of the plan.
O/1/6926/3482	Strategic Planning Context – Relationship to South Hams Local Plan	South Hams District Council Mr Alan Robinson	Urges the Council to amend the summary of the South Hams Local Plan Review to make it more balanced and up-to-date.
S/1/6224/1604	Strategic Planning Context – Relationship to South Hams Local Plan	Bryant Developments	Supportive of relationship to South Hams, particularly the statements ‘. . .that any new residential development will be appropriately located to maximise the opportunity for sustainable development.’, and ‘That the Plymouth Fringe sites need to be looked at in a co-ordinated way because of the cross border environmental, social and transport issues.’ Support given to the possibility of an urban extension.
S/1/6926/3481	Strategic Planning Context – Relationship to South Hams Local Plan	South Hams District Council	Supports the need for sub-regional working in recognition of the range of cross-border issues facing local authorities and supports the need for Plymouth Sub Regional Study. Seeks amendment to the plan’s interpretation of the South Hams Local Plan in order to make it more balanced and up-to-date.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
2. Representations relating to Part Two: Local Plan Strategy.			
O/2/6911/3198	Plymouth's 2020 Vision.	Plymouth Chamber of Commerce and Industry Mr David Lobban	General support given for the Vision, but suggests adding a statements which can be assessed more easily in the future eg 'By 2011 Plymouth will be premier city in the South West in which to live and work'.
S/2/6907/3114	Plymouth's 2020 Vision.	Environment Agency Mr Mike Robins	Support the vision to make 2020 Vision central to plan.
S/2/6917/3281	Plymouth's 2020 Vision.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Supports tying in the Plan to the 2020 Pathfinder Strategy (PPG12#A14).
S/2/6475/1955	Plymouth's 2020 Vision.	Ms Val Woodward	Supportive of Vision.
S/2/6927/3519	Plymouth's 2020 Vision.	South West of England Regional Development Agency	Details and breakdown of Vision are supported; they provide a clear focus for the Plan. Suggests setting out the aims and objectives at city-wide and area levels, and also considering implications at sub-regional level e.g. South Hams and South East Cornwall.
S/2/6654/2357	Plymouth's 2020 Vision.	South West RSL Planning Consortium	Supportive.
S/2/6917/3282	Aims	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Supportive of aims, particularly in light of PPG12#4.2 and Sustainable Development Framework (RPG10 VIS1)
S/2/6654/2358	Aims	South West RSL Planning Consortium	Supportive.
O/2/6918/3405	General	Lee Mill Partnership	Plan is overly complicated and therefore contrary to PPG12 (para 3.1). Referencing particular parts of the plan is difficult because of the absence of paragraph numbers. Should introduce paragraph numbers.
O/2/6911/3199	General	Plymouth Chamber of Commerce and Industry Mr David Lobban	Suggests alterations to the presentation of the objectives and strategy statements, including the use of indicators. Suggest making a clearing Vision by bringing some objectives and strategy statements forward into the Vision, and making particular references to key sites.
O/2/6926/3484	General	South Hams District Council Mr Alan Robinson	Urges Plymouth to adopt this strategy as soon as possible in the light of PPG3 (Housing) to planning applications that are submitted in advance of the adoption of their local plan. Wording should be added to the plan to make this clear.
S/2/5410/0539	General	Mr R H Wilcockson	Support given to all of Part 2.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
S/2/6926/3483	General	South Hams District Council Mr Alan Robinson	Strongly supports the general strategy and in particular its emphasis on regeneration with the re-use of previously developed land. Urges Plymouth to adopt this strategy as soon as possible in the light of PPG3 (Housing) to planning applications that are submitted in advance of the adoption of their local plan.
O/2/6917/3283	Objective 1 Regional identity, facilities and services.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Although strategy statements 1 & 2 appear to contain the main statement of the spatial strategy, figure 1 – which is so crucial to the spatial strategy – is located in a different part of the plan. This is confusing and needs to be set out clearly (PPG12 #2.18). Suggests Figure 1 to be more closely related to the strategy statements, or to set out the strategy statements at the top of section 2.5.
O/2/6866/2972	Objective 1 Regional identity, facilities and services.	Maritime Plymouth Captain A G Dyer	Objective 1 is weakened by not adequately reflecting the aim of the Plymouth Marine Sector Development Strategy, which is to ‘secure the greatest economic benefit for the city of Plymouth from its established strengths in port and marine activities and make best use of the unique natural resource represented by the Waters of Tamar and associated land based activities’.
O/2/6812/2784	Objective 1 Regional identity, facilities and services.	Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners	Objects to references to specific sites in strategy statement. Mention of these is inappropriate at strategic level and should therefore be deleted and dealt with among the proposals. The inclusion of ‘RNEC Manadon site’ is capable of misinterpretation, as this is split up into different areas.
O/2/6927/3520	Objective 1 Regional identity, facilities and services.	South West of England Regional Development Agency	Object to the lack of clarification on Plymouth’s role as a regional centre in relation to other major cities in the South West, such as Bristol and Exeter Objects to the lack of reference to clusters and sectors in Aim 1, as these could contribute significantly towards the development of Plymouth as a regional centre. Objects to lack of recognition of the need to improve rail services in supporting the spatial strategy. The following amendments should be made: clarification on what is meant by Plymouth’s role as a regional centre; reference to the importance of clusters; and reference to importance of improved rail infrastructure and services to the spatial strategy of the Plan.
O/2/6900/3039	Objective 1 Regional identity, facilities and services.	Sport England South West Region Mr Gary Parsons	Object to the lack of recognition of Plymouth’s potential to become an international centre for sport, as well as knowledge and learning, tourism and culture.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
<i>S/2/6911/3200</i>	<i>Objective 1 Regional identity, facilities and services.</i>	<i>Plymouth Chamber of Commerce and Industry Mr David Lobban</i>	<i>Strategy statements 1 & 2 of Objective 1 are supported.</i>
<i>S/2/6903/3088</i>	<i>Objective 1 Regional identity, facilities and services.</i>	<i>University of Plymouth Mr Mark Harvey</i>	<i>Supports the Council's aim to support the growth of further & higher education institutions in the city, and strengthening of their links with local communities and businesses, both in functional and land-use terms. The university also supports the Council's aim to exploit and develop the city's potential regional and sub-regional significance as a centre for sport. In particular, the university would welcome the opportunity to be part of developments at sites such as Central Park, Brickfields and RNEC Manadon.</i>
O/2/5453/0597	Objective 2 Image of city.	Penlee Vale Residents Association Brigadier P C Bowser	Strategy statement 8 (protecting views) will not provide adequate protection of views unless it specifies restrictions on building heights.
<i>S/2/6911/3201</i>	<i>Objective 2 Image of city.</i>	<i>Plymouth Chamber of Commerce and Industry Mr David Lobban</i>	<i>Strongly supported.</i>
<i>S/2/6927/3521</i>	<i>Objective 2 Image of city.</i>	<i>South West of England Regional Development Agency</i>	<i>Supportive of objective to improve image, especially in light of RPG10. Recommend that objective should be retained.</i>
O/2/6837/2868	Objective 3 Strategic communication links.	Captain Tim Charlesworth	Strategy statement 3 does not fully reflect the importance of commercial shipping in Cattewater, particularly in light of SWERDA naming Plymouth as a hub port in the Regional Strategy Document. Urges the Council to make a stronger statement of commitment to both retaining and growing the port's commercial activities.
O/2/6917/3284	Objective 3 Strategic communication links.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Strategy statement 1 appears reactive. The local plan should identify the key city transport requirements in the city (PPG12 #5.15), rather than support investments proposed elsewhere.
O/2/6918/3409	Objective 3 Strategic communication links.	Lee Mill Partnership	Object on grounds that it does not state the improvement of existing communications infrastructure, such as buses and railway, as opposed to investment in other new forms of transport such as the light rail transit, which could be disruptive. Stresses the necessity of buses and trains.
O/2/6911/3202	Objective 3 Strategic communication links.	Plymouth Chamber of Commerce and Industry Mr David Lobban	Strategy does not seem to be specific enough to Plymouth – it could apply to any city. Urges that an over-arching vision statement should be included, which can be tested more easily, such as 'Plymouth will become the premier city in south west in which to live and work by 2001.'
<i>S/2/6866/2971</i>	<i>Objective 3 Strategic communication links.</i>	<i>Maritime Plymouth Captain A G Dyer</i>	<i>Strongly supported, particularly the strategy statements. Strengthening the port activities should be included as a 'key proposal', stemming from the Ro Ro Development Study currently being carried out for Maritime Plymouth.</i>

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
S/2/6599/2225	Objective 3 Strategic communication links.	Railtrack	Support particularly the parts supporting investment in public transport infrastructure and safeguarding railway land and land with the potential for rail freight.
S/2/6927/3522	Objective 3 Strategic Communication Links	South West of England Regional Development Agency	Supportive of policy, particularly the way it reflects PPG10 and the Regional Strategy. Also welcomes reference to the role of the port and airport in the strategy statements supporting Objectives 3 and 4. Support for the competitiveness of the port and the city's marine sector in strategy statement to Objective 3. Support given for the intention to safeguard existing railway land and land with the potential for the promotion of rail freight in the city as part of the strategy statement for Objective 3. The aim to improve information technology and telecommunications is also positive. A high quality ICT infrastructure is vital for securing economic investment and reducing the need to travel.
O/2/6917/3285	Objective 4 Local economy.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Considers the Local Economy Objective should refer to 'business opportunities'. Also considers that Table 3 should be amended to quantify the employment component of mixed-use and other developments, and for sites with insignificant employment components to be removed from the table.
O/2/6918/3410	Objective 4 Local economy.	Lee Mill Partnership	Objects to the inclusion of Table 3 (Objective 4) which is considered to be confusing.
O/2/6585/2777	Objective 4 Local economy.	Midas Commercial Developments Ltd	Considers that, because the Plan makes provision for housing beyond the Structure Plan requirement, it should therefore provide for a commensurate increase in employment land
O/2/6584/3451	Objective 4 Local economy.	Persimmon Homes South West Limited	Objects to the principle of 'compensatory provision' being required when employment land is 'lost' to other uses.
S/2/6866/2970	Objective 4 Local economy.	Maritime Plymouth Captain A G Dyer	Supports the Plan's approach to the port. Suggests that the strategy statements relating to the Local Economy Objective could usefully include reference to general marine employment and port uses.
S/2/6911/3203	Objective 4 Local economy.	Plymouth Chamber of Commerce and Industry Mr David Lobban	Strongly supports key statements within the Strategy. Suggests that an overarching vision statement for 2011 could usefully be included.
S/2/6927/3523	Objective 4 Local economy.	South West of England Regional Development Agency	Supports Local Economy Objective
O/2/6693/2449	Objective 5 Shopping.	Aldi Stores (Swindon) Ltd	Considers that the sites at Whitleigh Green and Granby Way/South Yard should be deleted from the shopping strategy, and that the site at Longfield Place should be included.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/2/6690/2439	Objective 5 Shopping.	B & Q PLC	Considers the Plan should state that retail need/capacity should be kept under review, that the retail requirements outlined in the Plan are only a guide to future development, and that individual applications will be judged on their own merits, in view of the need demonstrated at the time.
O/2/6917/3286	Objective 5 Shopping.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Suggests that the focus of the Shopping Objective could be emphasised by calling it 'City, District and Local Centres' rather than 'Shopping'. Also suggests that the designated shopping centres could be listed here.
O/2/6923/3433	Objective 5 Shopping.	Granite Asset Management	Considers the Shopping Objective to be too prescriptive and insufficiently flexible to accommodate changes in the retail sector
O/2/6803/2759	Objective 5 Shopping.	John Lewis Partnership (Waitrose Ltd)	Considers that the Plan should include a new Shopping Objective, to identify a site or sites to meet a recognised need for a large food and non-food store, of up to 10,000 sq m.
O/2/6908/3160	Objective 5 Shopping.	Plymouth & South West Co-operative	Objects to use of the word 'discount' in the Shopping Objective, in relation to food shops. Also seeks definition of the term 'medium-sized' in relation to food shops.
O/2/6911/3211	Objective 5 Shopping.	Plymouth Chamber of Commerce and Industry Mr David Lobban	Generally supports the Shopping Objective, but considers it should also address the issue of quality.
O/2/6586/2183	Objective 5 Shopping.	W.M. Morrison Supermarkets Plc	Considers one of the strategy statements relating to the Shopping Objective should be amended to provide for the appropriateness of mixed-uses to be considered in the context of developments within, or on the edge of town, district, and local centres.
S/2/6927/3524	Objective 5 Shopping.	South West of England Regional Development Agency	Supports Shopping Objective.
O/2/6853/2930	Objective 6 Deliverability of Housing Strategy	Plympton Quaker Group-Religious Society of Friends Mrs Eunice Slee	Objects to the affordable housing requirements, together with other financial demands placed on developers. This will mean that development is not financially viable, particularly on sites where conservation issues demand a high standard of design and materials. If development is not financially viable, then the windfall dwellings target in table 5 will not be achieved. The affordable housing provision is also idealistic, and so the percentage should be changed to 15-25% Suggests adding another criterion which allows for fewer affordable homes on sites where developers also have to meet costs of site clearance, demolition and decontamination.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/2/6918/3411	Objective 6 Housing.	Lee Mill Partnership	It is questioned whether existing residents of the City will have the quality living environment maintained, given the level of development proposed within the city within the plan period.
O/2/6918/3447	Objective 6 Housing.	Lee Mill Partnership	Object to Table 5 – it is unlikely that the level of housing development proposed will be achieved; the non-achievement allowances are too low. The phasing of proposals is overly optimistic, and the proportions of affordable housing proposed are optimistic, given that 91% of the allocations are on brownfield sites. Support is given for working with the South Hams but it is questioned as to whether it is lawful under current legislation and whether this will compromise future housing needs. It is also questioned whether this cross boundary working has broken down given the different targets for affordable housing.
O/2/6924/3448	Objective 6 Housing.	McCarthy & Stone (Developments) Ltd	There is no reasoned justification for the affordable housing target . It is not clear how the target has been arrived at, and there is not a robust housing needs assessment.
O/2/6557/2095	Objective 6 Housing.	Mr Andrew Philip Dart	Strategy Statement no. 1 supporting Objective 6 should be amended to give support to the use and re-use of 'under-developed' land as well as previously developed.
O/2/6911/3204	Objective 6 Housing.	Plymouth Chamber of Commerce and Industry Mr David Lobban	The need to meet the affordable housing needs of the City is acknowledged. It is also recognised that even with an improved economy and increased spending power there will always be those who will find it difficult to access appropriate homes. However the plan failed to recognise that it is equally important to ensure that there are homes suitable for those who wish to invest in the City, and for those who may take their spending power to the many market towns around Plymouth and thereby add to the commuting congestion.
O/2/6926/3486	Objective 6 Housing.	South Hams District Council Mr Alan Robinson	Development at South Hams is to meet the needs of the sub-region, therefore there should be a consistent response to the Housing Needs Survey. The SHDC objects to the decision to the approach of adopting a mid-range between scenarios A and B; and the cautious approach to estimating capacity on sites is not yet identified. Believes that there is further scope to develop previously developed sites to reduce greenfield take. The results of the UCS are difficult to relate to proposals in the PLP. Not satisfied that the potential for the city has been identified and embraced in the PLP Review.
O/2/6927/3525	Objective 6 Housing.	South West of England Regional Development Agency	Objects to such high affordable housing requirements, which, together with other obligations, may render sites uneconomic. Lower Negotiated affordable housing provisions are needed in Strategic Opportunity areas and other regeneration areas where it can be demonstrated that it would prejudice the viability of development.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/2/6900/3040	Objective 6 Housing.	Sport England South West Region Mr Gary Parsons	Should include a similar reference to providing for sport as that which is included related to providing for affordable housing. Developers of new housing, including single dwellings should make adequate on-site provision or contribute money to a pool to be spent on appropriate sports projects in the city. This is a legitimate and workable approach.
O/2/6479/1959	Objective 6 Overall Housing Provision.	Brixton Parish Council	Housing which is six miles from the City Centre is not sustainable and would create traffic that could not be accommodated by the present road systems. Any provision for housing people of Plymouth should be catered for by Plymouth's own regeneration plans.
O/2/5075/0479	Objective 6 Overall Housing Provision.	CPRE Plymouth & South Hams Group Mr Roger Gage	Supports the provision of an extra 2,500 houses, but suggests that the target should be higher in order to comply with the Urban Capacity Study. The Plan should reflect the time period of PPG10 – to 2016 – then more houses could be built. All extra housing should be accommodated in Plymouth.
O/2/6790/2607	Objective 6 Overall Housing Provision.	House Builders Federation (HBF) Ms Jo Hanslip	Objects to Objective 6 as it does not provide sufficient certainty that the strategic requirement can be constructed by 2011. Insufficient data has been provided by the urban capacity study and no data is provided to enable the testing of the findings of assumptions undertaken in the study. The plan over estimates the capacity and likely delivery of housing within the plan period. Objects to the inclusion of the targets for affordable housing, as they are unduly excessive and unrealistic given the local circumstances. HBF is concerned that references to “all” sites as it is considered to be inflexible in approach.
O/2/6918/3418	Objective 6 Overall Housing Provision.	Lee Mill Partnership	It is unlikely that the Council will achieve its commitment to meeting the housing land requirement for the Plymouth Area of Economic Activity, as 91% of the proposals for residential development alone are on previously developed land.
O/2/6484/1964	Objective 6 Overall Housing Provision.	Miss Cathy Palmer	The proposed ‘new community’ is unnecessary and unsustainable. It will cause traffic congestion and grid-lock on both the A38 and A379. It is also contrary to government housing policy PPG3 clause 73. The new settlement should be deleted; the districts housing allocation is far too high. If an urban extension is needed it should be done in a balanced logical way, looking at the area as a whole, regardless of council boundaries.
O/2/6600/2227	Objective 6 Overall Housing Provision.	Modbury Society Mrs M Barnett	Welcome Plymouth's plans for regeneration but believes that if PPG3 policies are strictly followed there is the capacity within the city to meet all housing needs. It would therefore not be necessary to build in the South Hams. Should adhere to PPG3 and RPG10 and delay implementation of the plan until Devon Structure Plan to 2016 has been reviewed.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/2/6223/1602	Objective 6 Overall Housing Provision.	Mr & Mrs R Elford	Oppose the proposed Sherford Valley Housing Development. It would change the character of Brixton village, traffic congestion would increase on the A379, and building a new town in a rural area is likely to attract even more in-comers into the country. Suggest that more brown field development should occur in and around the central area of Plymouth.
O/2/6605/2283	Objective 6 Overall Housing Provision.	Mr & Mrs R Westlake	Question whether a number of identified sites are likely to be brought forward. Not all previously developed land will be available Urban extensions should be included.
O/2/6206/1582	Objective 6 Overall Housing Provision.	Mr David Vosper	Objects to development, as fields will be lost, and there is concern of increased traffic – he did not choose to live in a town. Should build elsewhere such as Plymouth.
O/2/5366/0495	Objective 6 Overall Housing Provision.	Mr Edward C Herbert	Objects to the use of Greenfield sites for the development of the new Sherford community, when there are brownfield sites and areas of run down commercial and residential property for redevelopment. Plans should maximise the amount of housing on sites within Plymouth.
O/2/6207/1583	Objective 6 Overall Housing Provision.	Mr J Carter	Against development at Sherford. The roads and Laira Bridge at peak times can hardly cope, and extra traffic will cause grid lock. The countryside will also be ruined. All brownfield sites must be dedicated to low cost housing and rent related flats for single/ one-parent families. City centre developers must put housing above all future retail plans.
O/2/6577/2146	Objective 6 Overall Housing Provision.	Mr J F Rogers	Objects to Barn Farm, Court Gates Farm and Manor Farm at Staddiscombe not being included in developable land. The proposed Local Plan Review offers a number of brown field sites which are questionable as to their deliverability within the plan period. The sites mentioned above would be deliverable in this time span and should therefore be included.
O/2/6520/2030	Objective 6 Overall Housing Provision.	Mr John A Carter	Against development at Sherford. The roads, and Laira Bridge at peak times, can hardly cope; extra traffic will cause grid-lock. The countryside will also be ruined. All brownfield sites must be dedicated to low cost housing and rent related flats for single/ one-parent families. City Centre developers must put housing above all future retail plans.
O/2/6209/1585	Objective 6 Overall Housing Provision.	Mr John Fairweather-Tall	Object to Sherford development. An area of exceptional beauty will be lost. Traffic will increase on the already busy A379 causing gridlock. Four villages within close proximity will create youth problems. No provision has been made for churches. Should minimise the impact of any essential additional housing by maximising use of brownfield sites, and by ensuring that excess is distributed thinly around towns and villages of the South Hams.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/2/6521/2031	Objective 6 Overall Housing Provision.	Mr Mark Carter	Against development at Sherford. It will contribute to road congestion, causing more pollution and road rage. Loss of countryside is unacceptable. Brown field sites should be given priority and no more retail development should occur in the City Centre without major priority being given to residential accommodation. This will cut traffic and bring back life to the centre.
O/2/5514/0699	Objective 6 Overall Housing Provision.	Mr Paul G Wright	Objects to the “new community” at Sherford. Plymouth should reconsider its use of brownfield sites to supply its own land for additional building and avoid encroaching into Devon’s beautiful countryside.
O/2/6519/2029	Objective 6 Overall Housing Provision.	Mr Philip John Briant	Against development at Sherford. The roads and Laira Bridge at peak times can hardly cope, and extra traffic will cause grid lock. The countryside will also be ruined. All brownfield sites must be dedicated to low cost housing and rent related flats for single/ one-parent families. City centre developers must put housing above all future retail plans.
O/2/6208/1584	Objective 6 Overall Housing Provision.	Mrs Carole Bennett	Against development at Sherford. The roads and Laira Bridge at peak times can hardly cope, and extra traffic will cause grid lock. The countryside will also be ruined. All brownfield sites must be dedicated to low cost housing and rent related flats for single/ one-parent families. City centre developers must put housing above all future retail plans.
O/2/6937/2411	Objective 6 Overall Housing Provision.	Mrs Deborah Carter	Against development at Sherford. The roads, and Laira Bridge at peak times, can hardly cope; extra traffic will cause grid-lock. The countryside will be also be ruined. All brownfield sites must be dedicated to low cost housing and rent related flats for single/ one-parent families. City centre developers must put housing above all future retail plans.
O/2/6522/2032	Objective 6 Overall Housing Provision.	Mrs Julie Kay Briant	Against development at Sherford. The roads, and Laira Bridge at peak times, can hardly cope; extra traffic will cause grid lock. The countryside will also be ruined. All brownfield sites must be dedicated to low cost housing and rent related flats for single/ one-parent families. City centre developers must put housing above all future retail plans
O/2/6210/1586	Objective 6 Overall Housing Provision.	Mrs R W Carter	Against development at Sherford. The roads and Laira Bridge at peak times can hardly cope, and extra traffic will cause grid lock. The countryside will also be ruined. All brownfield sites must be dedicated to low cost housing and rent related flats for single/ one-parent families. City centre developers must put housing above all future retail plans.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/2/5513/0698	Objective 6 Overall Housing Provision.	Mrs Rose Clark	The proposed “new community” is unnecessary. It will cause even more traffic chaos on the A38 and A379, and is contrary to PPG3 clause 73. The new settlement should be deleted, and as many as possible of the 3,500 should be located within Plymouth.
O/2/6812/2785	Objective 6 Overall Housing Provision.	Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners	General support is given to the policy approach behind Objective 6: Strategy Statement 1. However the inclusion of specific sites within the related Table 6 is unjustified and inappropriate at a strategic level. Table 6 should be amended by the inclusion of further land or sites in sustainable locations in accordance with government advice in PPG3 Housing.
O/2/6584/3462	Objective 6 Overall Housing Provision.	Persimmon Homes South West Limited	Supports the general emphasis of Objective 6. Objection is raised over the methodology used in preparing to meet the identified need in the adopted structure plan for 14,000 homes between 1995 and 2011. Fully supports the proposed allocation of the Amey Rail Depot on Valletort Road as a sustainable brownfield housing site. Objects to the lack of information provided within the Deposit Plan and associated Urban Capacity Study, the estimated capacity of the site, the level of affordable housing sought on this and other brownfield sites, and the omission of land adjoining Proposal 117.
O/2/6584/2462	Objective 6 Overall Housing Provision.	Persimmon Homes South West Limited Mr Richard Ayre	Many of the sites in question have been identified by the Urban Capacity Study, which the house building industry has not been involved in. Persimmon Homes objects to all the sites included in Table 6 to allow time for further consideration.
O/2/6831/3457	Objective 6 Overall Housing Provision.	Prowting Projects Ltd	There is potential for the Local Plan to make provision for a larger number of dwellings, reflecting generally the capacity identified in the UCS and, in particular, the opportunity for additional housing at Plymstock Quarry.
O/2/5201/0278	Objective 6 Overall Housing Provision.	South Hams Against Rural Destruction Mr Steve Melia	The overall housing allocation is too low to accommodate the anticipated demand generated by existing households. The proposed over spill into the South Hams will be damaging to the city and contrary to PPG3. The terms of reference for the Urban Capacity Study were unduly restrictive, ruling out large scale redevelopment of currently occupied sites. The housing allocation should be increased to 12,000 by incorporating plans for large scale redevelopment of areas such as the City Centre, Millbay and Cattedown at much higher densities.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/2/6926/3485	Objective 6 Overall Housing Provision.	South Hams District Council Mr Alan Robinson	Urges that the City Council to continue to investigate and promote further opportunities to identify and bring forward additional scope for housing development in the city to further reduce the requirement for development on greenfield sites in the South Hams or elsewhere. The conclusions of the Plymouth UCS are over-cautious in view of the resultant implications for greenfield development in the South Hams. In particular, the Council objects to the decision to adopt a mid-point between Senarios A and B of the UCS and the “cautious approach” to estimating capacity on sites not yet identified. The results of the Plymouth UCS are complex and it is difficult to clearly relate them to the housing content and proposals. Seek greater transparency and clarity in linking the UCS to the PLP and the fuller advancement of the capacity for housing development both identified in the UCS and beyond its recommendations.
O/2/6926/3493	Objective 6 Overall Housing Provision.	South Hams District Council Mr Alan Robinson	In relation to each development proposal the City Council are urged to review the capacity and phasing of housing provision to reduce pressure on greenfield sites. Suggest a critical review of the capacity and phasing of each development proposal to advance previously developed land ahead of greenfields in the Plymouth Area of Economic Activity.
O/2/6921/3426	Objective 6 Overall Housing Provision.	South Hams Tourism Forum Mr Nigel Way	The allocation of housing relating to a new settlement in any Greenfield site within the South Hams will adversely affect the tourism industry. The area is a sensitive area and being increased in development will have a detrimental effect on the roads and coastline of the South Hams. It would be much more productive if the possibility of developing the Brownfield sites within Plymouth City was explored.
O/2/6920/3437	Objective 6 Table 5 Housing land position.	Wainhomes (SW) Limited	Object to details, particularly the allowances for non-implementation of large sites with permission, the non-achievement of residential allocations, contributions from sub-division of existing housing, contributions for living over the shop, contribution from empty homes, contributions from conversion of commercial buildings and windfalls. The scale of the sites to be allocated should be further increased.
O/2/6832/2840	Objective 6 Table 6 New residential allocations.	Barratt Homes Exeter Ltd	Land south of Newnham Road, Plympton should be allocated as a housing site. Table 6 should be amended accordingly. Complimentary objections to the omission of a proposal are reported in the area committee report covering Plympton St. Mary Ward.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/2/6830/2820	Objective 6 Table 6 New residential allocations.	Greenside Properties Ltd	Land east of Charlton Crescent at the former Seaton Barracks should be allocated as a housing site that could accommodate up to 250 dwellings. Table 6 should be amended accordingly. Complimentary objections to the Greenscape designation and omission of a proposal are reported in the area committee report covering Estover Ward.
O/2/6557/2096	Objective 6 Table 6 New residential allocations.	Mr Andrew Philip Dart	The site between 28 to 48 Dunraven Drive should be shown as a new residential allocation in Table 6, able to accommodate 6 dwellings. Complimentary objections to the Greenscape designation and omission of a proposal are reported in the area committee report covering Estover/ Southway Wards.
O/2/6584/2463	Objective 6 Table 5 Housing land position.	Persimmon Homes South West Limited Mr Richard Ayre	Support principle, but allowance for non-achievement of sites with planning permission is insufficient. New sites allocated in the plan will not be achieved at the rate indicated. The allowance for non- implementation of sites with planning permission should be increased, as should the allowance for non-implementation of new residential allocations. Allowances should also be discussed with interested stakeholders.
O/2/6831/2830	Objective 6 Table 6 New residential allocations.	Prowing Projects Ltd	Land south of Brookwood Road, Elburton should be allocated as a housing site. Table 6 should be amended accordingly. Complimentary objections to the Greenscape designation and omission of a proposal are reported in the area committee report covering Plymstock Dunstone Ward.
O/2/6588/2197	Objective 6 Table 6 New residential allocations.	Redrow Homes (South West) Ltd	A significant proportion of the sites identified for development are in existing commercial use, or are in multiple ownership, and may not become available. Density assumptions may be too high. The figure is not likely to be realised. The types of dwellings needed arising from Housing Needs Study ie larger family dwellings are unsuited to the high density development sites. Therefore housing sites in Table 6 are unrealistic and should be reviewed and reduced.
O/2/6926/3488	Objective 6 Table 6 New residential allocations.	South Hams District Council Mr Alan Robinson	Strongly urges the City Council to review the phasing and capacity of each of these sites to assess whether there are opportunities to bring forward more housing earlier within the plan period to minimise pressure on greenfield sites. Should be a re-evaluation of the phasing and capacity of each of the sites allocated in the local plan to bring the supply of previously developed land identified in the PLP forward sooner and ahead of greenfields in the Plymouth Area of Economic Activity.
O/2/6920/3438	Objective 6 Table 6 New residential allocations.	Wainhomes (SW) Limited	Support to table 6 in principle regarding Radford Quarry, but object to estimated number of dwellings.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
<i>S/2/6224/1605</i>	<i>Objective 6 Housing.</i>	<i>Bryant Developments</i>	<i>Support the aim “to ensure that Plymouth’s residents have access to a good quality living environment and a decent home which is affordable and suitable to their needs”.</i>
<i>S/2/6919/3424</i>	<i>Objective 6 Overall Housing Provision.</i>	<i>Caradon District Council Mr Geoff Roughton</i>	<i>The approach allocating in excess of the Structure Plan’s requirement for housing is supported, providing this does not prejudice Plymouth’s ability to accommodate future requirements. Clear progress needs to be made in developing a sub-regional strategy to ensure that allocations follow RPG as far as the appointment between Devon and Cornwall is concerned. No development should be deflected into Caradon that arises from demands of the Plymouth and South Hams parts of the Sub-Area.</i>
<i>S/2/5075/0116</i>	<i>Objective 6 Overall Housing Provision.</i>	<i>CPRE Plymouth & South Hams Group Mr Roger Gage</i>	<i>Broadly support the Local Plan. Particularly commend the strategy of urban regeneration in identifying areas for residential development within the city boundaries. Whilst applauding the Council’s aims and aspirations the CPRE urges the planners to continue to seek new sites within the city in which to create quality residential facilities.</i>
<i>S/2/6917/3287</i>	<i>Objective 6 Housing.</i>	<i>Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod</i>	<i>Supports the objective to ensure ‘balanced and healthy communities’ (RPG10)</i>
<i>S/2/6926/3487</i>	<i>Objective 6 Housing.</i>	<i>South Hams District Council Mr Alan Robinson</i>	<i>Generally welcome the approach of the UCS, and the allocation of additional dwellings on previously developed sites. Welcome approach to providing affordable housing.</i>
<i>S/2/6654/2359</i>	<i>Objective 6 Housing.</i>	<i>South West RSL Planning Consortium</i>	<i>Support the aim “to ensure that Plymouth’s residents have access to a good quality living environment and a decent home which is affordable and suitable to their needs”, and the Councils general proposals for achieving this aim.</i>
<i>S/2/6654/2360</i>	<i>Objective 6 Housing.</i>	<i>South West RSL Planning Consortium</i>	<i>Support the aim “to ensure that Plymouth’s residents have access to a good quality living environment and a decent home which is affordable and suitable to their needs”, and the Councils general proposals for achieving this aim.</i>
<i>S/2/6654/2361</i>	<i>Objective 6 Housing.</i>	<i>South West RSL Planning Consortium</i>	<i>Support the aim “to ensure that Plymouth’s residents have access to a good quality living environment and a decent home which is affordable and suitable to their needs”, and the Councils general proposals for achieving this aim.</i>
<i>S/2/6654/2362</i>	<i>Objective 6 Housing.</i>	<i>South West RSL Planning Consortium</i>	<i>Support the aim “to ensure that Plymouth’s residents have access to a good quality living environment and a decent home which is affordable and suitable to their needs”, and the Councils general proposals for achieving this aim.</i>

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
S/2/6920/3436	Objective 6 Housing.	Wainhomes (SW) Limited	Support, in principle, Objective 6 provided the Council's policy accords with PPG3 and Circular 6/98.
O/2/6746/2530	Objective 7 Community health, safety and well-being.	Miss J Whyte	Objects to lack of emphasis on the need for local health centres. Local surgeries cannot cope with increased development. It is useless demolishing 3 hospital sites to make way for new housing: Lidl's or Milkmart in Plymstock would be more appropriate.
O/2/6927/3526	Objective 7 Community health, safety and well-being.	South West of England Regional Development Agency	Supportive of policy, but recommends making reference to the Local Neighbourhood Regeneration Strategies being prepared for the Strategic Opportunity Areas.
O/2/6900/3041	Objective 7 Community health, safety and well-being.	Sport England South West Region Mr Gary Parsons	Should include a similar reference to providing for sport as that which is included related to criterion 3 regarding education. Developers of new housing, including single dwellings, should make adequate on-site provision or contribute money to a pool to be spent on appropriate sports projects in the city. This is a legitimate and workable approach.
S/2/6224/1606	Objective 7 Community health, safety and well-being.	Bryant Developments	Supportive of objective 7
O/2/6918/3412	Objective 8 Transport.	Lee Mill Partnership	Considers Objective 8 does not give enough importance to improving existing transport infrastructure rather than simply providing new infrastructure. A light rapid transit system is unlikely to be realised given the lack of commitment to the New Community by South Hams District Council. Recommends that light rapid transport would be appropriate along existing routes and infrastructure.
O/2/6836/2864	Objective 8 Transport.	Railfuture-Southwest Mr Peter D Mulley	The 1.5% yearly increase applied to bus use should also be applied to other forms of public transport, in particular the number of rail passengers. Policy should be amended accordingly.
O/2/6836/2863	Objective 8 Transport.	Railfuture-Southwest Mr Peter D Mulley	Objection on grounds that the terminology Light Rapid Transit System (LRT) could be construed to include guided bus ways or mono-rails. This would prevent integration with heavy rail and the ability to use the same routes for the moving of the occasional rail freight wagons off peak.
O/2/6926/3490	Objective 8 Transport.	South Hams District Council Mr Alan Robinson	Objects to lack of protection given to the proposed strategic LRT route, as it is safeguarded in the South Hams Local Plan.
O/2/5454/0615	Objective 8 Transport.	Stoke Damerel Conservation Society Mr Robin Midgley	Measures to reduce traffic congestion are inadequate and would have little effect on the traffic congestion in Stoke Village. Does not seem to address the problem of cars parking on pavements, congestion caused by lorry deliveries, and reducing traffic by re-routing traffic. Plan should address all these issues.
S/2/6224/1607	Objective 8 Transport.	Bryant Developments	Supportive of objective 8

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
<i>S/2/6902/3081</i>	<i>Objective 8 Transport.</i>	<i>Cavanna Homes (Devon) Ltd Mr Michael Griffin</i>	<i>Supportive of objective, particularly the need to ensure that development takes place in locations which reduce the need to travel. Suggests that development of Plympton Cattle Markset would comply with such criteria.</i>
<i>S/2/6922/3431</i>	<i>Objective 8 Transport.</i>	<i>Devon County Council</i>	<i>Supportive of strategy but suggests that further consideration should be given to the provision of Park & Ride sites on the A379 and 138 corridors.</i>
<i>S/2/6917/3288</i>	<i>Objective 8 Transport.</i>	<i>Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod</i>	<i>Supportive of Objective 8.</i>
<i>S/2/6911/3212</i>	<i>Objective 8 Transport.</i>	<i>Plymouth Chamber of Commerce and Industry Mr David Lobban</i>	<i>Support in particular the need to develop Freight Quality Partnerships and LRT to reduce congestion.</i>
<i>S/2/6599/2224</i>	<i>Objective 8 Transport.</i>	<i>Railtrack</i>	<i>Supportive – particularly of housing along transport routes and at transport nodes and new employment, shopping and housing at sites accessible by a range of transport modes.</i>
<i>S/2/6926/3489</i>	<i>Objective 8 Transport.</i>	<i>South Hams District Council Mr Alan Robinson</i>	<i>Support the promotion of integrated cross boundary transport provision.</i>
<i>S/2/6927/3527</i>	<i>Objective 8 Transport.</i>	<i>South West of England Regional Development Agency</i>	<i>Supportive of objective 8, particularly the promotion of mixed-use developments integrated with transport choice. Park and ride sites and the LRT are also welcomed.</i>
<i>S/2/6601/2267</i>	<i>Objective 8 Transport.</i>	<i>Transport 2000 Cornwall/Plymouth & District Group Mr Don Allen</i>	<i>Supportive</i>
<i>O/2/6437/2103</i>	<i>Objective 9 Cycling and walking networks.</i>	<i>CTC Mr Colin Woodman</i>	<i>Cycling and walking networks should not be treated as one entity: the needs of cyclists and pedestrians are different, and conflict between them should be avoided. Objective should be reworded as follows: '...shared use of space between pedestrians and cyclists, especially in well used urban contexts, should only be adopted as a last resort when all other solutions have been dismissed.'</i>
<i>O/2/6692/2442</i>	<i>Objective 9 Cycling and walking networks.</i>	<i>Plymouth Public Rights of Way Forum</i>	<i>The wording of objective 9 is not specific and therefore open to wide interpretation. The policy does not seem to clarify whether it supports the statutory duty to record existing routes on the Definitive Map – routes recorded on this map would afford legal protection and assist the council in its duty to 'assert and protect' public use. Urges Council to state that any new routes should benefit from protection of the Highways Act. Also urges that the statutory duty to produce a Rights of Way Improvement Plan should be included in Objective 9 as the appropriate means of developing the network within Plymouth.</i>

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
S/2/6224/1608	Objective 9 Cycling and walking networks.	Bryant Developments	Supportive of cycling and walking networks.
S/2/6927/3528	Objective 9 Cycling and walking networks.	South West of England Regional Development Agency	Supportive of policy – it will help more people to walk and cycle instead of using their cars.
S/2/5340/0442	Objective 9 Cycling and walking networks.	Tamerton Foliot Village Conservation Society Mrs B Bebbington	Supportive of comprehensive network of walking and cycling routes.
S/2/6601/2266	Objective 9 Cycling and walking networks.	Transport 2000 Cornwall/Plymouth & District Group Mr Don Allen	Supportive of cycling and walking networks within the city. The South West Coast Path should therefore be extended through Millbay Docks.
O/2/6790/2608	Objective 10 Inclusiveness and participation.	House Builders Federation Ms Jo Hanslip	Objects to target of ensuring that 20% of housing is for lifetime homes: the building regulations provide guidelines for special needs and accessibility in new dwellings, and this is sufficient. It is therefore unnecessary for the Local Plan to replicate requirements of Building Regulations, and it would not reflect PPG12. It is unreasonable to expect 20% housing for lifetime needs, especially if there are no such needs. Objective 10 & Policy 35 address issues outside responsibilities of local plan, and would not seem to be supported by findings of housing need assessment.
S/2/6224/1609	Objective 10 Inclusiveness and participation.	Bryant Developments	Supportive
S/2/6918/3413	Objective 10 Inclusiveness and participation.	Lee Mill Partnership	Strongly supports this objective.
S/2/6927/3529	Objective 10 Inclusiveness and participation.	South West of England Regional Development Agency	Supportive of Objective 10, particularly the recognition of the important role played by the Single Regeneration Budget in promoting regeneration schemes that involve all sectors of the community in the design and implementation stages.
O/2/6907/3115	Objective 11 Urban environment.	Environment Agency Mr Mike Robins	Objective 11 does not include promotion of sustainability principles; it only considers aesthetic and landscape values. Provision should be made to ensure that new development is sustainable. The Regional Assembly and Sustainability South West initiative, 'A Sustainable Construction Charter' inform later parts of section.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/2/5453/0594	Objective 11 Urban environment.	Penlee Vale Residents Association Brigadier P C Bowser	Objective 11 does not do enough to raise the quality of design. Urges the Council to make greater use of organisations such as the Civic Trust to advise on design and listen to comments by local societies.
O/2/5454/0616	Objective 11 Urban environment.	Stoke Damerel Conservation Society Mr Robin Midgley	Objects on grounds that the Objective does not provide for an independent advisory body to scrutinise development proposals in conservation areas.
S/2/6224/1610	Objective 11 Urban environment.	Bryant Developments	Supportive
S/2/6917/3289	Objective 11 Urban environment.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Supportive according to PPG1 (para nos 13-20)
S/2/6746/2528	Objective 11 Urban environment.	Miss J Whyte	Objective 11 supported.
S/2/6584/3453	Objective 11 Urban environment.	Persimmon Homes South West Limited	Aims of objective 11 are supported.
S/2/6911/3205	Objective 11 Urban environment.	Plymouth Chamber of Commerce and Industry Mr David Lobban	Objective 11 strongly supported.
S/2/6927/3530	Objective 11 Urban environment.	South West of England Regional Development Agency	Supportive, particularly in light of Policy SS17 of RPG10.
O/2/6917/3290	Objective 12 Historic Environment	Government Office for the South West	The objective is weakened by the words, 'where possible', which contrasts to the statutory objective to 'preserve and enhance'. Strategy statement 2 should also protect features. Statement 3 should include statutory objective for Conservation Areas.
O/2/6917/3290	Objective 12 Historic environment.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	The Objective is weakened by the wording, 'where possible'. This undermines the statutory objective, 'to preserve and enhance'. Object to the omission of the word, 'features' – these should also be protected. Strategy statement 3 should include the statutory objective for conservation areas.
O/2/6833/2860	Objective 12 Historic Environment	Mr J C Emery	All strategies and policies relating to historic and archaeological sites should be adopted as supplementary planning guidance. All buildings at risk throughout the city should be recorded on the Buildings at Risk Register.
O/2/5453/0595	Objective 12 Historic environment.	Penlee Vale Residents Association Brigadier P C Bowser	Objects to absence of any reference in objective to involve local societies in the preservation of the urban heritage. Objective should state the need to listen to local societies.
S/2/6224/1611	Objective 12 Historic environment.	Bryant Developments	Supportive

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
<i>S/2/6746/2527</i>	<i>Objective 12 Historic environment.</i>	<i>Miss J Whyte</i>	<i>Objective 12 supported.</i>
<i>S/2/6927/3531</i>	<i>Objective 12 Historic environment.</i>	<i>South West of England Regional Development Agency</i>	<i>Supportive – Plymouth has a number of historic features that contribute to environmental quality, image and economic prosperity of city. These assets should be retained.</i>
O/2/6897/3011	Objective 13 Green space water space and wildlife.	English Nature Mr Matt Low	Objects to lack of emphasis on the value of wildlife in greenscape areas. Aesthetic, economic and 'well being' benefits should not be the only priorities.
O/2/6907/3116	Objective 13 Green space water space and wildlife.	Environment Agency Mr Mike Robins	The supporting strategy statement no. 3 needs to be worded more strongly. Loss of key inter-tidal habitat is unacceptable and the cumulative impact of such losses should be considered.
O/2/6790/2610	Objective 13 Green space water space and wildlife.	House Builders Federation Ms Jo Hanslip	Objects to target of protecting 100% space and questions whether this target has any regard to the Urban Capacity Study.
O/2/6866/2969	Objective 13 Green space water space and wildlife.	Maritime Plymouth Captain A G Dyer	Considers Strategy statement 3 to be too prescriptive, which would prohibit the economic growth of the Port of Plymouth. There is a current shortage of port or waterfront land, as indicated in the Marine Sector Strategy, and therefore further reclamation should not be restricted.
O/2/5453/0596	Objective 13 Green space water space and wildlife.	Penlee Vale Residents Association Brigadier P C Bowser	Considers that the Plan should promote maintenance as part of stewardship of green spaces.
O/2/5201/0279	Objective 13 Green space water space and wildlife.	South Hams Against Rural Destruction Mr Steve Melia	Considers development on limited greenfield sites inside the city boundary to be less damaging and sustainable than development just outside the city boundary. If any greenfield development is planned just outside Plymouth's boundaries, then the greenscape findings should be considered on a comparative basis.
O/2/6900/3042	Objective 13 Green space water space and wildlife.	Sport England South West Region Mr Gary Parsons	The supporting strategy statements are unsatisfactory as none of the criteria make reference to the need to protect green spaces for formal sports purposes.
<i>S/2/6224/1612</i>	<i>Objective 13 Green space water space and wildlife.</i>	<i>Bryant Developments</i>	<i>Supportive.</i>
<i>S/2/6917/3291</i>	<i>Objective 13 Green space water space and wildlife.</i>	<i>Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod</i>	<i>Supportive.</i>

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
S/2/6918/3414	Objective 13 Green space water space and wildlife.	Lee Mill Partnership	Supportive, but questions the joint working arrangements with South Hams District Council in the protection of greenscape site ref. 338. Proposed Sherford New Community blocks off greenscape area with inappropriate development from wider countryside beyond.
S/2/6791/2699	Objective 13 Green space water space and wildlife.	Plymouth East End Renewal Partnership Mr Phil Mitchell	Supportive.
S/2/6927/3532	Objective 13 Green space water space and wildlife.	South West of England Regional Development Agency	Supports Objective 13, particularly recognition of role of open spaces and water features in attracting economic development and tourism to the city.
S/2/5454/0609	Objective 13 Green space water space and wildlife.	Stoke Damerel Conservation Society Mr Robin Midgley	Strong support for objective. It is important that the strategy statements are implemented, particularly No. 8 in protecting views.
O/2/6897/3012	Objective 14 Optimising use of land and infrastructure.	English Nature Mr Matt Low	Objective 14 causes concern about protecting protected species in brownfield sites. Particularly against promoting 'highest density of housing' on such sites – lower densities would be more suitable.
O/2/6790/2611	Objective 14 Optimising use of land and infrastructure.	House Builders Federation Ms Jo Hanslip	Objects to target of bringing 700 empty homes back into use on grounds that the Urban Capacity Study is not robust enough and has no clear assumptions. It is also questioned whether the 80% target can be achieved during the plan period.
O/2/6557/2097	Objective 14 Optimising use of land and infrastructure.	Mr Andrew Philip Dart	The supporting strategy statement no. 1 should be amended to ensure that 'under-used' land is prioritised for development along with 'previously developed' land, before the development of green field sites and other less sustainable development options.
O/2/6926/3492	Objective 14 Optimising use of land and infrastructure.	South Hams District Council Mr Alan Robinson	Optimising the use of previously developed land is strongly supported. The policy content, targets and previously developed land sites brought forward in the Plan are also supported. Compulsory Purchase Powers to achieve the targets would be welcomed, as the effective development of brownfield land is crucial.
S/2/6902/3080	Objective 14 Optimising use of land and infrastructure.	Cavanna Homes (Devon) Ltd Mr Michael Griffin	Supportive of objective to optimise use of previously-developed sites. Development of Plympton Cattle Market would suit these criteria.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
<i>S/2/6917/3292</i>	<i>Objective 14 Optimising use of land and infrastructure.</i>	<i>Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod</i>	<i>Supportive.</i>
<i>S/2/6584/3454</i>	<i>Objective 14 Optimising use of land and infrastructure.</i>	<i>Persimmon Homes South West Limited</i>	<i>Supportive, particularly in light of Proposal 117. Recommends that additional land in this proposal area should be identified.</i>
<i>S/2/6926/3491</i>	<i>Objective 14 Optimising use of land and infrastructure.</i>	<i>South Hams District Council Mr Alan Robinson</i>	<i>The objective to optimise the use of previously developed land is welcomed and strongly supported. The policy content, targets and previously developed land sites that are brought forward are also supported. Commitment to use Compulsory Purchase Orders would be welcomed, in order to achieve the target.</i>
<i>S/2/6927/3533</i>	<i>Objective 14 Optimising use of land and infrastructure.</i>	<i>South West of England Regional Development Agency</i>	<i>Support to Objective 14 including sequential approach to identifying development sites, and 80% target for new homes to be developed on brownfield sites.</i>
O/2/5212/0295	Objective 15 Energy, water, minerals, waste and pollution.	DTI (ETSU)	The plan should refer to the existing national and regional strategies for renewable energy provision.
O/2/5212/0296	Objective 15 Energy, water, minerals, waste and pollution.	DTI (ETSU)	The supporting text does not mention the potential for renewable energy to contribute towards more sustainable forms of development. In view of published national and regional targets for the production of renewable energy, this part of the plan should identify a target for the production of renewable energy in Plymouth by the end of the plan period.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/2/6907/3117	Objective 15 Energy, water, minerals, waste and pollution.	Environment Agency Mr Mike Robins	<p>Object to the lack of reference to key issues such as arisings, storage, treatment or disposal of special waste. Also object to lack of consideration to commercial or industrial waste arisings of a large scale or hazardous nature eg fridges, sewage sludge or liquid wastes.</p> <p>The plan should set the strategic framework for the development of new waste treatment facilities. The supporting text to this objective is inadequate in establishing this framework.</p> <p>The plan must be informed by an assessment of the 'Best Practicable Environmental Option' (BPEO) for the future management of Plymouth's waste, thus informing not only land use decisions but decisions on appropriate methodologies and technologies for managing and disposing of waste.</p> <p>There is an urgent need to develop an alternative disposal facility to that of Chelson Meadow landfill, given the landfill will be complete by 2006.</p> <p>The plan lacks data on waste arisings, forecasts and the subsequent context for establishing how and where waste should be managed and disposed of in the future.</p>
O/2/6790/2612	Objective 15 Energy, water, minerals, waste and pollution.	House Builders Federation Ms Jo Hanslip	<p>Objects to requirement of Sustainable Drainage Schemes in developments, mainly because of the adoption and maintenance problems involved. In the past, local authorities and other agencies have been unwilling to adopt these schemes. The local plan should address this issue to ensure that objectives for these systems can be achieved.</p>
O/2/6746/2531	Objective 15 Energy, water, minerals, waste and pollution.	Miss J Whyte	<p>Whilst this objective is supported it could improved by suggesting that solar panels could be introduced into the design of new housing, so that such panels were not visually intrusive.</p>
O/2/6332/2324	Objective 15 General Approach to Waste?	Roseland Plant Co Ltd	<p>The waste elements of the plan are not based on an assessment of the 'Best Practicable Environmental Option' (BPEO) of the various waste streams.</p> <p>The plan does not take into account waste facilities and waste arising outside the city boundary with in the sub-region.</p> <p>The plan does not provide for sufficient facilities to manage waste arising from either the municipal or commercial sectors.</p>
O/2/6927/3534	Objective 15 Energy, water, minerals, waste and pollution.	South West of England Regional Development Agency	<p>The supporting text to this objective could be improved by making reference to the Renewable Energy Strategy currently being produced by the South West Regional Assembly.</p>

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/2/6197/1576	Objective 15 Energy, water, minerals, waste and pollution.	Viridor Waste Management Limited Mr M G Oliver	Strategy Statement 6 relating to Objective 15 presents an inaccurate interpretation of what constitutes renewable energy. Re-use and recycling isn't really a renewable energy. Suggests adding 10 principles of waste management to accompanying text. Considers the accompanying text to be unnecessarily alarmist in referring to other (than waste) environmental impacts of development.
S/2/6917/3293	Objective 15 Energy, water, minerals, waste and pollution.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Supportive.
S/4/6926/3501	Objective 15 Energy, water, minerals, waste and pollution.	South Hams District Council Mr Alan Robinson	Supports the strategy to aim to provide waste management facilities in the city, particularly energy from waste facilities.
O/2/6917/3294	Spatial Planning Framework.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	The spatial strategy is a key part of the plan, yet it is not clearly presented. This is because it is not clearly stated alongside Figure 1. It should therefore be mentioned here, in line with guidance from PPG12 #A23. The spatial strategy would be more complete if it included reference to the New Community at Sheford in its Reasoned Justification.
O/2/6911/3206	Spatial Planning Framework.	Plymouth Chamber of Commerce and Industry Mr David Lobban	Lack of a clear reference point to strategic opportunity areas. Lack of indication of gateways to city.
O/2/6831/3459	Spatial Planning Framework Figs 1 & 2	Prowing Projects Ltd	Figures 1 & 2 are inconsistent with proposal 103 and proposal map 42. Proposal Map 42 does not indicate Plymstock Quarry as a Greenscape area, whereas this same area is indicated as a greenscape area on Fig 1 and Fig 2. This is confusing, given that proposal 103 is for residential development.
O/2/6437/2102	Urban Design Statement.	CTC Mr Colin Woodman	UD Principle 7 should refer to cycling as an important mode of transport.
O/2/6917/3295	Urban Design Statement.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	The principles should be refocused in line with 'By Design'. Important townscape and landscape features should be more clearly.
O/2/6790/2614	Urban Design Statement.	House Builders Federation Ms Jo Hanslip	Section 2.6 is lengthy, and inconsistent with PPG12, which seeks to avoid 'lengthy, over-detailed plans.' Urges Council to remove Urban Design Statement and to provide an Urban Design Circular instead.
O/2/6911/3208	Urban Design Statement.	Plymouth Chamber of Commerce and Industry Mr David Lobban	Suggests strengthening the UD Principles, as they are considered to be fairly standard, and need to be more specific to Plymouth issues.
O/2/6927/3535	Urban Design Statement.	South West of England Regional Development Agency	Suggests change to supporting text to make reference to the relationship of the Principles with By Design and the UD Compendium.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/2/5454/0617	Urban Design Statement.	Stoke Damerel Conservation Society Mr Robin Midgley	UD Principle 3 should refer to 'arrangements for eliminating unsatisfactory parking, loading and unloading of vehicles.' Essence of principle supported.
S/2/6224/1615	Urban Design Statement.	Bryant Developments	Support for UD Principle 7.
S/2/6224/1613	Urban Design Statement.	Bryant Developments	Support for UD Principle 2.
S/2/6224/1614	Urban Design Statement.	Bryant Developments	Support for UD Principle 6.
S/2/6831/3458	Urban Design Statement.	Prowting Projects Ltd	Strong support for UD Principles 1-10.
O/2/6833/2856	Related Strategies.	Mr J C Emery	Considers the Plan should give more recognition to supporting studies eg the Urban Capacity Study and Greenscape Assessment. If such studies are integral to the plan, they will have more authority.
O/2/6917/3296	Area Strategies	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Considers that the urban design principles should be as specific and concrete as possible.
O/2/6746/2529	Implementation	Miss J Whyte	Suggests that more account should be taken of local opposition in the decision-making process
O/2/6746/2533	Implementation	Miss J Whyte	Object to preparation of planning briefs – they are not effective.
O/2/6790/2616	Monitoring and Review	House Builders Federation Ms Jo Hanslip	Adequate regard has not been given to the requirements of DTLR good practice guidance on monitoring. It is essential that the monitoring framework seeks to monitor the assumptions that underpin the plan, rather than merely counting completions.
O/2/6918/3415	Monitoring and Review	Lee Mill Partnership	Fully supports process, however there is worry that the council is more concerned with the use of its policies in determining planning applications which are then challenged at appeal, rather than providing adequate homes and jobs for citizens.
O/2/6584/2461	Monitoring and Review	Persimmon Homes South West Limited Mr Richard Ayre	Supports principle. More detail should be given on the information to be collected and indicators used. Firmer proposals for adjustment would also be useful.
O/2/6917/3297	Strategic Policy S1. Local Plan Strategy.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Policy S1 is unnecessary, as it merely refers to previous objectives and principles. It should therefore be deleted.
O/2/6927/3547	Strategic Policy S1. Local Plan Strategy.	South West of England Regional Development Agency	Policy S1 appears weak in that it does not refer to each objective, and the objectives themselves are not policies.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/2/6902/3079	Strategic Policy S2. Strategic principles on the distribution of development.	Cavanna Homes (Devon) Ltd Mr Michael Griffin	Criterion 1 and to some extent criterion 2 are not easy to interpret and could be inconsistent with other policies in the plan. They should be re-drafted accordingly. Criterion 1 of S2 makes no reference to the search sequence in PPG3 or sequential approach in PPG6. Search sequence should be added to policy. Criterion 4 is unnecessary as it is fully implied in the policy S3. Suggest amending Criteria 1 by adding sequence, and removing reference to S3 in Criteria 4.
O/2/6917/3298	Strategic Policy S2. Strategic principles on the distribution of development.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Criterion 1 of Policy S3 talks of developers meeting reasonable costs of infrastructure and transport 'made necessary from the proposal'. This may not have the same implications as infrastructure and community benefits 'needed from a practical point of view to enable the development to go ahead' as suggested in paragraph B9 of Circular 1/97. The policy should therefore reflect the Circ 1/97 B9 test by stressing that contributions should be sought rather than required.
O/2/6790/2617	Strategic Policy S2. Strategic principles on the distribution of development.	House Builders Federation Ms Jo Hanslip	Point 4 of Policy S2 does not meet requirements of Circular 1/97.
O/2/6918/3416	Strategic Policy S2. Strategic principles on the distribution of development.	Lee Mill Partnership	Strategic Policy S2 does not adequately reflect the search sequence identified in PPG3, particularly as the plan has been prepared in collaboration with South Hams District Council.
O/2/6831/3460	Strategic Policy S2. Strategic principles on the distribution of development.	Prowting Projects Ltd	Objection to criterion 2 of Policy S2 – it may not always be possible to locate housing development in areas where travel times in appendix 9 can be met. Considers that travels times should be a target rather than an absolute requirement.
O/2/6927/3548	Strategic Policy S2. Strategic principles on the distribution of development.	South West of England Regional Development Agency	Strategy policy S2 should include reference to Objective 14.
O/2/6902/3077	Strategic Policy S3. Infrastructure and community benefits.	Cavanna Homes (Devon) Ltd Mr Michael Griffin	Some elements of this policy are too prescriptive. Its aim should be to outline the wider remit and objectives, and to provide a basis for more specific policies later in the plan. Criterion 1 is superfluous. While support is given for the principle of developer contributions, it is not appropriate to list the issues eg transport, education, health etc at such a strategic stage. The specifics of developer contributions should instead be reserved for the planning application stage.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/2/6907/3118	Strategic Policy S3. Infrastructure and community benefits.	Environment Agency Mr Mike Robins	This strategic policy is welcomed but it can be improved by making reference to the need for flood protection measures in either the policy or the supporting text.
O/2/6917/3299	Strategic Policy S3. Infrastructure and community benefits.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Considers that costs 'made necessary as a result from the proposal' is not the same as the test in Circ 1/97 #B9, which states, '. . .needed from a practical point of view to enable the development to go ahead'. Contributions should be <i>sought</i> rather than required and the policy should reflect #B9. Criteria 2 and 3 appear to go beyond the scope of #B9 and B11(offsetting loss of an existing resource). They should therefore be limited to that scope, or deleted.
O/2/6790/1759	Strategic Policy S3. Infrastructure and community benefits.	House Builders Federation Ms Jo Hanslip	Points 1-4 of Policy S3 do not reflect guidance in Circular 1/97.
O/2/6927/3549	Strategic Policy S3. Infrastructure and community benefits.	South West of England Regional Development Agency	Object to the lack of consideration towards costs of developing previously developed sites. Affordable housing requirements should also be considered for financial contributions.
O/2/6900/3043	Strategic Policy S3. Infrastructure and community benefits.	Sport England South West Region Mr Gary Parsons	Objects to 20 Point 1 of S3 on grounds that it omits considerations towards sport and recreation facilities; whereas all new housing should provide adequate sport and recreation facilities. Developers should make financial contributions to Council for such facilities.
O/2/6917/3385	Strategic Policy S4. Plan, monitor and manage.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Monitoring variables appear rather limited. It was assumed that performance against the targets in the Strategy Statements would be monitored. It is also suggested that the variables agreed to be monitored in the Structure Plan context should be monitored at the City level as well.
O/2/6917/3385	Strategic Policy S4. Plan, monitor and manage.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Monitoring variables appear rather limited. It was assumed that performance against the targets in the Strategy Statements would be monitored. It is also suggested that the variables agreed to be monitored in the Structure Plan context should be monitored at the City level as well.
O/2/6918/3417	Strategic Policy S4. Plan, monitor and manage.	Lee Mill Partnership	Fully supports principles, however questions the city's ability to allocate new sites within its boundaries, as all sites have already been allocated.
S/2/6927/3562	Strategic Policy S4. Plan, monitor and manage.	South West of England Regional Development Agency	Fully supported. It is in accord with national planning policy, particularly PPG3. Include Strategic Policy S4 in the local plan.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/2/6917/3300	Tourism Strategy	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Objects to the omission of a strategy for tourism, and therefore the absence of monitoring objectives. Also points to the absence of an assessment of need for tourist facilities, especially hotels.
O/2/6900/3038	Sports Strategy.	Sport England South West Region Mr Gary Parsons	Formal sport and informal recreation has not been properly recognised and acknowledged in the Strategy chapter. Sport plays a crucial role in meeting a number of Government agendas including health, education, community regeneration etc.
3. Representations relating to Part Three: Local Plan Proposals.			
O/3/6917/3301	General comments.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Proposals do not go far enough in identifying and quantifying the main non-housing development components, particularly where a number of proposals come together in a particular area and are likely to make a significant contribution to it urban renaissance.
O/3/6911/3209	General comments.	Plymouth Chamber of Commerce and Industry Mr David Lobban	Considers there is a need to identify the real priorities out of the many proposals. E.g. 5 prime development sites as priorities, and to obtain the support of the whole community for their development.
O/3/6437/2046	Proposal 123. Strategic Cycle Network.	CTC Mr Colin Woodman	Urges links to be made with the network. Not all desire lines are covered. The Plymstock/Elburton route is on the wrong side of the A379.
O/3/6692/2444	Proposal 123. Strategic Cycle Network.	Plymouth Public Rights of Way Forum	Suggests that those parts not on the public highway should be public rights of way.
S/3/6866/2951	Proposal 123. Strategic Cycle Network.	Maritime Plymouth Captain A G Dyer	Support given, provided that safety and security for maritime uses are given paramount weight. (Relates more to Proposal 124).
S/3/6800/2733	Proposal 123. Strategic Cycle Network.	Mr A J S Burnett	Supportive.
S/3/6475/2026	Proposal 123. Strategic Cycle Network.	Ms Val Woodward	Supportive.
S/3/6601/2240	Proposal 123. Strategic Cycle Network.	Transport 2000 Cornwall/Plymouth & District Group Mr Don Allen	Supportive.
4. Representations relating to Part Four: Local Plan Policies and allocation of sites under particular policies.			
O/4/6917/3363	Design Policies-general.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Generally supports the policy, but considers it too detailed, and should therefore be simplified.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
S/4/6911/3210	General Design Policies.	Plymouth Chamber of Commerce and Industry Mr David Lobban	Supports the broad thrust of the policy framework.
O/4/6690/2438	Policy 1. Established Employment Areas.	B & Q PLC	Considers Policies 1 and 2 should be combined, and modified to provide for other uses, such as retail, if the 'preferred' use, i.e. employment, is not forthcoming
O/4/6832/2845	Policy 1. Established Employment Areas.	Barratt Homes Exeter Ltd	Considers the Policy to be over-restrictive, potentially affecting the ability of landowners to adequately dispose of their land
O/4/6644/2343	Policy 1. Established Employment Areas.	Costco Wholesale U.K. Ltd	Considers the definition of employment should be expanded to provide for other uses, including 'warehouse clubs'
O/4/6917/3303	Policy 1. Established Employment Areas.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Considers the justification for the Policy requires strengthening, and that the Policy could be worded negatively.
O/4/6927/3540	Policy 1. Established Employment Areas.	South West of England Regional Development Agency	Considers the Policy, or the reasoned justification, should indicate that the establishment and growth of clustered employment developments will be supported, on large employment sites
O/4/6832/2844	Policy 2. Existing employment sites and premises.	Barratt Homes Exeter Ltd	Considers the requirement for appropriate replacement provision of employment land to be over-restrictive, largely unachievable, and unnecessary
O/4/6644/2344	Policy 2. Existing employment sites and premises.	Costco Wholesale U.K. Ltd	Considers the definition of employment should be expanded to provide for other uses, including 'warehouse clubs'
O/4/6917/3304	Policy 2. Existing employment sites and premises.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Considers the Policy requires redrafting to refer to the need to prevent harm to business and employment opportunities
O/4/6602/2270	Policy 2. Existing employment sites and premises.	McCarthy & Stone (Developments) Ltd	Considers the Policy should be amended to provide greater flexibility, including consideration of the use of a site for housing purposes
O/4/6654/2363	Policy 2. Existing employment sites and premises.	South West RSL Planning Consortium	Considers the opportunity should be taken for the Policy to give special priority to housing which meets affordable housing needs, in the re-use of redundant employment sites
S/4/6902/3076	Policy 2. Existing employment sites and premises.	Cavanna Homes (Devon) Ltd Mr Michael Griffin	Supports the Policy
O/4/6225/1763	Policy 3. Marine Employment Areas.	Cattedown Regeneration Ltd Mr T Jones	Objection to restriction of marine-related uses only in marine employment areas. May prejudice development in non-marine premises and considers that overall objectives for waterfront won't be achieved.
O/4/6917/3305	Policy 3. Marine Employment Areas.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Considers that the policy is inflexible and challenges whether it is appropriate for all sites.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/4/6925/3479	Policy 3. Marine Employment Areas.	Lattice Property Holdings Ltd	Objection on grounds that policy does state the type of acceptable uses other than B1, B2 or B3. The only indication is that they should 'directly support development of the marine sector'. The policy should therefore permit housing and live or work units provided that they support the marine industry.
O/4/6697/3102	Policy 3. Marine Employment Areas.	Midas Homes Ltd Mr David Seaton	Policy is inflexible. It does not allow for other uses that might stimulate the marine industry such as residential uses. Urges that policy should permit mixed uses that facilitate new investment in the marine industry, including residential.
O/4/6332/2325	Policy 3 Marine Employment Areas	Roseland Plant Co Ltd Mr Alan Prisk	Objects to the restricted designation of MEA sites and the prohibition of the use such sites for waste purposes. This would prevent marine related recovery and the transfer of waste within the city using previously developed sites close to energy and waste producers. There is not enough evidence to show that the MEA sites could be brought into use to comply with the policy within a reasonable time.
O/4/6802/2752	Policy 3. Marine Employment Areas	W. R. Crocker	Policy is too restrictive and does not take into account waste purposes.
S/4/6866/2966	Policy 3. Marine Employment Areas.	Maritime Plymouth Captain A G Dyer	Policy is strongly supported. Mistakes shouldn't happen again such as that at Cockle Bank. Suggests that policy should be expanded to prevent incompatible developments/uses close to marine employment areas.
S/4/6927/3541	Policy 3. Marine Employment Areas.	South West of England Regional Development Agency	Support policy 3: it is important to protect Plymouth's marine industry sites from other competing developments such as residential and office.
S/4/5209/0288	Policy 3. Marine Employment Areas	Victoria Wharf Mark Gatehouse (Managing Director)	Supportive of policy, particularly in light of protecting Victoria Wharf.
O/4/6644/2345	Policy 4. Manufacturing land.	Costco Wholesale U.K. Ltd	Considers the definition of employment should be expanded to provide for other uses, including 'warehouse clubs'.
O/4/6205/1574	Policy 4. Manufacturing land.	South West Water Ltd	Considers the site adjacent to the Belliver Industrial Estate should be allocated for housing development instead of employment.
O/4/6917/3306	Policy 5. Office development in the City Centre.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Objects to the use of the word 'enhance' which is considered not to provide a clear basis for decision-making
O/4/6917/3307	Policy 6. Office development outside the City Centre.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Suggests the Policy should be amended to provide for a sequential approach to be applied to office development, so that the city centre is the preferred location.
O/4/6917/3308	Policy 7. Local employment and training provision	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Objects on grounds that policy conflicts with Circa1/97B9 and is not consistent with aims of Government Office for the South West. The policy is not a land use planning consideration and is unclear how it will be implemented. Urges that policy should be deleted to improve clarity of plan.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
S/4/6927/3542	Policy 7. Local employment and training provision	South West of England Regional Development Agency	Policy is in line with SWERDA's Regional Strategy. It is suggested that the explanatory text should demonstrate how employment and training needs for local people are maximised.
O/4/6437/2072	Policy 8. Core Tourism Area.	CTC Mr Colin Woodman	Considers that the Policy should make provision for cycling, in addition to pedestrian and public transport links
O/4/6917/3309	Policy 8. Core Tourism Area.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Considers the Policy should be redrafted in terms of avoiding conflict with the tourism function of the core tourism areas specified
S/4/6475/1954	Policy 8. Core Tourism Area.	Ms Val Woodward	Supports the sensitive enhancement of the city's tourism potential
O/4/6917/3310	Policy 9. Tourist accommodation.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Considers the Policy should be redrafted to provide a clearer basis for decision-making
O/4/6906/3107	Policy 10. Shopping hierarchy.	Morley Fund Management	Considers the Policy should be amended to acknowledge the role in the shopping hierarchy of all established retail locations, including retail warehouses
O/4/6908/3175	Policy 10. Shopping hierarchy.	Plymouth & South West Co-operative	Considers the Policy heading should be changed to clarify that only edge-of-centre and out-of-centre developments should comply with 'need' and 'sequential approach' requirements
O/4/6586/2182	Policy 10. Shopping hierarchy.	W.M. Morrison Supermarkets Plc	Considers the Policy too restrictive, inhibiting competition within and between centres.
S/4/6917/3311	Policy 10. Shopping hierarchy.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Welcomes this positive Policy.
O/4/6693/2446	Policy 11. New shopping development.	Aldi Stores (Swindon) Ltd	Considers the Policy to be over-restrictive and prescriptive in relation to the range of goods to be sold in out-of-centre locations.
O/4/6690/2437	Policy 11. New shopping development.	B & Q PLC	Considers it inappropriate to restrict the range of goods to be sold in out-of-centre locations.
O/4/6201/1561	Policy 11. New shopping development.	Dawnan Ltd	Considers the Policy criteria to be overly restrictive. Suggests the Policy be redrafted in terms of 'bulky goods' only.
O/4/6201/1564	Policy 11. New shopping development.	Dawnan Ltd	Considers the Policy should be amended to apply only to development proposed on the edge of, or outside existing centres.
O/4/6917/3312	Policy 11. New shopping development.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Considers the Policy should be reworded to provide a clearer basis for decision-making, and to more closely reflect national planning policy guidance.
O/4/6923/3434	Policy 11. New shopping development.	Granite Asset Management	Considers the restrictions on out-of-centre retail development to be inappropriate.
O/4/6803/2758	Policy 11. New shopping development.	John Lewis Partnership (Waitrose Ltd)	Considers restrictions on out-of-centre retail development to be unreasonable and unnecessary.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/4/6906/3108	Policy 11. New shopping development.	Morley Fund Management	Considers the Policy should be amended so as not to apply to existing retail warehousing, and in applying the sequential approach to new development, for preference to be given to existing retail warehouse locations.
O/4/6908/3176	Policy 11. New shopping development.	Plymouth & South West Co-operative	Considers the Policy heading should be changed to clarify that only edge-of-centre and out-of-centre developments should comply with 'need' and 'sequential approach' requirements.
O/4/6199/1555	Policy 11. New shopping development.	Sainsbury's Supermarket Ltd	Objects to the blanket exclusion of post offices and pharmacies in out-of-centre food and convenience developments.
O/4/6202/1566	Policy 11. New shopping development.	Viridor Properties Ltd	Considers the Policy criteria to be overly restrictive. Suggests the Policy be redrafted in terms of 'bulky goods' only.
O/4/6202/1567	Policy 11. New shopping development.	Viridor Properties Ltd	Considers the Policy should be amended to apply only to development proposed on the edge of, or outside existing centres
O/4/6917/3313	Policy 12. Phasing of City Centre schemes.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Questions the value of the Policy, and suggests its deletion.
O/4/6908/3177	Policy 13. Tourism / leisure related shopping.	Plymouth & South West Co-operative	Considers the Policy should be amended to relate to 'small-scale' ancillary retail only.
O/4/6690/2436	Policy 14. Retail warehouse.	B & Q PLC	Considers the Policy to be overly restrictive.
O/4/6581/2159	Policy 14. Retail warehouse.	British Land Properties Ltd	Considers the Policy to protect existing retail warehouses from inappropriate changes of use to be unnecessary, and suggests its deletion.
O/4/6917/3314	Policy 14. Retail warehouse.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Questions the need for the Policy, and suggests its deletion.
O/4/6906/3109	Policy 14. Retail warehouse.	Morley Fund Management	Considers the Policy should be amended to support the retention of existing retail warehouses, and their redevelopment, subject to specific criteria.
O/4/6644/2346	Policy 15. Wholesaling.	Costco Wholesale U.K. Ltd	Considers the Policy should be amended to provide for uses in which retailing is ancillary to the primary warehouse use, which itself is <i>sui generis</i> .
O/4/6917/3315	Policy 15. Wholesaling.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Questions the need for the Policy, and suggests its deletion.
O/4/6908/3178	Policy 15. Wholesaling.	Plymouth & South West Co-operative	Considers the reasoned justification should be amended to state that the Policy does not apply to 'warehouse clubs'.
O/4/6693/2451	Policy 16. Changes of use in shopping centres.	Aldi Stores (Swindon) Ltd	Objects to the proposed change to the 'prime retail frontage' in the Mutley Plain District Shopping Centre.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/4/6917/3316	Policy 16. Changes of use in shopping centres.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Identifies the need to ensure that the Policy does not conflict with national planning policy guidance, regarding the designation of shopping frontages.
O/4/5240/0328	Policy 16. Changes of use in shopping centres.	Mr Victor French	Considers there is no clear rationale for the use of quotas, that the Policy is too prescriptive, and fails to take account of other criteria.
O/4/6908/3179	Policy 16. Changes of use in shopping centres.	Plymouth & South West Co-operative	Considers an additional criterion is required to indicate that the proposed change of use should not result in social exclusion.
O/4/6917/3317	Policy 17. Local shops.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Considers the Policy should be redrafted in terms of the avoidance of harm to the level of retail services locally.
O/4/6917/3318	Policy 18. Food and drink, entertainment and amusement uses.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Considers the Policy should be redrafted to more closely comply with national planning policy guidance, and to provide a clear spatial focus.
O/4/6917/3319	Policy 19. Shop fronts.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Considers that reference to shop front design in Conservation Areas etc should be deleted, and should be addressed in specific Conservation Area policies.
S/4/5340/0444	Policy 19. Shop fronts.	Tamerton Foliot Village Conservation Society Mrs B Bebbington	Recognises the important part that shop fronts play in the appearance of Conservation Areas
O/4/6917/3320	Policy 20. Security shutters.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Objects to use of the word 'normally', which is considered not to provide a clear basis for decision-making.
O/4/6690/2435	Policy 21. Mixed Use Areas.	B & Q PLC	Criteria 3 is unnecessary because it is effectively repeated in criteria 5. It should therefore be deleted, and retail uses should be included among the acceptable uses in the introductory paragraph.
O/4/6581/2158	Policy 21. Mixed Use Areas.	British Land Properties Ltd	Considers the Policy should be amended to include A1 and A3 uses, and expressly to provide for the extension of retail warehouses, especially within 'Mixed Use Areas'.
O/4/6644/2347	Policy 21. Mixed Use Areas.	Costco Wholesale U.K. Ltd	Considers the definition of employment should be expanded to provide for other uses, including 'warehouse clubs'.
O/4/6201/1562	Policy 21. Mixed Use Areas.	Dawnan Ltd	The intention of this policy is unclear in relation to mixed use areas. Suggests amending policy to, 'One or more of the following mix of uses . . .'
O/4/6917/3321	Policy 21. Mixed Use Areas.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Policy needs to be accompanied by site-specific proposals. Policy is too negative, conflicting with guidance in PPG1 paras 8-12. Criteria 2, 3 and 4 are particularly negative.
O/4/6923/3435	Policy 21. Mixed Use Areas.	Granite Asset Management	Criterion 3 is unnecessary, as it is covered in criterion 5. It should therefore be removed and retail use should be added to the introductory paragraph instead.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/4/6923/3563	Policy 21. Mixed Use Areas.	Granite Asset Management	Objects to lack of consideration to uses other than those specified.
O/4/6602/2269	Policy 21. Mixed Use Areas.	McCarthy & Stone (Developments) Ltd	Recognises value of policy, but disagrees with the criterion to ensure that new development is within proximity to other residential property' (subsection 4). This should be deleted in the revised version of the plan.
O/4/6202/1568	Policy 21. Mixed Use Areas.	Viridor Properties Ltd	The intention of this policy is unclear in relation to mixed use areas. Suggests amending policy to, 'One or more of the following mix of uses . . .'
S/4/6927/3543	Policy 21. Mixed Use Areas.	South West of England Regional Development Agency	Supportive of policy, as it reflects PPG3 (para.46). Advises that mixed-use development should not adversely affect character or economic function of areas. Can help regeneration of previously developed sites and vacant buildings eg Royal William Yard
O/4/6204/1572	Policy 23. Telecommunications development.	BT Group PLC	Considers the following wording should be deleted: Point 3 – 'closeness to certain uses', 4 – 'radio frequency radiation guidelines'.
O/4/6917/3322	Policy 23. Telecommunications development.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Following wording should be deleted: Criterion 3: 'closeness to certain uses' and 6: 'conservation areas'. There should also be reference to mast sharing.
S/4/6599/2220	Policy 23. Telecommunications development.	Railtrack	Welcomes the policy's support for mast sharing.
S/4/5340/0445	Policy 23. Telecommunications development.	Tamerton Foliot Village Conservation Society Mrs B Bebbington	Support especially point 6 on conservation areas.
O/4/6916/3220	Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.	Associated British Ports	The draft policy is overly prescriptive, and could deter appropriate development.
O/4/6832/2849	Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.	Barratt Homes Exeter Ltd	Does not adequately reflect PPG3 Criteria, particularly in reference to the search sequence. Does not allow for a choice of sites. Amount of brown field sites is excessive and will result in under provision of dwellings.
O/4/6902/3075	Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.	Cavanna Homes (Devon) Ltd Mr Michael Griffin	Should make reference to urban extensions PPG3 criteria should be reflected.
O/4/6897/3013	Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.	English Nature Mr Matt Low	Search sequence should make reference to ecological factors.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/4/6917/3323	Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Over simplified and prescriptive and inflexible. Places inappropriate burden of proof on development. Meaning of 'other land ' is ambiguous. Conflict with PPG1 Para 40. It is the LPAs duty to manage the release of land. It is not necessary to develop all brownfield sites before previously developed sites.
O/4/6830/2825	Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.	Greenside Properties Ltd	Does not adequately reflect PPG3 Criteria. Particularly in reference to search sequence. Does not allow for a choice of sites. Amount of brown field sites is excessive and will result in under provision of dwellings.
O/4/6790/2685	Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.	House Builders Federation Ms Jo Hanslip	The objective is not necessarily seeking to make the most use of previously developed land. It is too negative, and pays little regard to the suitability and availability of sites. It prioritises the size and location of previously developed land over availability, suitability and deliverability of sites. It is unsustainable and contrary to PPG3.
O/4/6918/3419	Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.	Lee Mill Partnership	Sequential approach does not follow search sequence in PPG3
O/4/6605/2277	Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.	Mr & Mrs R Westlake	Urban boundaries may have been drawn to exclude land that has development potential. Fails to recognise opportunity for development of underused land. Many of the allocated previously developed sites may not come forward for development. Policy should reflect PPG3, in respect of underused sites.
O/4/6557/2098	Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.	Mr Andrew Philip Dart	Priority should also be given to under used land.
O/4/6812/2788	Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.	Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners	Policy only partly reflects PPG3 as it does not recognise urban extensions. Could reduce windfall development.
O/4/6587/2196	Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.	Plymouth Roman Catholic Diocese Trust Registered	Fails to recognise opportunities on underused land within the City. Fails to recognise provision of PPG3, which states that there can be situations where greenfield land is preferable to previously developed sites.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/4/6831/2836	Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.	Prowting Projects Ltd	Does not adequately reflect PPG3 Criteria, particularly in reference to search sequence. Does not allow for a choice of sites. Amount of brown field sites is excessive and will result in under provision of dwellings.
O/4/6654/2364	Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.	South West RSL Planning Consortium	Object to policy as it can limit the scope for effective implementation of affordable housing, and RSL's have a constrained funding regime within which to operate. Furthermore, if there is a substantially unmet need for affordable housing, then it could effect the managed release of housing estates.
O/4/6920/3441	Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.	Wainhomes (SW) Limited	Policy should clearly state that it does not apply to allocated sites.
S/4/5447/0585	Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.	B K Ware	No specific grounds of support given.
S/4/6337/1771	Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.	Brixton St Marys PCC & Brixton Primary School Mr Roger Colwell	Would make best use of existing infrastructure.
S/4/6919/3425	Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.	Caradon District Council Mr Geoff Roughton	No specific grounds of support given.
S/4/6152/1507	Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.	CHT Mr Steve Walker	No specific grounds of support given.
S/4/6306/1726	Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.	Cllr Ruth James	All development should be on previously developed sites.
S/4/6645/2348	Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.	Dr A Deeley	Supports using brownfield sites to cater for the younger sector (ages 14-30) of the community. The lifestyle they enjoy means that their housing and social needs are best kept to a confined area away from more mature people.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
<i>S/4/5183/0253</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Dr Brenda Matthews</i>	<i>Use of previously developed sites will assist redevelopment.</i>
<i>S/4/6618/2296</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Dr Christopher Burrell</i>	<i>Aids regeneration. Stimulates economy. Protects surrounding countryside.</i>
<i>S/4/5161/0223</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Dr P F M Warlow</i>	<i>Develop within city to reduce commuting.</i>
<i>S/4/5184/0254</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Dr R A Matthews</i>	<i>Preferable to use of greenfield sites. Aids regeneration and city life.</i>
<i>S/4/6057/1411</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Dr Susan Loxdale</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5121/0177</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Holbeton, Yealmpton & Brixton Society</i>	<i>Pleased that brownfield sites will be developed. Regeneration of the city will make it more attractive, to the benefit of the region.</i>
<i>S/4/6109/1463</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>HYB Society, SHARD, C P R E Mrs S Court</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given</i>
<i>S/4/6624/2302</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Miss A Gregory</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6623/2301</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Miss Abigail Croot</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
<i>S/4/6651/2354</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Miss Amber Murch</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6082/1436</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Miss C Lane</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5892/1144</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Miss Claire Viner</i>	<i>Previously developed sites should be used to prevent development in countryside.</i>
<i>S/4/5894/1146</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Miss D M Procter</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6052/1406</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Miss Dawn Trower</i>	<i>Will assist regeneration, and improve Plymouths image.</i>
<i>S/4/6327/1747</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Miss Dora Williams</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6144/1498</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Miss E Harding</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6629/2307</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Miss E M Richmond</i>	<i>It would be better to extend Plymouth than build on countryside.</i>
<i>S/4/6063/1417</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Miss Emma Marie Purdie</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
<i>S/4/6322/1742</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Miss Emma Rowe</i>	<i>Development on previously developed sites will boost business, save countryside and reduce congestion.</i>
<i>S/4/6075/1429</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Miss Esme Goss</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given</i>
<i>S/4/6312/1732</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Miss Faye McCulloch</i>	<i>All development should be on previously developed sites.</i>
<i>S/4/6005/1359</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Miss Georgina Hunt</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5503/0688</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Miss Geraldine Hall</i>	<i>Object to green field development. People prefer to stay in their own communities.</i>
<i>S/4/5982/1336</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Miss H Chiswell</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6042/1396</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Miss H M Austin</i>	<i>Assists regeneration; adds vitality to the city; and additional population will boost the city. It will provide affordable houses in locations where people want to live.</i>
<i>S/4/6124/1478</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Miss Helen Berry</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6136/1490</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Miss J R Lyon</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
<i>S/4/6349/1783</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Miss J S Cane</i>	<i>Use all previously developed sites before green field.</i>
<i>S/4/6354/1788</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Miss Jacqueline Lowe</i>	<i>Assists regeneration, and helps to preserve the countryside.</i>
<i>S/4/5878/1130</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Miss Jane Ripley</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5302/0401</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Miss Janet Chapman</i>	<i>Use of previously developed sites will improve city and bring prosperity.</i>
<i>S/4/6611/2289</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Miss Jennifer Parker</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6631/2309</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Miss Jillian Chapman</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6127/1481</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Miss Joanne Portwood</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6323/1743</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Miss K E Rowe</i>	<i>Development on previously developed sites will boost business, save the countryside and reduce congestion.</i>
<i>S/4/6072/1426</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Miss Kate Ainsworth</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
<i>S/4/5893/1145</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Miss L E Procter</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5189/0262</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Miss L M Julian</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6619/2297</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Miss Olivia Burrell</i>	<i>Protects wildlife and countryside.</i>
<i>S/4/6346/1780</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Miss R Hindmarsh</i>	<i>Reduces congestion, and helps to preserve countryside</i>
<i>S/4/6313/1733</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Miss Rachael James</i>	<i>All development should be on previously developed sites.</i>
<i>S/4/6058/1412</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Miss Rebecca Griffin</i>	<i>Helps to preserve greenfield sites, and wildlife.</i>
<i>S/4/6112/1466</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Miss Rebecca Smerdon</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5975/1329</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Miss S L Wood</i>	<i>Support use of previously developed sites before green field sites.</i>
<i>S/4/6065/1419</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Miss Sarah Purdie</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
<i>S/4/6029/1383</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Miss Sharon May</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6185/1540</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Miss Stephanie Gallivan</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5874/1126</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Miss Tina Bament</i>	<i>Previously developed sites should be used to prevent development in countryside.</i>
<i>S/4/6039/1393</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Miss Tracey Ward</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5886/1138</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Balkwill</i>	<i>Prevents loss of greenfield sites, and reduces traffic congestion.</i>
<i>S/4/6607/2285</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Davies</i>	<i>Assists regeneration, helps to preserve countryside, and makes better use of infrastructure.</i>
<i>S/4/5502/0687</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Franklin</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6179/1534</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Pedrick</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5988/1342</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Prinn</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
<i>S/4/6334/1768</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Rye</i>	<i>Will help to reduce congestion.</i>
<i>S/4/5504/0689</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Stedham</i>	<i>Previously developed sites should be used to prevent development in the countryside.</i>
<i>S/4/6111/1465</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr & Mrs Reed</i>	<i>Will help to protect the countryside and reduce congestion.</i>
<i>S/4/6007/1361</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr & Mrs A W Sweet</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5219/0307</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr & Mrs Ian Aylett</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5996/1350</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr A Benbow</i>	<i>Supports development on previously developed sites in the city to reduce traffic congestion and assist regeneration.</i>
<i>S/4/5968/1322</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr A F Caldwell</i>	<i>Better to have homes near jobs – less commuting.</i>
<i>S/4/6095/1449</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr A H Tongue</i>	<i>Will help to remove eyesores.</i>
<i>S/4/6352/1786</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr A J T Cane</i>	<i>Suggests using all previously developed sites before green field</i>

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
<i>S/4/6034/1388</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr A L Cullen</i>	<i>People from Plymouth would prefer to live in the city. Helps to preserve greenfield sites.</i>
<i>S/4/6133/1487</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr A P Bermingham</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6122/1476</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr A P Carn</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6335/1769</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr A Twitchin</i>	<i>Will help to reduce congestion.</i>
<i>S/4/5991/1345</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr A W Simper</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5972/1326</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr A Woods</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6328/1748</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Adrian Bingham</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6055/1409</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Alan Donaghy</i>	<i>Help to preserve greenfield sites.</i>
<i>S/4/6606/2284</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Alan Facer</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
<i>S/4/6146/1500</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Alan Foot</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6000/1354</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Alan Ireland</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6609/2287</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Andrew Fox</i>	<i>Assists regeneration.</i>
<i>S/4/6317/1737</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Andrew Frampton</i>	<i>All development should be on previously developed sites.</i>
<i>S/4/5319/0418</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Andrew Matthews</i>	<i>Investment will aid regeneration.</i>
<i>S/4/5895/1147</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Andrew Viner</i>	<i>Previously developed sites should be used to prevent development in the countryside. Must have better use of existing infrastructure. Proximity to work and amenities is important.</i>
<i>S/4/6632/2310</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Anthony Enever</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6338/1772</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Anthony John Parish</i>	<i>Helps to preserve the countryside.</i>
<i>S/4/6347/1781</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Anthony Kingdom</i>	<i>Assists regeneration, and helps to preserve the countryside.</i>

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
<i>S/4/5159/0221</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Antony John Steer</i>	<i>Previously developed sites should be used to prevent development in countryside.</i>
<i>S/4/6305/1725</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr B French</i>	<i>All development should be on previously developed sites.</i>
<i>S/4/5978/1332</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr B J Wesson</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6108/1462</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr B Landricombe</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6077/1431</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Ben Quest</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5499/0684</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Brian Stillwell</i>	<i>Will reduce transport costs.</i>
<i>S/4/6638/2316</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Bryn Davies</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6101/1455</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr C Carson</i>	<i>Assists regeneration.</i>
<i>S/4/6163/1518</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr C Ham</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
<i>S/4/6023/1377</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr C L Atkins</i>	<i>Supports the use of previously developed sites before green field sites Development will assist regeneration.</i>
<i>S/4/6165/1520</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr C R George</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6634/2312</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Christopher Charles Perkins</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5877/1129</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Christopher Meen</i>	<i>Previously developed sites should be used to prevent development in the countryside. Reduces travel costs.</i>
<i>S/4/6009/1363</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Colin Burgess</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5438/0575</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Colin Curtis</i>	<i>It will assist regeneration, and reduce commuting.</i>
<i>S/4/5999/1353</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Colin Rowe</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5478/0663</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr D B Woodcock</i>	<i>It will enable people to live in communities in the city.</i>
<i>S/4/5387/0516</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr D Eschbaecher</i>	<i>Keeps people close to their roots and where infrastructure is available.</i>

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
<i>S/4/5127/0183</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr D J Burrige</i>	<i>Development on previously developed sites is more sustainable regarding jobs, schools and traffic.</i>
<i>S/4/5966/1320</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr D J Freeman</i>	<i>Supports the use of previously developed sites before green field sites.</i>
<i>S/4/5331/0432</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr D J Hildrew</i>	<i>Previously developed sites used to meet the need for more housing, especially low cost.</i>
<i>S/4/6650/2353</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr D Murch</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/5885/1137</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development</i>	<i>Mr D.J. Parker</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6026/1380</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Dale Capon</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5890/1142</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Damon Harvey</i>	<i>Previously developed sites should be used to prevent development in the countryside.</i>
<i>S/4/6315/1735</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Daniel Gillard</i>	<i>All development should be on previously developed sites.</i>
<i>S/4/6031/1385</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr David Benbow</i>	<i>Support use of previously developed sites and vacant properties.</i>

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
<i>S/4/6068/1422</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr David Bollard</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6002/1356</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr David Cunningham</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5998/1352</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr David Hannam</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6642/2320</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr David J Marchant</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given. The City of Plymouth and the South Hams District Council should work together to meet the requirement.</i>
<i>S/4/6105/1459</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr David Kingdom</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5997/1351</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr David Parfitt</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6017/1371</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr David Pryce</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6103/1457</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Dennis Pearn</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6041/1395</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Derek Austin</i>	<i>Will offer good quality affordable housing, where people want to live. Good access to services, and reduced transport costs.</i>

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
<i>S/4/6129/1483</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Derek Curtis</i>	<i>Will reduce the need to travel and congestion.</i>
<i>S/4/6092/1446</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr E D Simpson</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5375/0504</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Edward Gigg</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6356/1790</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Elliott Lowe</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5228/0316</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Eric Saxby</i>	<i>Will reduce development in the countryside.</i>
<i>S/4/6076/1430</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Eric Seymour Goss</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5124/0180</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr F S Yabsley</i>	<i>Reasons for support not stated.</i>
<i>S/4/6184/1539</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr G L Pope</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6087/1441</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr G B Couchman</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
<i>S/4/5897/1149</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr G Pengelly</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6172/1527</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr G R Savory</i>	<i>Development over commercial premises will bring life back to the city, and reduce congestion.</i>
<i>S/4/5251/0339</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Gary William Frank Hunt</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6033/1387</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr George Henry Cullen</i>	<i>Will assist regeneration, and help to preserve greenfield sites. Will also help to protect wildlife.</i>
<i>S/4/6004/1358</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr George Hunt</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6195/1550</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Gerald Rowe</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6030/1384</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Gwen Cawse</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6140/1494</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr H Cole</i>	<i>Develop previously developed sites and help to protect the countryside.</i>
<i>S/4/5506/0691</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr H Ridler</i>	<i>Supportive.</i>

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
<i>S/4/6060/1414</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Iain Griffin</i>	<i>Helps to preserve greenfield sites, and wildlife. Will reduce transport problems and congestion.</i>
<i>S/4/5448/0586</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr J A Salisbury</i>	<i>It will assist regeneration, reduce commuting and congestion, reduce the use of green field sites, and minimise work travel expenses.</i>
<i>S/4/6174/1529</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr J Bennett</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5573/0767</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr J F Beazley</i>	<i>Previously developed sites should be used to prevent development in countryside.</i>
<i>S/4/6036/1390</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr J H Eddy</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6155/1510</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr J H P Bermingham</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6121/1475</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr J Penney</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6647/2350</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr J R Buss</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6330/1750</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr J Scott</i>	<i>Environmentally and socially sensible.</i>

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
<i>S/4/5888/1140</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr James Grant</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5884/1136</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Jamie Hepper</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6345/1779</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Jason Freeborn</i>	<i>Assists regeneration, and helps to preserve the countryside.</i>
<i>S/4/6071/1425</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr John Ainsworth</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6097/1451</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr John Hillier</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5451/0589</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr John Hollow</i>	<i>Supportive.</i>
<i>S/4/6847/2889</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr John W Squire</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6158/1513</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr John Ward</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5385/0514</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr John Whitaker</i>	<i>Development should be in the city.</i>

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
<i>S/4/6355/1789</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Joshua Lowe</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6040/1394</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr K Fenneran</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6141/1495</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr K H Fiddik</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6308/1728</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr K S Francis</i>	<i>All development should be on previously developed sites.</i>
<i>S/4/6049/1403</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Keith Pierce</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6064/1418</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Kenneth Purdie</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5283/0379</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Keverne John Sharples</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6160/1515</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr L A Stevens</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6134/1488</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr L Bennett</i>	<i>Use also vacant properties and city centre to bring life back to the city.</i>

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
<i>S/4/5974/1328</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr L M Jackson</i>	<i>Supports the use of previously developed sites before green field sites.</i>
<i>S/4/6047/1401</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr M D Avery</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given. Will help to protect wildlife.</i>
<i>S/4/6151/1506</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr M E H Trower</i>	<i>Will assist regeneration.</i>
<i>S/4/6186/1541</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr M G Perkin</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6311/1731</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr M James</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6314/1734</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr M Lyndon</i>	<i>All development should be on previously developed sites.</i>
<i>S/4/6351/1785</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Marcus W Cane</i>	<i>Use all previously developed sites before green field.</i>
<i>S/4/5284/0380</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Mark F Hanley</i>	<i>Previously developed sites should be used to prevent development in the countryside.</i>
<i>S/4/6018/1372</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Mark Neale</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
<i>S/4/6333/1767</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Mark Twitchin</i>	<i>Will help to reduce congestion.</i>
<i>S/4/6471/1948</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Martyn John Oates</i>	<i>Scope for innovative development. Will reduce need to travel to work</i>
<i>S/4/6054/1408</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Matthew Horsley</i>	<i>Helps to preserve greenfield sites.</i>
<i>S/4/5882/1134</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Maurice Parker</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5984/1338</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Michael John Chiswell</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6079/1433</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Michael Quest</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6303/1723</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Michael Thorne</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6627/2305</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr N P Spindler</i>	<i>Protects countryside.</i>
<i>S/4/6132/1486</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr N T A Bermingham</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
<i>S/4/6066/1420</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Neil Edgcumbe</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6341/1775</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Nicholas Pitts</i>	<i>Previously developed sites are better served by infrastructure than greenfield sites.</i>
<i>S/4/6633/2311</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Nigel Brookes</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6630/2308</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr O S W Richmond</i>	<i>Protects the countryside.</i>
<i>S/4/6614/2292</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Orton John Crawford</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6353/1787</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr P A A Weare</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6626/2304</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr P A Gregory</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6059/1413</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr P C Griffin</i>	<i>Helps to preserve greenfield sites and wildlife.</i>
<i>S/4/5879/1131</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr P Dobranski</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
<i>S/4/5873/1125</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr P K Woolf</i>	<i>Previously developed sites should be used to prevent development in the countryside. Assists urban regeneration, and reduces transport costs to individuals, and congestion.</i>
<i>S/4/6083/1437</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr P Lane</i>	<i>Assists regeneration.</i>
<i>S/4/6177/1532</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr P S Ryder</i>	<i>Development of previously developed sites will help protect the countryside.</i>
<i>S/4/6106/1460</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr P Skentelbery</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6056/1410</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Patrick Loxdale</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6188/1543</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Paul Foulkes</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6636/2314</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Paul Lowden</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5524/0710</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Peter Fellows</i>	<i>Previously developed sites should be used to prevent development in the countryside.</i>
<i>S/4/5986/1340</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Peter Haines</i>	<i>Supports the use of previously developed sites before green field sites.</i>

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
<i>S/4/6162/1517</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Peter Lynn</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5355/0475</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Peter Richard White</i>	<i>Previously developed sites should be used to prevent development in the countryside.</i>
<i>S/4/6340/1774</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Phillip Hindmarsh</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6310/1730</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr R C A Whittle</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6171/1526</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr R E Henwood</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5994/1348</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr R E Pitman</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6012/1366</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr R F Evans</i>	<i>Supports the use of previously developed sites before green field sites.</i>
<i>S/4/6189/1544</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr R Foulkes</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6307/1727</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr R J Gittins</i>	<i>All development should be on previously developed sites.</i>

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
<i>S/4/6304/1724</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr R J Tucker</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5983/1337</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr R K Downing</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5350/0469</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr R Moore</i>	<i>Conforms to government policy. Previously developed sites should be used to prevent development in the countryside. There will be more demands for agricultural land in future.</i>
<i>S/4/6320/1740</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr R Rowe</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6118/1472</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr R S Williams</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6001/1355</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr R W Stubbs</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6149/1504</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr R Walker</i>	<i>Use MOD sites before previously developed sites.</i>
<i>S/4/5345/0464</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Raymond Michael Merritt</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6021/1375</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Richard Daly</i>	<i>Supports the use of previously developed sites before green field sites.</i>

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
<i>S/4/6147/1501</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Richard Foulkes</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6612/2290</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Richard Hart</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5371/0500</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Richard Kingdom</i>	<i>Needs to redevelop to revitalise the city. Reduces congestion.</i>
<i>S/4/6104/1458</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Robert Baskerville</i>	<i>Development of previously developed land will help to tidy up the city.</i>
<i>S/4/6639/2317</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Robert John Wheeler</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5995/1349</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Robert Robinson</i>	<i>Previously developed sites should be used to prevent development in the countryside. Reduces congestion.</i>
<i>S/4/5891/1143</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Robert Walker</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5208/0287</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Robin Davies</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6945/1754</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Roger Pope</i>	<i>Will help the economy and viability of the city.</i>

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
<i>S/4/6014/1368</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Ronald Henry Griffiths</i>	<i>Housing for city should be kept within the city.</i>
<i>S/4/5196/0269</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Roy Axell</i>	<i>Supports the use of previously developed land and regeneration funds particularly for city centre.</i>
<i>S/4/5339/1722</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Roy James</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6181/1536</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr S Cooke</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6145/1499</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr S Spean</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5964/1318</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Simon Aston</i>	<i>Supports the use of previously developed sites before green field sites.</i>
<i>S/4/6620/2298</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Simon Strong</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6622/2300</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Simon Strong</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5233/0321</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Stephen Duckworth</i>	<i>Will benefit the city and surrounding communities.</i>

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
<i>S/4/5273/0369</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Stephen Gimingham</i>	<i>Previously developed sites should be used to prevent development in countryside.</i>
<i>S/4/6316/1736</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Stephen Taylor</i>	<i>All development should be on previously developed sites.</i>
<i>S/4/6156/1511</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Steven Bunten</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6196/1551</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Stuart Worth</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6944/2959</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr T A Tunnicliffe</i>	<i>Support policy – many people do not want to move out of the suburbs leaving behind friends and family. Reinventing the city is essential to improve the well being of people and make them proud of Plymouth.</i>
<i>S/4/6143/1497</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr T J Williams</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6166/1521</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr T R George</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5977/1331</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Terence Windmill</i>	<i>Supports the use of previously developed sites before green field sites.</i>
<i>S/4/6139/1493</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Tim Cole</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
<i>S/4/6025/1379</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Tim Spencer</i>	<i>Supports the use of previously developed sites before green field sites.</i>
<i>S/4/6326/1746</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Toby Martin</i>	<i>Develop previously developed sites which are close to facilities. Reduces congestion. Assists regeneration.</i>
<i>S/4/5106/0161</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Vernon Bellerby</i>	<i>Houses are needed in the city, rather than on green fields.</i>
<i>S/4/6073/1427</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr W H Williams</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5970/1324</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr W J Hutcheon</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6114/1468</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr W J Wills</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6348/1782</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr W M Cane</i>	<i>Use all previously developed sites before green field.</i>
<i>S/4/5980/1334</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr W Mills</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6091/1445</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mr Zachary Gribble</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
<i>S/4/6137/1491</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Bartlett</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5985/1339</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Evans</i>	<i>Support use of previously developed sites before green field sites.</i>
<i>S/4/6178/1533</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Evans</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5501/0686</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Franklin</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6115/1469</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Jones</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6613/2291</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Landricombe</i>	<i>Assists regeneration. Encourages people back to the city.</i>
<i>S/4/6180/1535</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Pedrick</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5139/0196</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Phillimore</i>	<i>Development of previously developed sites is good for regeneration and reduces need to travel.</i>
<i>S/4/5989/1343</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Piney</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
<i>S/4/6342/1776</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Pitts</i>	<i>Helps to preserve countryside.</i>
<i>S/4/6194/1549</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Read</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5987/1341</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Roseveare</i>	<i>Supports the use of previously developed sites before green field sites.</i>
<i>S/4/5300/0399</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs & Mr Susan Pavier</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5279/0375</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs A Beamish</i>	<i>Plymouth residents need to live as near to the city as possible, to reduce traffic.</i>
<i>S/4/6024/1378</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Amanda Spencer</i>	<i>Supports the use of previously developed sites before green field sites.</i>
<i>S/4/6616/2294</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Andrea Roberts</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5433/0570</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Anette Stillwell</i>	<i>It will provide homes and help to make a safer and more attractive environment.</i>
<i>S/4/5473/0658</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Ann Robbins</i>	<i>Development should be in the city.</i>

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
<i>S/4/6067/1421</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Anne Bollard</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6154/1509</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Anthea Bermingham</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6625/2303</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs B Gregory - Schroder</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6135/1489</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs B J Huxtable</i>	<i>Build more 1 person flats and use empty properties.</i>
<i>S/4/6943/2963</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs B J Tunnicliffe</i>	<i>Moving people away from City Centres leaves the centre heartless and in decay. The city needs revival with fresher homes which are attractive to young people who will be responsible and proud to live there.</i>
<i>S/4/6159/1514</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs B P Stevens</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5374/0503</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Barbara Gigg</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5517/0703</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Barbara J Fellows</i>	<i>Previously developed sites should be used to prevent development in the countryside and reduce commuting.</i>
<i>S/4/6113/1467</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Barbara Leslie</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
<i>S/4/6084/1438</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Barbara Wilkinson</i>	<i>Assists regeneration.</i>
<i>S/4/6032/1386</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Betty Cullen</i>	<i>Will assist regeneration, and help to preserve greenfield sites. Will also help to protect wildlife.</i>
<i>S/4/6003/1357</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Betty Turner</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5976/1330</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Betty Windmill</i>	<i>Supports the use of previously developed sites before green field sites.</i>
<i>S/4/5344/0463</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Brenda Merritt</i>	<i>Green field sites should be used for pleasure.</i>
<i>S/4/6100/1454</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs C Carson</i>	<i>Assists regeneration.</i>
<i>S/4/6175/1530</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs C E Freeman</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6094/1448</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs C Hillier</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6339/1773</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Christine Hindmarsh</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
<i>S/4/6150/1505</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs D F Trower</i>	<i>Will assist regeneration.</i>
<i>S/4/5981/1335</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs D H Mills</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5285/0381</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Deborah H Hanley</i>	<i>Need affordable housing in the city where the infrastructure exists.</i>
<i>S/4/6610/2288</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Deborah Hart</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6120/1474</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Deborah Rose</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6161/1516</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Denise Hooper</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6641/2319</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Doreen Joan Norris</i>	<i>Supports the policy; there are a lot of neglected and ugly sites which are presently an eyesore.</i>
<i>S/4/6169/1524</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Dorothy Clark</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6074/1428</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Dorothy Vosper</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
<i>S/4/6048/1402</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs E Benbow</i>	<i>Supports development on previously developed sites in the city to reduce traffic congestion.</i>
<i>S/4/6190/1545</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs E J Hepton</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5123/0179</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs E R M Follett</i>	<i>Reason for support not stated.</i>
<i>S/4/6617/2295</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs E S Burrell</i>	<i>Puts houses where they are needed, and protects wildlife and countryside.</i>
<i>S/4/5301/0400</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Elizabeth Joan Griffiths</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5899/1151</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Elizabeth Rossiter</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5178/0242</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Elspeth Amy Fisher</i>	<i>Development on previously developed sites would enable people to live where they want to be.</i>
<i>S/4/6653/2356</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs F Wright</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6010/1364</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Francine Goss</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
<i>S/4/6117/1471</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Freda O'Brien</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5900/1152</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Frieda Court</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5166/0228</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs G Davey</i>	<i>Previously developed sites should be used to prevent development in the countryside.</i>
<i>S/4/6646/2349</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs G E Buss</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6649/2352</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs G Murch</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5274/0370</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Gillian Gimingham</i>	<i>Previously developed sites should be used to prevent development in the countryside.</i>
<i>S/4/6193/1548</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Grace Simmonett</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6102/1456</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Hilary Pearn</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6086/1440</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs I A Drake</i>	<i>Assists regeneration.</i>

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
<i>S/4/6069/1423</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs J A Downing</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6183/1538</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs J A Pope</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6053/1407</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs J C Shopland</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5388/0517</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs J Eschbaecher</i>	<i>Optimum utilisation of previously developed land will aid regeneration and provide homes close to facilities.</i>
<i>S/4/5967/1321</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs J Freeman</i>	<i>Supports the use of previously developed sites before green field sites.</i>
<i>S/4/6107/1461</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs J Landricombe</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6081/1435</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs J Lane</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6128/1482</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs J Lloyd</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5876/1128</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs J M Balkwill</i>	<i>Previously developed sites should be used to prevent development in the countryside. Reduces congestion.</i>

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
<i>S/4/6130/1484</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs J M Curtis</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6168/1523</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs J M George</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6176/1531</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs J M Ryder</i>	<i>Development of previously developed sites will protect the countryside.</i>
<i>S/4/6016/1370</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs J M White</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5869/1121</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs J Meen</i>	<i>Previously developed sites should be used to prevent development in the countryside. Assists urban regeneration. Reduces transport costs to individuals. Reduces congestion.</i>
<i>S/4/5971/1325</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs J O Osborn</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5449/0587</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs J Salisbury</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6942/0422</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs J T Leonard</i>	<i>Use of previously developed sites before green field sites will generally be smaller and more discrete.</i>
<i>S/4/5870/1122</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs J Woodcock</i>	<i>Homes for locals near where they already live and work.</i>

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
<i>S/4/6044/1398</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Jacqui Donaghy</i>	<i>Helps to preserve greenfield sites. Will help to protect wildlife.</i>
<i>S/4/6062/1416</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Janet M Purdie</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5875/1127</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Janet Parish</i>	<i>Previously developed sites should be used to prevent development in the countryside.</i>
<i>S/4/6110/1464</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Janina Hicks</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6125/1479</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Jean Jewell</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6648/2351</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Jean Wilkinson</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5268/0362</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Jennifer Jane Hollow</i>	<i>Previously developed sites should be used to prevent development in countryside.</i>
<i>S/4/6324/1744</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Jil Atkins</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5450/0588</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Joan Alder</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
<i>S/4/6006/1360</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Joan Hunt</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5962/1316</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Joan Weare</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5992/1346</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Joyce Simper</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6309/1729</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Judith Reynolds</i>	<i>All development should be on previously developed sites.</i>
<i>S/4/5896/1148</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Judith Viner</i>	<i>Previously developed sites should be used to prevent development in the countryside. Better transport links in urban areas.</i>
<i>S/4/6325/1745</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Judy Martin</i>	<i>Develop previously developed sites which are close to facilities.</i>
<i>S/4/5252/0340</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Julie Ann Hunt</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5210/0289</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Julie Stewart</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6321/1741</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Juliet Rowe</i>	<i>Development on previously developed sites will boost business, help save the countryside and reduce congestion.</i>

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
<i>S/4/6045/1399</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs June Avery</i>	<i>Helps to preserve greenfield sites, and protect wildlife.</i>
<i>S/4/6142/1496</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs K L Williams</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5872/1124</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Kate Woolf</i>	<i>Previously developed sites should be used to prevent development in the countryside. Assists urban regeneration. Reduces transport costs to individuals. Reduces congestion.</i>
<i>S/4/6167/1522</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Katie George</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5979/1333</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Kay Wesson</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5887/1139</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs L J Grant</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6028/1382</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs L May</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6187/1542</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs L R Perkin</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6037/1391</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs L V Eddy</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
<i>S/4/5357/0477</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs L Y Miller</i>	<i>Previously developed sites should be used to prevent development in the countryside.</i>
<i>S/4/5969/1323</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Lisa Follet</i>	<i>Supports the use of previously developed sites before green field sites.</i>
<i>S/4/6621/2299</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Lorraine Croot</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6148/1503</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs M Braker</i>	<i>Use MOD sites first, then previously developed sites.</i>
<i>S/4/6093/1447</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs M C Tongue</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6116/1470</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs M E Grainge</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support give.</i>
<i>S/4/5177/0241</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs M E Millin</i>	<i>Priority on previously developed sites would help regeneration, give employment and reduce commuting.</i>
<i>S/4/6119/1473</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs M E Williams</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6191/1546</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs M Foulkes</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
<i>S/4/6173/1528</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs M H Curd</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6090/1444</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs M J Couchman</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6015/1369</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs M J Huntley</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6085/1439</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs M Jeffery</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5500/0685</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs M K Samuels</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6319/1739</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs M Pugh</i>	<i>Build in the city instead of on farmland.</i>
<i>S/4/6050/1404</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs M West</i>	<i>Helps to preserve greenfield sites.</i>
<i>S/4/5554/0740</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Marilyn Williams</i>	<i>Environmentally and sociologically sound. Protects the countryside. Restores life to city.</i>
<i>S/4/6011/1365</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Marjorie Ruth Bellerby</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
<i>S/4/6078/1432</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Mary Quest</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5223/0311</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Mary Wilcox</i>	<i>Will reduce travel, and make best use of existing infrastructure.</i>
<i>S/4/5880/1132</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Maureen Parker</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6331/1751</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Michelle Brown</i>	<i>Assists regeneration. Helps to preserve countryside.</i>
<i>S/4/6070/1424</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Michelle Ireland</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5965/1319</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs N Aston</i>	<i>Supports the use of previously developed sites before green field sites.</i>
<i>S/4/6131/1485</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Nula Shane Bermingham</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5256/0344</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Olive James</i>	<i>Supportive.</i>
<i>S/4/6157/1512</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs P A Ward</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
<i>S/4/6098/1452</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs P Haines</i>	<i>Will help to preserve the countryside.</i>
<i>S/4/5533/0719</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Pamela Martin</i>	<i>Previously developed sites should be used to prevent development in the countryside.</i>
<i>S/4/6022/1376</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Patricia Thompson</i>	<i>Supports the use of previously developed sites before green field sites.</i>
<i>S/4/6640/2318</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Penelope Sonia James</i>	<i>Supports the policy; there are a lot of ugly and derelict sites in Plymouth.</i>
<i>S/4/5963/1317</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Penny Ainsworth</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5144/0201</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs R A Burridge</i>	<i>Supports the use of previously developed sites, and sites near to employment provision, and in the city centre. Also helps to relieve congestion.</i>
<i>S/4/6153/1508</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs R A L Napton</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5898/1150</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs R A Pengelly</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6027/1381</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs R E Capon</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
<i>S/4/6008/1362</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs R K Davis</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5505/0690</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Reta Ethel Ridler</i>	<i>Supportive.</i>
<i>S/4/6099/1453</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Rosemary Deeley</i>	<i>Will help to preserve the countryside.</i>
<i>S/4/5871/1123</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Rosemary Willsher</i>	<i>Previously developed sites should be used to prevent development in the countryside.</i>
<i>S/4/6811/3427</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Ruth Beazley</i>	<i>The housing allocation should be increased and designated to brownfield sites.</i>
<i>S/4/5105/0160</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Ruth Bellerby</i>	<i>Houses are needed in the city, rather than on green fields.</i>
<i>S/4/6350/1784</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs S E Cane</i>	<i>Use all previously developed sites before green field.</i>
<i>S/4/6038/1392</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs S E Herbert</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5197/0270</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs S J Axell</i>	<i>Will assist urban regeneration, and make best use of infrastructure.</i>

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
<i>S/4/6043/1397</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs S M Austin</i>	<i>It will regenerate the city centre. Provide affordable homes in areas with good transport, and access to amenities.</i>
<i>S/4/6318/1738</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs S M Frampton</i>	<i>All development should be on previously developed sites.</i>
<i>S/4/6192/1547</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs S M Hutcheon</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6628/2306</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs S V Spindler</i>	<i>Protect the countryside.</i>
<i>S/4/6170/1525</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Shirley Henwood</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5496/0681</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Stephanie Treeby</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6637/2315</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Susan Davies</i>	<i>The City Centre can best address the housing and social needs of single people. Poorer areas with mixed housing should be redeveloped and the countryside conserved to enhance the area for all and appeal to tourists boosting income to the area.</i>
<i>S/4/6061/1415</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Susan Griffin</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6344/1778</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Susan Harvey</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
<i>S/4/6343/1777</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Susan Newsome</i>	<i>Helps to preserve the countryside.</i>
<i>S/4/6652/2355</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Sylvia Pratt</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6020/1374</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Sylvia Pryce</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6123/1477</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Teresa Carn</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6051/1405</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Thelma Daly</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6336/1770</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs V A Twitchin</i>	<i>Will help to reduce congestion.</i>
<i>S/4/6635/2313</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs V Brookes</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6096/1450</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs V E Welch</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6164/1519</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs V M Fiddik</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
<i>S/4/5881/1133</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs V Morsman</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6126/1480</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Vanessa Milden</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5883/1135</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Vera Linnen</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5281/0377</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Veronica Sharples</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6608/2286</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Wendy D S Kennedy</i>	<i>Use all previously developed sites before green field.</i>
<i>S/4/6013/1367</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Wendy Elizabeth Griffiths</i>	<i>Supports the use of previously developed sites before green field sites.</i>
<i>S/4/6080/1434</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Wendy Venetia Watts</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6088/1442</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Y Burt</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5973/1327</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Y Robinson</i>	<i>Develop in city which will reduce congestion.</i>

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
<i>S/4/5889/1141</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Mrs Yvonne Westlake</i>	<i>Prevents loss of greenfield sites. Assists regeneration.</i>
<i>S/4/6182/1537</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Ms Anne Elms</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6019/1373</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Ms Catherine Clark</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6035/1389</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Ms E Faulkner</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6329/1749</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Ms Gill Kingdom</i>	<i>Develop previously developed sites which are close to facilities. Builds communities.</i>
<i>S/4/6046/1400</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Ms Nicola Gartrell</i>	<i>Helps to preserve greenfield sites. Will help to protect wildlife.</i>
<i>S/4/5282/0378</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Ms Rachel Sharples</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/6615/2293</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Ms Rose Wood</i>	<i>Environmentally and socially appropriate. Close to employment facilities and infrastructure.</i>
<i>S/4/6138/1492</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Ms S Behenna</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
<i>S/4/5389/0518</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Newton and Noss Parish Council Mrs J Eschbaecher</i>	<i>It will enable people to stay in their communities and provide homes close to facilities.</i>
<i>S/4/5318/0417</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Newton and Noss Parish Councillor Mrs Catherine Anne Matthews</i>	<i>Will reduce congestion, make the city a more desirable place to live in, and increase prosperity.</i>
<i>S/4/6089/1443</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>SHARD Mr N J Carter</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5993/1347</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Shard Mr Nigel Blenkinsop</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5990/1344</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>SHARD Mrs Alice Blenkinsop</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5990/1502</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>SHARD Mrs Alice Blenkinsop</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>S/4/5340/0446</i>	<i>Policy 24. Sequential approach to residential development.</i>	<i>Tamerton Foliot Village Conservation Society Mrs B Bebbington</i>	<i>No specific grounds of support given.</i>
<i>O/4/6832/2848</i>	<i>Policy 25. New housing development.</i>	<i>Barratt Homes Exeter Ltd</i>	<i>Criterion 1 should be reworded to allow for the development of land adjacent to established residential areas, reflecting PPG 3 guidance. Reference to refuse collection areas in criterion 6 should be deleted: it is unnecessary to include in such a minor detail in a policy, as it is can be reserved for negotiation on planning layouts.</i>

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/4/6902/3074	Policy 25. New housing development.	Cavanna Homes (Devon) Ltd Mr Michael Griffin	Policy 25 acts as a 'development standards' policy both within Established Residential areas and elsewhere, ie on allocated sites. Criterion 2 of the policy relating to open space should be deleted as it is already referred to in other policy statements. It is inappropriate to refer to prohibitions relating to locations of any kind in such a policy.
O/4/6897/3014	Policy 25. New housing development.	English Nature Mr Matt Low	Criteria should include some reference to the nature conservation value of a site.
O/4/6907/3129	Policy 25. New housing development.	Environment Agency Mr Mike Robins	Development should reach high levels of insulation; heating systems should be energy efficient; buildings should be built of sustainable materials; and water management should be considered. Should include the following statement: 'development will only be approved where there is no net environmental damage and which will comply with the highest achievable standards of sustainable construction'. Item 6 should refer to segregation of recyclable waste to support community recycling. Generation and recycling of waste must be considered in large developments.
O/4/6907/3129	Policy 25. New housing development.	Environment agency Mr Mike Robins	Considers all buildings should be energy efficient, well insulated, and constructed of sustainable materials. Provision should be made for good water management and permeable surfaces. Suggests adding the following statements: 'The development will only be approved where there is no net environmental damage against which there can be no mitigation (includes protection of habitats and ecology).' 'The development will comply with the highest achievable standards of sustainable construction.' Criterion 6 should make reference to the segregation or minimisation of waste and recycling.
O/4/6917/3324	Policy 25. New housing development.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Criteria 1 and 2 (and possibly other criteria) appear to contain tests in other policies. The duplication and overlap should be removed as contrary to PPG 12 para 3.1.
O/4/6830/2824	Policy 25. New housing development.	Greenside Properties Ltd	Criterion 1 should be reworded to allow for the development of land adjacent to established residential areas, reflecting PPG 3 guidance. Criterion 6 relating to refuse collection areas should be deleted, as it is unnecessary to include a policy of such minor detail, which can be reserved for detailed negotiation on planning layouts.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/4/6790/2686	Policy 25. New housing development.	House Builders Federation Ms Jo Hanslip	Appreciate the intentions of Policy 25 however it would be more effective as supplementary planning guidance and should be deleted. Lengthy and repetitious statements run contrary to PPG12. Criterion 4 relates to energy efficiency and criterion 7 to accessible housing – these are inappropriate to the Local Plan as they repeat other statutory guidance, especially the Building Regulations.
O/4/6697/3103	Policy 25. New housing development.	Midas Homes Ltd Mr David Seaton	Part 1 of this policy should re-iterate policy 24.
O/4/6605/2278	Policy 25. New housing development.	Mr & Mrs R Westlake	The provisions of the policy set onerous requirements on developers, which could hinder development during the plan period. It should be amended to be succinct or deleted and replaced by a commentary in the written text of the plan.
O/4/6785/2582	Policy 25. New housing development.	Mr A E Cullen	The policy does not make sufficient distinction between the criteria for new housing developments and the effect on existing ones. Criterion 5 is too subjective; it should be re-worded to say that privacy enjoyed by existing adjoining properties is not reduced and that problems of overlooking are not created. In Reasons for the Policy, it should be made clear beyond doubt that it applies to standards within new housing development.
O/4/6812/2789	Policy 25. New housing development.	Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners	Policy 25 acts as a 'development standards' policy both within Established Residential areas and elsewhere, ie on allocated sites. Criterion 2 of the policy relating to open space should be deleted as it is already referred to in other policy statements. It is inappropriate to prohibit locations of any kind in such a policy.
O/4/6587/2195	Policy 25. New housing development.	Plymouth Roman Catholic Diocese Trust Registered	Policy should be re-drafted to adopt a more flexible approach to new housing development. Criterion 2 is too onerous. Criterion 3 conflicts with criterion 2, as development could include amenity and open space within it. Criteria 4, 5 and 6 should be assessed on an individual basis, as the Local Plan policies cover these areas. Criterion 7 - affordable housing should only be sought on sites 'where it is necessary'.
O/4/6831/2837	Policy 25. New housing development.	Prowting Projects Ltd	Criterion 1 should be reworded to allow for the development of land adjacent to established residential areas to reflect PPG 3 guidance. Criterion 6 relating to refuse collection areas should be deleted – it is unnecessary to include in a policy as it is a minor detail that can be reserved for detailed negotiation on planning layouts.
O/4/6831/3461	Policy 25. New housing development.	Prowting Projects Ltd	Criteria 1-4 set out the objectives adequately. Criteria 5-8 are superfluous. The lines '...and that problems of overlooking are not created' should be deleted from criterion 5.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/4/6831/3376	Policy 25. New housing development.	Prowting Projects Ltd Mr Norman Kwan	Criterion 1 should be reworded to allow for the development of land adjacent to established residential areas to reflect PPG 3 guidance and sustainable development. Criterion 6 on refuse storage should be deleted, as it is a minor detail that can be dealt with through negotiation.
O/4/6900/3054	Policy 25. New housing development.	Sport England South West Region Mr Gary Parsons	Objects to lack of consideration towards formal sport and informal recreation for both indoor and outdoor facilities. Suggests including a criterion to ensure that all new housing development (apart from exceptions) , including single dwellings, should reasonably contribute to formal sport and informal recreation, for both indoor and outdoor facilities. Where on site provision is not appropriate, developers should make financial contributions to new, or the enhancement of existing, facilities within the appropriate catchment area.
O/4/6900/3055	Policy 25. New housing development.	Sport England South West Region Mr Gary Parsons	Support criterion 2 but should also acknowledge the protection of playing fields and cross reference to policy 61.
S/4/5075/0114	Policy 25. New housing development.	CPRE Plymouth & South Hams Group Mr Roger Gage	A high quality residential development including a range of services is needed if urban areas are to prove attractive to live in. This will reduce pressure on accommodation in rural areas.
S/4/6654/2365	Policy 25. New housing development.	South West RSL Planning Consortium	Supported.
S/4/5340/0447	Policy 25. New housing development.	Tamerton Foliot Village Conservation Society Mrs B Bebbington	A sound social and environmental policy.
S/4/6688/2429	Policy 25. New housing development.	The Chestnut Avenue Trust	Supportive.
S/4/6920/3442	Policy 25. New housing development.	Wainhomes (SW) Limited	Support in principle.
O/4/6897/3015	Policy 26. Established Residential Areas.	English Nature Mr Matt Low	Objects to policy on grounds that it does not include any ecological criteria.
O/4/6907/3130	Policy 26. Established Residential Areas.	Environment Agency Mr Mike Robins	Considers the policy should include the following criterion: 'The development will not exceed the capacity of existing waste water treatment works.'

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/4/6917/3325	Policy 26. Established Residential Areas.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Objects to the repetition of policy 25 in the first sentence of Policy 26. It should therefore be deleted. The policy should also deal with positive and negative elements more clearly eg 'Non-residential uses in residential areas will be permitted where they will assist in creating a balanced and sustainable community. They will not be permitted where (1) the residential character is harmed, etc.
O/4/6790/2687	Policy 26. Established Residential Areas.	House Builders Federation Ms Jo Hanslip	Objection to criterion 5: to ensure a minimum of 115 ² metres in family dwellings. This should be covered in supplementary guidance, not the local plan, and such a size threshold should not become a requirement for development. Lengthy and repetitious statements are contrary to objectives of PPG12.
O/4/6785/2583	Policy 26. Established Residential Areas.	Mr A E Cullen	Considers Policy – particularly criterion 1 – to be inadequate in protecting Established Residential Areas against non-residential development.
S/4/6902/3073	Policy 26. Established Residential Areas.	Cavanna Homes (Devon) Ltd Mr Michael Griffin	Supportive of policy.
S/4/6815/2796	Policy 26. Established Residential Areas.	Mutley Community Association Ms Margaret Taylor	Strongly supportive of policy, particularly the reason behind it to ensure '... quietness, and access to open space, and the homes themselves are not lost.'
S/4/6791/2702	Policy 26. Established Residential Areas.	Plymouth East End Renewal Partnership Mr Phil Mitchell	Supports concept of achieving and supporting balanced and sustainable communities where people enjoy living. Trusts that criteria will be met in future developments.
S/4/6654/2366	Policy 26. Established Residential Areas.	South West RSL Planning Consortium	Supported.
S/4/6688/2433	Policy 26. Established Residential Areas.	The Chestnut Avenue Trust	Support the presumption in favour of residential development in Established Residential Areas.
O/4/6902/3072	Policy 27. Residential density.	Cavanna Homes (Devon) Ltd Mr Michael Griffin	Development at higher density should be considered in a wider range of locations than specified.
O/4/6897/3016	Policy 27. Residential density.	English Nature Mr Matt Low	Policy should recognise that lower densities will be required where the site is of natural importance.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/4/6917/3326	Policy 27. Residential density.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Oversimplifies a more complicated set of issues. Conflicts with PPG3 advice (paras 22, 57). May need to identify conservation areas where lower density is appropriate. Lower density in or adjacent to sensitive wildlife or countryside areas will not necessarily have more impact than lower density. Delete word only in final paragraph to allow higher density in other locations.
O/4/6602/2268	Policy 27. Residential density.	McCarthy & Stone (Developments) Ltd	Density should not be restricted to 30-50 /ha. Many forms of development can achieve a higher density.
O/4/6605/2279	Policy 27. Residential density.	Mr & Mrs R Westlake	Policy will stifle development. Each application should be determined on its merits. Delete criterion 3 of the policy.
O/4/6587/2194	Policy 27. Residential density.	Plymouth Roman Catholic Diocese Trust Registered	Policy should accept development on open spaces which are suitable for residential development. Criterion 2 requires further explanation in respect of other areas.
O/4/5201/0277	Policy 27. Residential density.	South Hams Against Rural Destruction Mr Steve Melia	Development should exceed 50/ha in centres and areas of high accessibility etc – such areas should be specifically identified.
O/4/6654/2367	Policy 27. Residential density.	South West RSL Planning Consortium	Policy should allow for higher densities.
S/4/6916/3221	Policy 27. Residential density.	Associated British Ports	Policy accords with national guidance.
S/4/6920/3443	Policy 27. Residential density.	Wainhomes (SW) Limited	No specific reasons given.
O/4/6917/3327	Policy 28. Householder development.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Policy is a confusing mix of positive and negative tests (PPG12 para A23). It might be clearer to deal with them more explicitly.
S/4/5454/0611	Policy 28. Householder development.	Stoke Damerel Conservation Society Mr Robin Midgley	The criteria are particularly important in Conservation areas. Harm has been caused by, for example, unsuitable surface treatments or wrong window proportions.
O/4/6917/3328	Policy 29. Loft conversions / dormer windows.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	The Government is very much opposed to over-elaborate plan making (PPG12 para 3.1). This does not appear to be a 'core policy' and most of the principles are established in policy 28. It should be deleted and more detailed tests for dormers should be contained within Supplementary Planning Guidance.
S/4/5454/0612	Policy 29. Loft conversions / dormer windows.	Stoke Damerel Conservation Society Mr Robin Midgley	These criteria are particularly important in Conservation Areas where inappropriate dormer windows or roof extensions have caused much harm to the quality of the area.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/4/6917/3329	Policy 30. Conversions to flats.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	The second paragraph appears negative and should instead provide that such projects will be permitted, subject to criteria (PPG2 para 22). Criterion 6 – it appears fundamentally negative; there appears no general reason why existing uses should be more valuable to the public interest than housing, and should therefore be deleted.
O/4/5201/0276	Policy 30. Conversions to flats.	South Hams Against Rural Destruction Mr Steve Melia	Objects against restrictive nature of criteria, particularly criterion 1 which does not allow existing flats less than 115 ² m to be converted into flats. Suggests rewording criterion 1 to encourage sub-divisions.
O/4/6654/2368	Policy 30. Conversions to flats.	South West RSL Planning Consortium	The policy should also encourage mixed B1 (Offices/Light Industry etc) and residential accommodation.
O/4/6917/3330	Policy 31. Layout for flat conversions.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	The policy appears to be over-elaborate (PPG12 para 3.1). The Council should satisfy itself that the criteria do not duplicate other controls (para 3.5). The policy should set out the main principles, and further detail could be the subject of SPG (para 3.15-18).
O/4/6790/2688	Policy 31. Layout for flat conversions.	House Builders Federation Ms Jo Hanslip	The policy is over detailed and would be better set out in Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) as put forward in PPG12. The policy should be deleted and replaced with a more general policy relating to good design and referring to SPG.
O/4/5454/0621	Policy 31. Layout for flat conversions.	Stoke Damerel Conservation Society Mr Robin Midgley	Concerned about the demolition of boundary walls for car parking, which would have a negative impact on the appearance of the Stoke Damerel Conservation Area. An Article IV direction requiring express consent for hardstandings should be introduced and set out in criterion 8 of Policy 31.
S/4/6654/2369	Policy 31. Layout for flat conversions.	South West RSL Planning Consortium	Supported.
O/4/6903/3087	Policy 32. Houses in multiple occupation.	University of Plymouth Mr Mark Harvey	HIMO's are an important source of accommodation to students and permanent residents. The restriction on the change of use of properties with a floor area of less than 115sq. m. will restrict the living accommodation choices for residents in the city, including students. This requirement should be deleted, with each proposal considered on its merits in the context of the surrounding building character.
S/4/6815/2797	Policy 32. Houses in multiple occupation.	Mutley Community Association Ms Margaret Taylor	Support the policy, particularly criteria 2, 6, 7 and 9.
S/4/6654/2370	Policy 32. Houses in multiple occupation.	South West RSL Planning Consortium	Supported.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/4/6654/2371	Policy 33. Existing residential accommodation in the City Centre and district centres.	South West RSL Planning Consortium	The Council should encourage targeting of city centre properties for mixed uses
S/4/5454/0613	Policy 33. Existing residential accommodation in the City Centre and district centres.	Stoke Damerel Conservation Society Mr Robin Midgley	Retention of accommodation above shops is vital to safe and lively centres.
O/4/6916/3222	Policy 34. Affordable housing.	Associated British Ports	Excessive requirement affects viability of development. Will result in under provision of housing.
O/4/6832/2847	Policy 34. Affordable housing.	Barratt Homes Exeter Ltd	Contrary to circular 6/98. Proposals are excessively onerous. Affects the viability of development. The proposals promote social rented housing rather than all forms of tenure.
O/4/6224/1603	Policy 34. Affordable housing.	Bryant Developments	Requirement is excessive, and will inhibit development.
O/4/6854/2931	Policy 34. Affordable housing.	Edward Symmons and Partners Mr W Lean	Affects the viability of development. Will result in non achievement of housing requirement Idealistic, not realistic.
O/4/6907/3131	Policy 34. Affordable housing.	Environment Agency Mr Mike Robins	Social housing should be built to a higher standard than current building regulations.
O/4/6917/3331	Policy 34. Affordable housing.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Targets are very ambitious, and they could lead to an imbalance in social /economic characteristics in larger housing developments. The LPA should satisfy itself that its targets are realistic in terms of the economics of development. The presumption should be that affordable housing is provided on the site. Retaining land in perpetuity for future occupiers omits the point that housing is available to initial and future occupiers. Reasoned justification does not set out the findings of the HNS. Clear evidence is needed. It seems that RSLs are to provide low cost housing, which is not desirable.
O/4/6830/2823	Policy 34. Affordable housing.	Greenside Properties Ltd	Contrary to circular 6/98, proposals are excessively onerous. Affects the viability of development. The proposals promote social rented housing rather than all forms of tenure.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/4/6790/2684	Policy 34. Affordable housing.	House Builders Federation Ms Jo Hanslip	Proposals are excessively onerous. Affects the viability of development. Not substantiated by local need. Lack of robust housing need assessment in line with government best practice Contrary to circular 6/98. The targets are inflexible and allow little scope for negotiation. The definition of affordable housing is inaccurate and overly prescriptive. No regard has been taken of affordable housing supply within the plan period. The proposals promote social rented housing rather than all forms of tenure. Takes no account of the social, economic and market conditions of the site.
O/4/6789/2606	Policy 34. Affordable housing.	Land South West Chartered Surveyors Mr M J Holden	Requirement is excessive and will not make many developments viable. Will result in under provision of housing.
O/4/6925/3480	Policy 34. Affordable housing.	Lattice Property Holdings Ltd	Questions the validity of the basis of the HNS. Delivering 55% affordable housing will lead to unbalanced communities. The practice of accepting off site contributions would mean that some sites would deliver more than 100% affordable housing. It is questionable whether registered social landlords can deliver the amount of affordable housing proposed. It will make sites uneconomic to develop which will mean the housing targets will not be achieved.
O/4/6924/3449	Policy 34. Affordable housing.	McCarthy & Stone (Developments) Ltd	There is no justification given for the figures. Policy should set a size threshold in hectares. It is not made clear why there is a priority for social rented housing. HNS method does not comply with best practice guidance and is now out of date. There is no definition of 'highly accessible location'. Off site provision should only be applied where a particular site would normally qualify. All of the costs of provision, as set out in paragraphs 2, and 10 of 6/98, should be referred to. The imposition of perpetuity clauses will make access to private funding impossible. Provision should be made on qualifying sites in accordance with paras 2, &10 of Circular 6/98. Definition should refer to income levels and house prices. The plan should not specify who developers take as partners. All forms of tenure should be accepted. Price of purchasing HNS restricts fair consultation.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/4/6697/3104	Policy 34. Affordable housing.	Midas Homes Ltd Mr David Seaton	Too high a target, which is not in accordance with government guidance Not deliverable.
O/4/6605/2280	Policy 34. Affordable housing.	Mr & Mrs R Westlake	The definition of affordable housing is not in accordance with that in Circular 6/98.
O/4/6812/3375	Policy 34. Affordable housing.	Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners Dr Malcolm Hockaday	Does not take into account site characteristics and flexibility. Percentage of affordable units are too high, contrary to government policy. Would restrict development, and may prevent reaching the overall housing target.
O/4/6584/2168	Policy 34. Affordable housing.	Persimmon Homes South West Limited	Affordable housing requirement needs full justification itself, and on a site by site basis related to local need and infrastructure costs.
O/4/6584/2459	Policy 34. Affordable housing.	Persimmon Homes South West Limited Mr Richard Ayre	Requirement is excessive. Housing needs study is inadequate and out of date. Lack of public subsidy. Inadequate consideration of social issues. It will make many developments not economically viable.
O/4/6587/2193	Policy 34. Affordable housing.	Plymouth Roman Catholic Diocese Trust Registered	Object to the definition including Registered Social Landlords. It should not be specific on tenure. Requirement is excessive.
O/4/6831/2838	Policy 34. Affordable housing.	Prowting Projects Ltd	Contrary to circular 6/98. Proposals are excessively onerous. Affects viability of development. The proposals promote social rented housing rather than all forms of tenure.
O/4/6831/3462	Policy 34. Affordable housing.	Prowting Projects Ltd	Excessive requirement for affordable housing could prejudice development, particularly in the case of previously developed sites. Plan should not specify tenure, or the provider, which is contrary to Circular 6/98. Question if SPG is the right way to deal with this complex issue. The 6 criteria do not mention need, which is essential to demonstrate. It is not possible to retain affordable housing in perpetuity because of the right to buy etc. Criterion 6 of policy should reflect para 10 of Circular 6/98 Concerned about the methodology of the HNS, and the target figure is therefore questioned.
O/4/6926/3496	Policy 34. Affordable housing.	South Hams District Council Mr Alan Robinson	Target figures are too low, and should be in line with the HNS. This would assist in enabling a balanced community at Sherford in the South Hams.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/4/6927/3544	Policy 34. Affordable housing.	South West of England Regional Development Agency	High affordable housing target figures could affect the viability of regeneration schemes. The policy should allow for lower provision in regeneration and strategic opportunity areas where high figures would threaten viability.
O/4/6654/2372	Policy 34. Affordable housing.	South West RSL Planning Consortium	Should not rely on Housing Needs Survey (HNS), which is becoming dated; other sources of information should be used Relationship between affordable housing target and HNS is not clear; it should be a single figure and not a range. Universal target is not appropriate; it should reflect the individual sites. 38% social rented target will affect balanced communities. Too much flexibility; provision should be made on site. There are no definitions of affordable housing, social housing, or low cost market housing and no reference to Key workers. Has not considered lowering the threshold at which affordable housing should be required. It should be emphasised as a material planning consideration. Nothing to enable RSL to develop sites on their own or in partnership with developers. No specific reference to empty homes. No direct reference to the Housing Strategy Statement Cross-reference should be made to emerging SPG.
O/4/6205/1573	Policy 34. Affordable housing.	South West Water Ltd	Affordable housing requirement needs full justification itself, and on a site by site basis, related to local need and infrastructure costs.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/4/6842/3277	Policy 34. Affordable housing.	Sutton Harbour Community Mr Tim Bacon	<p>Should require a mix of house types.</p> <p>No definition of social rented accommodation, or how it will be provided.</p> <p>Question the housing Needs Study finding: that more private rented accommodation is needed in certain parts of the city.</p> <p>Question the assumptions between on or off site provision, which has been applied inconsistently.</p> <p>Heavy financial burden on developers.</p> <p>HNS should not make the assumption that private developers will not provide rented accommodation.</p> <p>What are the qualifications of HNS consultants?</p> <p>The assumptions of the policy should be fully explained and be freely available.</p> <p>It is not clear that the social rented accommodation reflects the growth in Plymouth's economy.</p> <p>What is the social rent level?</p> <p>Policy is unfair to the low waged. Social housing stigmatises residents.</p> <p>Affordable element is not clearly defined.</p> <p>Policy assumes that social renting is the only way to achieve affordable rents.</p> <p>Policy does not make any allowance for safety net of state benefits which are assessed on proper means testing.</p> <p>Fails to enable brown field development, by making it financially non viable.</p> <p>Policy will hamper regeneration.</p> <p>Policy does not reflect income and property prices.</p> <p>As HNS says there is above average private renting on the water front area there must be a shortfall of owner occupier accommodation. There is also a large supply of waterfront social housing.</p> <p>HNS survey sample was inadequate.</p> <p>HNS should not take blanket approach across the city.</p>
O/4/6903/3084	Policy 34. Affordable housing.	University of Plymouth Mr Mark Harvey	<p>Amount and type of affordable housing should be in agreement with developer.</p> <p>Affects viability of development.</p> <p>Will not create balanced communities.</p>
O/4/6595/2209	Policy 34. Affordable housing.	W.T. Jinkin Trust	Requirement is excessive.
O/4/6920/3444	Policy 34. Affordable housing.	Wainhomes (SW) Limited	<p>Percentages and tenures are inappropriate.</p> <p>The approach is contrary to PPG6.</p>
O/4/6920/3445	Policy 34. Affordable housing.	Wainhomes (SW) Limited	<p>Supporting text is contrary to PPG3.</p> <p>The plan should make reference to keeping the HNS up-to-date.</p>

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
S/4/6475/1953	Policy 34. Affordable housing.	Ms Val Woodward	Essential for dynamism and sustainability.
S/4/6905/3099	Policy 34. Affordable housing.	NHS Executive South West Mr Jonathan Hall	Broad support will assist key workers and recruitment.
O/4/6916/3223	Policy 35. Lifetime homes.	Associated British Ports	It should be subject of an SPG and not a matter of Policy.
O/4/6902/3071	Policy 35. Lifetime homes.	Cavanna Homes (Devon) Ltd Mr Michael Griffin	It should be subject of an SPG and based on negotiation as part of Development Control Process.
O/4/6917/3332	Policy 35. Lifetime homes.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Considers that there is no clear evidence on which the target is based; and in the absence of such evidence, the policy should be deleted.
O/4/6790/2609	Policy 35. Lifetime homes.	House Builders Federation Ms Jo Hanslip	The requirements relate to internal arrangements which are covered by building regulations, not planning. Contrary to PPG12. Unreasonable requirement in the absence of a justification based on need and demand. Objective 10 and Policy 35 address matters outside of planning and are not justified by HNS.
O/4/6584/2169	Policy 35. Lifetime homes.	Persimmon Homes South West Limited	Unreasonable requirement in the absence of a justification based on need and demand. Other than car parking, the requirements relate to internal arrangements which are covered by building regulations, and not planning.
O/4/6584/2458	Policy 35. Lifetime homes.	Persimmon Homes South West Limited Mr Richard Ayre	Unreasonable requirement in the absence of a justification based on need and demand. Other than car parking, the requirements relate to internal arrangements which are covered by building regulations, and not planning.
O/4/6831/3463	Policy 35. Lifetime homes.	Prowing Projects Ltd	Will affect the viability of development in light of other demands. Such properties have larger footprints and will lower density.
O/4/6205/1761	Policy 35. Lifetime homes.	South West Water Ltd	Other than car parking, the requirements relate to internal arrangements, which are covered by building regulations, and not planning.
O/4/6595/2210	Policy 35. Lifetime homes.	W.T. Jinkin Trust	Proportion of lifetime homes should reflect the site characteristics. The Trust provides elderly ladies with 21 rent free flats on adjacent sites, which should be taken into account.
S/4/6507/2904	Policy 35. Lifetime homes.	Plymouth Friends of the Earth Miss Sheila V Evans	It is more environmentally efficient to adapt buildings than to create demands for new ones
S/4/6926/3497	Policy 35. Lifetime homes.	South Hams District Council Mr Alan Robinson	Support principle.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
S/4/6654/2373	Policy 35. Lifetime homes.	South West RSL Planning Consortium	Support principle.
O/4/6775/2955	Policy 36. Student housing.	Greenbank Community Association Mrs Lynn Fearon	Further conversions to student housing in the residential area of Greenbank should be prohibited. This conflicts with the Drake Vision statement (appendix 4) which seeks to keep residential areas free from unacceptable levels of noise and disturbance.
O/4/6815/2798	Policy 36. Student housing.	Mutley Community Association Ms Margaret Taylor	The reasons for the Policy section of Policy 36 justifies the student housing target area by saying that there are already a lot of student houses so further conversions will have little impact on the character of the area. This is untrue – there is a mix of housing tenures in the area and existing residents have as much right to peace and a quiet and clean environment as anyone else in the city.
O/4/6946/1760	Policy 36. Student housing.	Mutley Greenbank Trust Ms Jane Gould	The high number of students in the area represented by the Mutley Greenbank Trust causes harm in respect to noise, litter, pollution and traffic issues. Many students have cars, particularly those that commute to Marjons. The policy will lead to a student Ghetto as seen elsewhere in the UK. Student lives aren't compatible with much of the population, particularly elderly people in longstanding sheltered homes. Criterion 1 of the policy says that development should not unacceptably harm amenity or character but the supporting text conflicts with this by stating that further conversions of properties would result in little change in the character of the area. Want clarification on the Council's aims for the area. Residents are unwilling to tolerate any further deterioration of their lives.
O/4/6841/2880	Policy 36. Student housing.	Unite Group	The Local Plan should clarify that housing sites developed for student accommodation will not be expected to provide additional contributions towards affordable homes.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/4/6903/3085	Policy 36. Student housing.	University of Plymouth Mr Mark Harvey	<p>What is the Universities accommodation Bureau? Do we mean the University's Student accommodation Service?</p> <p>Restricting the student 'target area' will restrict the University's ability to meet the needs of students and will lead to heavier concentrations of students in areas where discrete integration would be preferred.</p> <p>The criterion that relates to the safeguarding of dwellings below 115sq m in area is confusing and could lead to many larger student developments close to the University being unviable even though there would be a net gain in accommodation. The criterion for distances between student housing outside the target area is not sustainable and each proposal should be decided on its merits.</p> <p>The City Centre is outside the target area but schemes such as that at Pearl Assurance House are in line with goals of bringing accommodation in to the heart of the city – the policy should be changed to reflect this.</p> <p>Propose:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The student target area should be extended east to include more of Greenbank. It should also extend north to Ford Park Road and incorporate the established student area east of Mutley Plain. • Include city centre in the target area. • Remove 115sq. m housing restriction. • Clarify Student Accommodation provider name. • Remove provision limiting proximity of student residential developments outside the designated area.
S/4/6475/1952	Policy 36. Student housing.	Ms Val Woodward	<i>The University needs accommodation to encourage its expansion but this must not be detrimental to longer term residential living.</i>
O/4/6815/2799	Policy 37. Hostel and homes.	Mutley Community Association Ms Margaret Taylor	This gives the most concern to our members. The map highlights a concentration of such uses in the Houndiscombe Road, Gordon Terrace and Restormel Road area. It is not clear whether you are saying permission would be granted in the designated area as it would alter the character of the area or whether you are saying there is already too large a concentration in that area. This is of concern given that the Priory Trust and others are trying to accommodate clients from other parts of the country here. Hostel type accommodation should be spread evenly across the city.
O/4/6587/2192	Policy 37. Hostel and homes.	Plymouth Roman Catholic Diocese Trust Registered	Policy 37 should be deleted and the notation of the proposals map deleted. The policy is unduly prescriptive, applications should be judged on their individual merits.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/4/6654/2374	Policy 37. Hostel and homes.	South West RSL Planning Consortium	The policy needs to encompass a wider area given the thrust of PPG 13 (paragraphs 1, 2 and 13). Should include reference to enabling the provision of the wide range of special needs accommodation – the Plan should be integrated with the Council's Community Care Plan. Need to clarify the interface between affordable and special needs/supported housing. Often the latter is only affordable to those at the higher end of the market.
S/4/6220/1598	Policy 37. Hostel and homes.	Mrs Jill Gubbins	Protection of area of Plympton St Maurice against further institutional establishments seems more than timely.
O/4/6437/2074	Policy 38. Walking and cycling.	CTC Mr Colin Woodman	Walking and cycling should not be grouped together, as the modes conflict.
O/4/6897/3017	Policy 38. Walking and cycling.	English Nature Mr Matt Low	Further point required preventing harm to ecological or geological interests.
O/4/6917/3333	Policy 38. Walking and cycling.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Considers the policy to be too elaborate, and should be simplified. The existing and proposed footpaths and cycle routes to be protected should be marked on the Proposals Map.
O/4/6490/2075	Policy 38. Walking and cycling.	Mr C M L Bowler	PROWs need to be recorded and mapped. Gaps in cycle network need to be plugged specially at hazardous parts eg northbound at the Manadon flyover.
O/4/5154/0215	Policy 38. Walking and cycling.	Mr Graham McAlpine	Supports but cycle ways should be separate designated routes – not just parts of the road.
O/4/6692/2443	Policy 38. Walking and cycling.	Plymouth Public Rights OF Way Forum	Creation of the Definitive Map (DM) should form part of the policy. PROWs should be legally recorded on the DM. Horse riders interests need to be addressed.
O/4/5454/0622	Policy 38. Walking and cycling.	Stoke Damerel Conservation Society Mr Robin Midgley	Also refer to annex 2 map 1. Need for a new route from Central Park to Mt Wise via Stoke and Devonport.
S/4/6224/1617	Policy 38. Walking and cycling.	Bryant Developments	Supports. Need for early completion of the gap between Derriford and Woolwell.
S/4/6475/2058	Policy 38. Walking and cycling.	Ms Val Woodward	Too much car use but walking and cycling not suitable for all groups.
S/4/6908/3185	Policy 38. Walking and cycling.	Plymouth & South West Co-operative	Supports especially in relation to the Co-operative Way. The integrity of existing and proposed footpaths should be retained.
S/4/6507/2905	Policy 38. Walking and cycling.	Plymouth Friends of the Earth Miss Sheila V Evans	Supports.
S/4/6601/2228	Policy 38. Walking and cycling.	Transport 2000 Cornwall/Plymouth & District Group Mr Don Allen	Supports.
O/4/6917/3334	Policy 39. Buses and new development.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Should be merged with policy 38.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/4/6906/3112	Policy 39. Buses and new development.	Morley Fund Management	Facilities required should relate to scale of development.
O/4/6507/2906	Policy 39. Buses and new development.	Plymouth Friends of the Earth Miss Sheila V Evans	Support but wish to see 1.5% annual growth met and exceeded. Journey times improved, increased frequency especially in evenings and on Sundays.
O/4/6199/1554	Policy 39. Buses and new development.	Sainsbury's Supermarket Ltd	Policy needs to be re-worded as services may be provided by other parties and might not be possible for the developers to provide the facilities.
O/4/6586/2181	Policy 39. Buses and new development.	W.M. Morrison Supermarkets Plc	Too restrictive.
S/4/6224/1618	Policy 39. Buses and new development.	Bryant Developments	Support.
S/4/6601/2229	Policy 39. Buses and new development.	Transport 2000 Cornwall/Plymouth & District Group Mr Don Allen	Supportive.
O/4/6917/3335	Policy 40. Operational railway land.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Should be merged with 41 and reworded in the negative.
S/4/6507/2907	Policy 40. Operational railway land.	Plymouth Friends of the Earth Miss Sheila V Evans	Supportive.
S/4/6599/2219	Policy 40. Operational railway land.	Railtrack	Support, provided that Railtrack are consulted on proposals affecting railway land.
S/4/6601/2230	Policy 40. Operational railway land.	Transport 2000 Cornwall?Plymouth & District Group Mr Don Allen	Supportive.
O/4/6897/3018	Policy 41. Former railway land.	English Nature Mr Matt Low	Need to strengthen the protection of nature conservation interests.
O/4/6917/3336	Policy 41. Former railway land.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Merge with 40 and simplify.
O/4/6855/2932	Policy 41. Former railway land.	Railfuture South West Mr Peter D Mulley	Seems to preclude re-use for rail passenger traffic.
S/4/6507/2908	Policy 41. Former railway land.	Plymouth Friends of the Earth Miss Sheila V Evans	Supportive.
S/4/6599/2218	Policy 41. Former railway land.	Railtrack	Support provided that rail interests are consulted on proposals affecting railway land.
S/4/6601/2231	Policy 41. Former railway land.	Transport 2000 Cornwall/Plymouth & District Group Mr Don Allen	Support.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/4/6897/3019	Policy 42. New water transport facilities.	English Nature Mr Matt Low	Refer to their comments on policy 70 on what 'unacceptable harm' means especially on protected areas with European designations.
S/4/6601/2232	Policy 42. New water transport facilities.	Transport 2000 Cornwall/Plymouth & District Group Mr Don Allen	Supportive.
O/4/6907/3133	Policy 44. Car, cycle and lorry parking standards and requirements.	Environment Agency Mr Mike Robins	Need an additional criterion: development shall not pollute the water environment or increase flood risk.
O/4/6917/3338	Policy 44. Car, cycle and lorry parking standards and requirements.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	The appendix should be in the policy as a schedule.
O/4/6583/2167	Policy 44. Car, cycle and lorry parking standards and requirements.	Mr A Prisk	Plymouth is a sub-regional capital in a region with inadequate public transport. It does not have an integrated PT system.
O/4/6908/3180	Policy 44. Car, cycle and lorry parking standards and requirements.	Plymouth & South West Co-operative	Developments that reduce off street parking should not harm the vitality and viability of shopping centres.
O/4/6654/2376	Policy 44. Car, cycle and lorry parking standards and requirements.	South West RSL Planning Consortium	Standards should be more flexible for social housing.
O/4/6586/2184	Policy 44. Car, cycle and lorry parking standards and requirements.	W.M. Morrison Supermarkets Plc	Object to the cycle parking standard in App 10 as the alternative standard is onerous and excessive.
S/4/6601/2234	Policy 44. Car, cycle and lorry parking standards and requirements.	Transport 2000 Cornwall/Plymouth & District Group Mr Don Allen	Support.
O/4/6907/3134	Policy 45. Development on off-street parking areas.	Environment Agency Mr Mike Robins	Need an additional criterion: development shall not pollute the water environment or increase flood risk.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/4/6917/3339	Policy 45. Development on off-street parking areas.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Delete policy.
O/4/6908/3181	Policy 45. Development on off-street parking areas.	Plymouth & South West Co-operative	Include a criterion that development does not harm the vitality or viability of shopping centres.
S/4/6601/2236	Policy 45. Development on off-street parking areas.	Transport 2000 Cornwall/Plymouth & District Group Mr Don Allen	Support.
O/4/6907/3135	Policy 46. Lorry and coach parking.	Environment Agency Mr Mike Robins	Need an additional criterion: development shall not pollute the water environment or increase flood risk.
S/4/6507/2909	Policy 46. Lorry and coach parking.	Plymouth Friends of the Earth Miss Sheila V Evans	Support.
S/4/6601/2235	Policy 46. Lorry and coach parking.	Transport 2000 Cornwall/Plymouth & District Group Mr Don Allen	Support.
O/4/6917/3340	Policy 47. Transport assessments and travel plans.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Should state the specific measures required in travel plans. All proposals requiring travel plans should cite the measures required.
O/4/6904/3096	Policy 47. Transport assessments and travel plans.	Highways Agency Mr David Whitton	Highway authorities need to be consulted as does the HA where development affects trunk roads.
O/4/6906/3113	Policy 47. Transport assessments and travel plans.	Morley Fund Management	Where development is for redevelopment or reconfiguration of existing floorspace, existing floorspace must be taken into account. Only a material increase in floorspace or traffic will require a TA or TP.
O/4/6903/3086	Policy 47. Transport assessments and travel plans.	University of Plymouth Mr Mark Harvey	Developers contributions to transport improvements should be related to the degree with which the development meets strategic objectives.
S/4/6507/2910	Policy 47. Transport assessments and travel plans.	Plymouth Friends of the Earth Miss Sheila V Evans	Supportive.
S/4/6601/2237	Policy 47. Transport assessments and travel plans.	Transport 2000 Cornwall/Plymouth & District Group Mr Don Allen	Support.
O/4/6917/3341	Policy 48. Highway capacity and safety.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Policy should be worded in the negative.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/4/6833/3398	Policy 48. Highway capacity and safety.	Mr J C Emery	Failure to upgrade the highway network is irresponsible. Provision of such basic infrastructure is the responsibility of the HA, not developers.
O/4/6586/2180	Policy 48. Highway capacity and safety.	W.M. Morrison Supermarkets Plc	Point 3 on trees hedges etc is too restrictive.
S/4/6897/3020	Policy 48. Highway capacity and safety.	English Nature Mr Matt Low	Support.
S/4/6507/2911	Policy 48. Highway capacity and safety.	Plymouth Friends of the Earth Miss Sheila V Evans	Support.
S/4/6601/2238	Policy 48. Highway capacity and safety.	Transport 2000 Cornwall/Plymouth & District Group Mr Don Allen	Support.
O/4/6437/2073	Policy 49. Light Rapid Transit system.	CTC Mr Colin Woodman	Insufficient consideration on the likely adverse impacts on non-car travel modes.
O/4/6907/3136	Policy 49. Light Rapid Transit system.	Environment Agency Mr Mike Robins	Need for another criterion on impact on groundwater – possible need for a hydrogeological assessment, impact statement and mitigation measures.
O/4/6917/3342	Policy 49. Light Rapid Transit system.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Should be deleted.
O/4/6855/2933	Policy 49. Light Rapid Transit system.	Railfuture South West Mr Peter D Mulley	The policy's terminology could include guided bus ways or mono rails preventing use for occasional freight purposes.
O/4/6599/2217	Policy 49. Light Rapid Transit system.	Railtrack	Policy should be changed so that when LRT uses railway lines / land the railway interests aren't prejudiced.
S/4/6507/2912	Policy 49. Light Rapid Transit system.	Plymouth Friends of the Earth Miss Sheila V Evans	Support.
S/4/6927/3545	Policy 49. Light Rapid Transit system.	South West of England Regional Development Agency	Support – there needs to be a statement that development that would prejudice implementation of the LRT will not be permitted.
S/4/6601/2239	Policy 49. Light Rapid Transit system.	Transport 2000 Cornwall/Plymouth & District Group Mr Don Allen	Support.
O/4/6917/3343	Policy 50 Airport Public Safety Zones	Government Office for the South West	Policy places burden of proof on development, contrary to principle in PPG1 para 40. Could be reworded as follows: 'development within . . . will not be permitted where there is an unacceptable danger'.
S/4/6251/1659	Policy 50	Anna Bloomfield (Ms), General Aviation Awareness Council	Supported provided that both Airport Public Safety Zones protect both aeroplanes ie prohibit obstacles that might present a danger to aeroplanes; and people on ground. Both needs must be met. Should consider advise of Circular 2/92 para 5.3

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/4/6902/3070	Policy 51. Neighbourhood services.	Cavanna Homes (Devon) Ltd Mr Michael Griffin	The policy should be deleted in accordance with PPG12 guidance. It is more appropriate to deal with the issue as part of the development control process and include it as a condition or part of a Section 106 agreement.
O/4/6917/3344	Policy 51. Neighbourhood services.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	This policy fails to provide a clear basis for decision making as it does not identify clearly what is meant by neighbourhood facilities and who is responsible for assessing whether there is a deficiency. Referral to appendix 8 should be in upper case policy (as Appendix 9). The policy appears likely to have implications for planning obligations and appears to conflict with guidance in Circ 1/97B#2 that obligations should be sought in relation to provision necessary to allow the development to go ahead.
O/4/6831/3465	Policy 51. Neighbourhood services.	Prowting Projects Ltd	Neighbourhood services should be clarified to indicate what comes within the definition - for the avoidance doubt. There is ambiguity regarding how the first two tables in appendix 9 will be applied when considering planning applications. The tables should be used as target distance criteria.
O/4/6917/3345	Policy 52. Provision of community facilities.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Criterion 3 is unnecessary – clarity could be improved by including reference to character of a residential area within criterion 4.
O/4/5453/0604	Policy 52. Provision of community facilities.	Penlee Vale Residents Association Brigadier P C Bowser	Community facilities in residential areas are unwelcome as they often attract anti-social behaviour in the evenings. This is a particular problem where elderly people are housed.
O/4/6900/3056	Policy 52. Provision of community facilities.	Sport England South West Region Mr Gary Parsons	The importance of community buildings for indoor sports should be rightly acknowledged. They should be flexible in design to accommodate a number of indoor sports e.g. high ceilings for badminton and volleyball etc – amend the policy and supporting text accordingly.
O/4/6917/3346	Policy 53. Protection of community facilities.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	PPG1#40 refers to the general principle that account should be taken of whether development would cause demonstrable harm to interests of acknowledged importance. Suggest rewording: 'Development which results in the loss of an existing community facility will not be permitted where it would harm the level of community services and facilities locally'.
S/4/6691/2441	Policy 53. Protection of community facilities.	Diocese of Exeter	The policy appropriately addresses a situation met by the Diocese when, for reasons given in the listed criteria, a church building becomes redundant.
S/4/6905/3098	Policy 53. Protection of community facilities.	NHS Executive South West Mr Jonathan Hall	Support inclusion of 'health' within the list of new infrastructure that will be required as a result of new development.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/4/6917/3347	Policy 54. Dual use of educational facilities.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	PPG1#40 refers to the general principle that account should be taken of whether development would cause demonstrable harm to interests of acknowledged importance. Suggest rewording: 'Proposals for new educational facilities and development at existing educational facilities will not be permitted where: 1. it will harm the amenities of neighbouring properties; and 2. it is incompatible with the site's primary educational function.'
O/4/6917/3347	Policy 54. Dual use of educational facilities.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Ppg1#40 refers to the general principle that account should be taken of whether development would cause demonstrable harm to interests of acknowledged importance. Suggest rewording: 'Proposals for new educational facilities and development at existing educational facilities will not be permitted where: 3. it will harm the amenities of neighbouring properties; and 4. it is incompatible with the site's primary educational function.'
O/4/6838/2877	Policy 54. Dual use of educational facilities.	Mr Brian Cheal	If the Local Authority decides what acceptable community uses are as well as undertaking statutory noise and nuisance enforcement, this has the potential to create considerable conflict. There is no mention of problems that may occur after planning permission has been granted. Noise from educational facilities is not covered in any current Planning Policy Guidance. The Council should subscribe to a protocol that covers such issues as: clear definition of what constitutes 'community use'; acceptable hours of usage; a speedy complaints procedure; the setting up of a liaison committee for each educational facility where community use is approved; independent arbitration in the case of continuing disagreement; unequivocal subscription to recognised levels of noise nuisance that apply to noise-sensitive residential areas (as contained in PPG24).
O/4/6838/2877	Policy 54. Dual use of educational facilities.	Mr Brian Cheal	If the Local Authority decides what acceptable community uses are as well as undertaking statutory noise and nuisance enforcement, this has the potential to create considerable conflict. There is no mention of problems that may occur after planning permission has been granted. Noise from educational facilities is not covered in any current Planning Policy Guidance. The Council should subscribe to a protocol that covers such issues as: clear definition of what constitutes 'community use'; acceptable hours of usage; a speedy complaints procedure; the setting up of a liaison committee for each educational facility where community use is approved; independent arbitration in the case of continuing disagreement; unequivocal subscription to recognised levels of noise nuisance that apply to noise-sensitive residential areas (as contained in PPG24).

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/4/6849/2900	Policy 54. Dual use of educational facilities.	Mrs Christine Cheal	If the Local Authority decides what acceptable community uses are as well as undertaking statutory noise and nuisance enforcement, this has the potential to create considerable conflict. There is no mention of problems that may occur after planning permission has been granted. Noise from educational facilities is not covered in any current Planning Policy Guidance. The Council should subscribe to a protocol that covers such issues as: clear definition of what constitutes 'community use'; acceptable hours of usage; a speedy complaints procedure; the setting up of a liaison committee for each educational facility where community use is approved; independent arbitration in the case of continuing disagreement; unequivocal subscription to recognised levels of noise nuisance that apply to noise-sensitive residential as (as contained in PPG24).
O/4/6849/2900	Policy 54. Dual use of educational facilities.	Mrs Christine Cheal	If the Local Authority decides what acceptable community uses are as well as undertaking statutory noise and nuisance enforcement, this has the potential to create considerable conflict. There is no mention of problems that may occur after planning permission has been granted. Noise from educational facilities is not covered in any current Planning Policy Guidance. The Council should subscribe to a protocol that covers such issues as: clear definition of what constitutes 'community use'; acceptable hours of usage; a speedy complaints procedure; the setting up of a liaison committee for each educational facility where community use is approved; independent arbitration in the case of continuing disagreement; unequivocal subscription to recognised levels of noise nuisance that apply to noise-sensitive residential as (as contained in PPG24).
O/4/5453/0605	Policy 54. Dual use of educational facilities.	Penlee Vale Residents Association Brigadier P C Bowser	Dual use of facilities could attract anti-social behaviour and should not be allowed adjacent to residential areas, particularly where the elderly are housed.
S/4/6849/2898	Policy 54. Dual use of educational facilities.	Mrs Christine Cheal	The broad principle of extending the use of educational establishments to cover community use is supported. See also objection.
S/4/6849/2898	Policy 54. Dual use of educational facilities.	Mrs Christine Cheal	The broad principle of extending the use of educational establishments to cover community use is supported. See also objection.
S/4/6831/3466	Policy 54. Dual use of educational facilities.	Prowting Projects Ltd	Dual use will allow a more efficient use of land, dual use of facilities is particularly important in the redevelopment of sites such as Plymstock Quarry where physical constraints on development may mean that greater flexibility is needed in the planning of land uses, particularly those that are "land hungry".
S/4/6900/3057	Policy 54. Dual use of educational facilities.	Sport England South West Region Mr Gary Parsons	Support.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/4/6917/3348	Policy 56. Health care facilities.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Criterion 4 refers to conflict with policy 16. GOSW identifies the need to ensure that Policy 16 does not conflict with national planning policy guidance, regarding the designation of shopping frontages.
S/4/6905/3097	Policy 56. Health care facilities.	NHS Executive South West Mr Jonathan Hall	Support a specific policy for the provision of healthcare facilities.
O/4/6917/3349	Policy 57. Childcare facilities.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Childcare facilities could encourage travel by car contrary to objectives in PPG13. Suggest rewording Criterion 1 as Criterion 2 in Policy 56 which refers to people travelling by public transport.
O/4/6200/1556	Policy 58. Commercial leisure and strategically important arts facilities.	Legal & General Investment Management Property	Should pay regard to PPG6 advice and clarification from Central Government which states that local authorities should have regard to the need for additional floorspace, and adopt a sequential approach to development. Without researching this area the Council can not make informed decisions. It does not have a robust policy framework. A study should be undertaken to assess the need for new commercial leisure facilities and support for such facilities deleted till this is done. Suggest the following policy: Planning permission for commercial leisure development will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that: 1. there is proven need for additional facilities; and 2. a sequential approach has been applied in selecting the location or the site..
O/4/6570/2136	Policy 58. Commercial leisure and strategically important arts facilities.	Warner Village Cinemas	The policy should be re-drafted. It does not appear to suggest that a demonstration of need would be required, and that selection of sites should follow the sequential approach required by PPG6. If a needs assessment has been carried out as part of the local plan process, any further applications would need to demonstrate need in the first instance. Thereafter, the policy should reflect the requirement of PPG6 to follow a sequential approach in terms of site selection.
O/4/6917/3350	Policy 59. Protection of strategically important arts facilities.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Need to take account of any demonstrable harm. Suggest rewording: 'Proposals that will result in the loss of an existing arts facility will not be permitted where it would harm the level of arts facilities in the area.'
O/4/6917/3351	Policy 60. Children's play space.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Policy likely to have implications for planning obligations. Conflicts with Circ 1/97B#2 – obligations should be sought in relation to provision necessary to allow the development to go ahead.
O/4/6790/2689	Policy 60. Children's play space.	House Builders Federation Ms Jo Hanslip	Object to the arbitrary alteration to accepted standards of open space provision, contained within the NPFA standards – 2.4 ha per 1000 persons. The plan also has no regard to the surplus of open space already within an area – which in accordance with Circular 1/97 – would not require additional provision to be provided.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/4/6831/3379	Policy 60. Children's play space.	Prowting Projects Ltd Mr Norman Kwan	Object to accepting NPFA standards. The policy should be revised to take into account local circumstances and be resolved through negotiation.
O/4/6917/3352	Policy 61. Playing fields.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Inadequate assessment of need. Policy title should relate to the 'protection of playing fields'. Unnecessarily elaborate. Should be re-worded to reflect advice in PPG17#4.2.
O/4/6790/2690	Policy 61. Playing fields.	House Builders Federation Ms Jo Hanslip	Object to the arbitrary alteration to accepted standards of open space provision, contained within the NPFA standards – 2.4 ha per 1000 persons. The plan also has no regard to the surplus of open space already within an area – which in accordance with Circular 1/97 – would not require additional provision to be provided.
O/4/6812/2790	Policy 61. Playing fields.	Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners	Should not make reference to the impact on Greenscape areas. This is a difference matter and should not be mixed with the issues of sports use.
O/4/6831/3380	Policy 61. Playing fields.	Prowting Projects Ltd Mr Norman Kwan	Object to accepting NPFA standards. The policy should be revised to take into account local circumstances and be resolved through negotiation.
O/4/6900/3058	Policy 61. Playing fields.	Sport England South West Region Mr Gary Parsons	Object to criterion 1. Should only consider development of a <i>small</i> part of a site to enable the retention and enhancement of sport and recreational facilities. There should be a cross reference to policy 25.
O/4/6917/3353	Policy 62. New playing fields.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Need to refer to NPFA standards to add focus. Need audit of existing provision. Contributions should be sought rather than required. Need to ensure it doesn't conflict with Circ1/97.
O/4/6790/2691	Policy 62. New playing fields.	House Builders Federation Ms Jo Hanslip	Object to the arbitrary alteration to NPFA standards. Have no regard to surplus space (Circ1/97) which would not require additional provision.
O/4/6831/3381	Policy 62. New playing fields.	Prowting Projects Ltd Mr Norman Kwan	Object to accepting NPFA standards. The policy should be revised to take into account local circumstances and be resolved through negotiation.
O/4/6900/3059	Policy 62. New playing fields.	Sport England South West Region Mr Gary Parsons	Should seek contributions for outdoor and indoor sports provision from all housing except exception housing. Provision should be off-site if not practical on-site. An SPG and annual costings of sport and recreation facilities and code of practice would have to be produced. Also need a sports and recreation needs assessment as a foundation.
O/4/6917/3354	Policy 63. Protection of indoor or outdoor sports facilities.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Policy and criteria over elaborate. Should be reworded to reflect PPG17#4.2.
O/4/6790/2692	Policy 63. Protection of indoor or outdoor sports facilities.	House Builders Federation Ms Jo Hanslip	Object to the arbitrary alteration to NPFA standards. Have no regard to surplus space (Circ1/97) which would not require additional provision.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/4/6812/2791	Policy 63. Protection of indoor or outdoor sports facilities.	Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners	Should not make reference to the separate greenscape policy. Should also delete reference to outdoor sports facilities.
O/4/6831/3382	Policy 63. Protection of indoor or outdoor sports facilities.	Prowting Projects Ltd Mr Norman Kwan	Object to accepting NPFA standards. The policy should be revised to take into account local circumstances and be resolved through negotiation.
S/4/6900/3060	Policy 63. Protection of indoor or outdoor sports facilities.	Sport England South West Region Mr Gary Parsons	Supportive.
O/4/6917/3355	Policy 64. New sports facilities.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	The policy should take into account proximity to public transport (PPG17#31).
O/4/6790/2693	Policy 64. New sports facilities.	House Builders Federation Ms Jo Hanslip	Object to the arbitrary alteration to NPFA standards. Have no regard to surplus space (Circ1/97) which would not require additional provision.
O/4/6831/3383	Policy 64. New sports facilities.	Prowting Projects Ltd Mr Norman Kwan	Object to accepting NPFA standards. The policy should be revised to take into account local circumstances and be resolved through negotiation.
S/4/6900/3061	Policy 64. New sports facilities.	Sport England South West Region Mr Gary Parsons	Supportive.
O/4/6897/3021	Policy 65. New marinas.	English Nature Mr Matt Low	Should refer readers to policy 70 which gives a more detailed understanding of unacceptable harm to the environment. The very strict nature of safeguarding both national and European sites should be made clear either by reference to the relevant policies or spelt out within the policy.
O/4/6907/3137	Policy 65. New marinas.	Environment Agency Mr Mike Robins	Reasons should make reference to policy 70. Policy should be more pro-active in encouraging re-use of MoD sites for marina development to reduce demand on intertidal and foreshore areas. No consideration is given to policies developing and improving the waste (solid and liquid) handling facilities of yachts and pleasure craft.
O/4/6838/2873	Policy 65. New marinas.	Mr Brian Cheal	Considers the policy should state clearly that Hooe Lake is not a suitable area for marine development.
O/4/5567/0753	Policy 65. New marinas.	Radford and Hooe Lake Presevation Association Ms Barbara Mickley	Considers Hooe Lake should be exempt from this policy. The Hooe Lake Planning Study makes reference to the undesirability of a marina or floating pontoons (5.23) here.
S/4/6866/2968	Policy 65. New marinas.	Maritime Plymouth Captain A G Dyer	Support.
S/4/6900/3063	Policy 65. New marinas.	Sport England South West Region Mr Gary Parsons	Supportive.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/4/6907/3138	Policy 66. Waterfront development.	Environment Agency Mr Mike Robins	Policy is inadequate in that it does not include reference to policy 70 among its reasons.
S/4/6866/2967	Policy 66. Waterfront development.	Maritime Plymouth Captain A G Dyer	Supportive of policy but suggests that it should be accompanied by the same restrictions as policy 65 in order to prevent water space becoming choked, as was the case with Chichester, Hamble, Lymington and the Solent.
S/4/6791/2703	Policy 66. Waterfront development.	Plymouth East End Renewal Partnership Mr Phil Mitchell	Supports policy – public access to waterfront is very important. Coxside slipway for example.
O/4/6917/3356	Policy 67. Access for people with mobility problems and sensory impairment.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Criterion 1 unnecessary. Delete last sentence.
O/4/6918/3420	Policy 67. Access for people with mobility problems and sensory impairment.	Lee Mill Partnership	Unnecessary, as this is covered by the building regulations.
O/4/6898/3028	Policy 69. Development in Greenscape Areas	Devon Wildlife Trust Ms Alison Slade	Disappointed that the policy is reactive. Wildlife management plans should be required from all developments in greenscape areas. Proposals to extend Local Nature Reserves have not been included. Greenscape sites of substantive nature conservation interest should be shown on the proposals map. The definition of “unacceptable” loss of wildlife interests should be clearer. The policy suggests that loss of wildlife interests may be permitted if they are replaced, which is not always possible.
O/4/6897/3022	Policy 69. Development in Greenscape Areas	English Nature Mr Matt Low	Object to the grouping of issues into one policy designation. Objects to lack of clarity of definition of statutorily and non-statutorily designated sites. Designation causes confusion between a variety of issues.
O/4/6907/3139	Policy 69. Development in Greenscape Areas	Environment Agency Mr Mike Robins	There should be an explicit reference to Policy 70 (European and national nature conservation sites) in the reason for this policy. Criterion 8 should be amended to avoid loss of all agricultural land, as the lowest value agricultural land is often the highest value natural habitat.
O/4/6917/3357	Policy 69. Development in Greenscape Areas	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Criterion 8 should be amended to allow for greater flexibility in relation to farm diversification. A form of words is suggested.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/4/6697/3105	Policy 69. Development in Greenscape Areas	Midas Homes Ltd Mr David Seaton	The policy is non-specific and fails to give clear guidance as to what may, or may not, be considered important to retain. Areas that are to be protected from development should be clearly identified.
O/4/6605/2281	Policy 69. Development in Greenscape Areas	Mr & Mrs R Westlake	The policy as drafted is unduly onerous. The policy should be amended to reflect opportunities for development on greenscape sites.
O/4/6800/2731	Policy 69. Development in Greenscape Areas	Mr A J S Burnett	Policy should be supported by a Biodiversity Action Plan. Wildlife surveys should be published and it should be demonstrated how wildlife and the environment will be protected by developments.
O/4/6557/2100	Policy 69. Development in Greenscape Areas	Mr Andrew Philip Dart	The criteria used to determine whether a loss of greenscape is unacceptable should include a reference the proportions of a greenscape designation that will be lost and retained and their relative values. A new criterion is suggested to address this.
O/4/5915/1222	Policy 69. Development in Greenscape Areas	Mr P C Roseveare	Sites allocated with this designation should not be treated equally when implementing this policy. The site at Dunstone Wood (No. 375) should not be developed and its historical importance has not been properly recognised. Footpaths and hedgerows leading to sites 374 and 375 should be included in the greenscape area.
O/4/5211/0291	Policy 69. Development in Greenscape Areas	Mrs Cobbald	The level of significance of the open space functions, particularly nature conservation, attributed to the greenscape site at the Southway valley (site no. 074) are too low and should be increased. Other representations supporting and objecting to greenscape designation 074 were reported to the relevant Area Committee.
O/4/5060/0080	Policy 69. Development in Greenscape Areas	Ms Anne Hawkins	Developments have been permitted that do not meet the criteria set out in the policy.
O/4/6812/2792	Policy 69. Development in Greenscape Areas	Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners	The policy designation attributes too great an importance to green spaces covered by it. Policy interpretation is too difficult. The policy is contrary to PPG7. The purpose of each greenscape site designation should be made clear. Partial development of a green space could secure greater public benefit. The policy should be deleted in its entirety.
O/4/6587/2191	Policy 69. Development in Greenscape Areas	Plymouth Roman Catholic Diocese Trust Registered	The criteria are unduly onerous and fails to recognise development opportunities on under-used land. A more flexible approach towards development on greenscape areas should be adopted.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/4/5454/0623	Policy 69. Development in Greenscape Areas	Stoke Damerel Conservation Society Mr Robin Midgley	The decision making criteria within the policy that relate to the determination of whether or not a loss of greenscape is unacceptable are potentially harmful to the quality of conservation areas. The criteria in b. and c. should be amended to make greenescapes in conservation areas exceptions to these criteria.
O/4/6909/3187	Policy 69. Development in Greenscape Areas	The Countryside Agency Ms Alison Rood	The policy should refer to the South Devon Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the future adoption of a management plan for it.
O/4/6910/3195	Policy 69. Development in Greenscape Areas	Trustees of the Cann Estate	Whilst the need for such a policy is recognised it is unduly restrictive in two ways. Some of the individual site designations cover large areas of land and the importance of functions varies across the site. The designation washes over all areas not allocated for other use or development and therefore restricts the role that some area or sites can contribute towards meeting the demand for housing. The policy designation does not recognise the need to consider urban extensions in preference to new communities. This blanket designation does not facilitate negotiation of improved access to land currently in private ownership, through development. The policy should be amended to reflect these concerns.
S/4/6918/3421	Policy 69. Development in Greenscape Areas	Lee Mill Partnership	Supports the identification of Greenscape areas, particularly areas that have strategic importance.
S/4/6838/2896	Policy 69. Development in Greenscape Areas	Mr Brian Cheal	Principle of the policy is supported.
S/4/5211/0290	Policy 69. Development in Greenscape Areas	Mrs Cobbald	Green open spaces are very important and do need to be protected from development. Does the 'greenscape' designation offer enough protection?
S/4/6849/2899	Policy 69. Development in Greenscape Areas	Mrs Christine Cheal	Principle of the policy is supported.
S/4/6220/1599	Policy 69. Development in Greenscape Areas	Mrs Jill Gubbins	Welcomes maintenance of greenscape areas, particularly in and around Plympton St.Maurice, as they help maintain the setting and character of the conservation area and blends the urban edges into the surrounding countryside. The policy also reinforces the need to make better use of brown field and in-fill sites before sprawling out. Particularly welcome the greenscape designation at Plympton Convent.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
<i>S/4/6791/2700</i>	<i>Policy 69. Development in Greenscape Areas</i>	<i>Plymouth East End Renewal Partnership Mr Phil Mitchell</i>	<i>Wholeheartedly supports the policy and the open space functions that the policy seeks to protect from unacceptable development.</i>
<i>S/4/6485/1965</i>	<i>Policy 69. Development in Greenscape Areas</i>	<i>Plympton Pathfields Preservation Group Mr K Owen</i>	<i>The policy will help to protect and conserve our important historic and landscape areas.</i>
<i>S/4/5340/0449</i>	<i>Policy 69. Development in Greenscape Areas</i>	<i>Tamerton Foliot Village Conservation Society Mrs B Bebbington</i>	<i>The concept of greenscape areas are welcomed and the policy supported.</i>
O/4/6898/3030	Policy 70. European and National nature conservation sites.	Devon Wildlife Trust Ms Alison Slade	This policy seeks to cover too many statutory designations. There should be two policies one for European sites and one for national sites. The existing policy can satisfactorily address European sites. A new policy is suggested for nationally important nature conservation sites. These different levels of sites need to be shown differently on the proposals map. Two nationally important sites are not shown on the proposals map.
O/4/6897/3023	Policy 70. European and National nature conservation sites.	English Nature Mr Matt Low	This policy seeks to cover too many statutory designations. There should be two policies one for European sites and one for national sites. The existing policy can satisfactorily address European sites. A new policy is suggested for nationally important nature conservation sites. These different levels of sites need to be shown differently on the proposals map. Two nationally important sites are not shown on the proposals map.
O/4/6907/3119	Policy 70. European and National nature conservation sites.	Environment Agency Mr Mike Robins	Support the policy, but criterion 2 suggests that there may always be a way of getting around restrictions – this is not the case as certain proposals will never be acceptable.
O/4/6907/3140	Policy 70. European and National nature conservation sites.	Environment Agency Mr Mike Robins	The Council should consider preparing Supplementary Planning Guidance to support development assessment within or adjacent to European nature conservation sites. The local plan should make reference to the Plymouth Sound and Estuaries single Scheme of Management Plan.
O/4/6917/3358	Policy 70. European and National nature conservation sites.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	The policy should be split into two separate policies, one dealing with European sites and one with national sites. The policy statements can also be made shorter.
<i>S/4/5340/0450</i>	<i>Policy 70. European and National nature conservation sites.</i>	<i>Tamerton Foliot Village Conservation Society Mrs B Bebbington</i>	<i>Supports the policy, with particular reference to Tamerton Lake.</i>

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/4/6898/3031	Policy 71. Protection of landscape features, habitats and species.	Devon Wildlife Trust Ms Alison Slade	The policy intent is welcomed but there is need to revise the policy to provide clearer guidance which is more in accordance with statutory protection afforded to some habitats and species and in reference to the well established hierarchy of habitats and species protection. In situ protection of important habitats should be given higher importance.
O/4/6897/3024	Policy 71. Protection of landscape features, habitats and species.	English Nature Mr Matt Low	The policy seeks to address too many factors. Landscape features should be dealt with as a separate policy. A separate policy dealing with protected habitats and species is appropriate, such a policy and its supporting justification should make reference to the hierarchy of species and habitat protection and that species and habitats should be protected in situ. The policy should also make reference to the need to survey and protect breeding and resting places. Species protection should be referenced in any building conversion policy. The policy should require the enhancement of the nature conservation resource as opposed to just the maintenance of it. The policy, text and proposals map should identify the important geological sites in the city which should be afforded protection.
O/4/6907/3141	Policy 71. Protection of landscape features, habitats and species.	Environment Agency Mr Mike Robins	An additional criteria is suggested that seeks to protect open water courses. The reasons for the policy should refer to the need to maintain 'un-engineered' natural open water courses.
O/4/6917/3359	Policy 71. Protection of landscape features, habitats and species.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	The policy is superfluous and should be deleted, as all the items are already covered by Greenscape policy 69.
O/4/6697/3106	Policy 71. Protection of landscape features, habitats and species.	Midas Homes Ltd Mr David Seaton	The policy is non-specific and fails to give clear advice as to what may, or may not, be considered appropriate to retain.
S/4/6800/2736	Policy 71. Protection of landscape features, habitats and species.	Mr A J S Burnett	Habitats require protection, there has been poor protection of limestone and wetland habitats in the city. Habitats require protection to protect species.
S/4/6579/2151	Policy 71. Protection of landscape features, habitats and species.	South Hams Coast & Countryside Service	Strongly supports protection of features of nature conservation importance.
S/4/5340/0451	Policy 71. Protection of landscape features, habitats and species.	Tamerton Foliot Village Conservation Society Mrs B Bebbington	Supports the protection of wildlife.
S/4/6800/2735	Policy 72. Protecting trees.	Mr A J S Burnett	Supports protection of trees, but more tree planting is needed.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
S/4/5340/0452	Policy 72. Protecting trees.	Tamerton Foliot Village Conservation Society Mrs B Bebbington	Supports the protection of trees.
O/4/6917/3360	Policy 73. Ancient monuments and archaeology.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Objects to Policy 73 on the grounds that it does not provide for the <i>in situ</i> preservation of 'National Ancient Monuments', and does not differentiate between nationally and locally important sites.
O/4/6587/2190	Policy 73. Ancient monuments and archaeology.	Plymouth Roman Catholic Diocese Trust Registered	Seeks clarification on the process by which the relative value of a development proposal can be assessed against the value of the archaeological resource. Seeks amendment to Policy 73 to more fully reflect opportunities for mitigation to allow development to take place, and seeks clarification as to what information would be required by the LPA to assess the relative value of a development against the archaeological resource.
O/4/6688/2432	Policy 73. Ancient monuments and archaeology.	The Chestnut Avenue Trust	Objects to Policy 73 on the grounds that it does not provide for 'enabling development' in respect of the historic environment. Requests addition of additional criterion to Policy 73 to provide for 'enabling development'.
S/4/6579/2152	Policy 73. Ancient monuments and archaeology.	South Hams Coast & Countryside Service	Supports proposed Policy 73
O/4/5918/1272	Policy 74. Development affecting listed buildings.	English Heritage Mr Duncan McCallum	The policy fails to accord with national policy as set out in PPG15 para 3.19 in that it does not include all the tests that should be carried out before approval is given, in particular 3.19 (ii) Modification of policy 74 to better reflect PPG 15 para 3.19.
O/4/6917/3361	Policy 74. Development affecting listed buildings.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Policy is over elaborate. The demolition of listed building is occasional and the criteria might suggest a greater frequency. Seek deletion of criterion 2 and simplification of policy, to read: ' <i>where development affects listed buildings the objective will be to preserve the buildings, their features and settings. Development which conflicts with this objective will not be permitted.</i> '
O/4/6587/2189	Policy 74. Development affecting listed buildings.	Plymouth Roman Catholic Diocese Trust Registered	Consider the provisions to be unduly onerous. The policy fails to recognize opportunities e.g. development lies close to or within the curtilage of a listed building, that both enable development yet safeguard listed buildings. Request the policy reflects more fully the provisions of PPG15 and recognizes that new development schemes can offset and minimize any impact on a neighbouring listed building.
O/4/6568/2128	Policy 74. Development affecting listed buildings.	The Church Of England Diocese Of Exeter Archdeacon of Plymouth Anthony Wilds	Objection to the wording of condition 2, line 2. Seek changes to replace 'and' by 'or; to read ' <i>in the case of demolition, their is proven to be no viable existing or alternative use for the building in a reasonable or improved condition or the building is wholly or economically beyond repair.</i>

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
S/4/5340/0457	Policy 74. Development affecting listed buildings.	Tamerton Foliot Village Conservation Society Mrs B Bebbington	Welcomes the protection proposed for listed buildings.
O/4/6917/3362	Policy 75. Development in conservation areas.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Policy is over elaborate and could be amended. Seek simplification of the policy, to read: <i>in conservation areas, the objective will be to preserve and enhance their character and appearance. Development which conflicts with that objective will not be permitted.</i>
O/4/6587/2188	Policy 75. Development in conservation areas.	Plymouth Roman Catholic Diocese Trust Registered	Considers the policy adopts a negative stance to development in conservation areas. Unclear as to the meaning of <i>'historic interpretation of the area'</i> Seek amendments to conform with the provisions of PPG 15, in particular paragraphs 4.9 & 4.10
O/4/5454/0624	Policy 75. Development in conservation areas.	Stoke Damerel Conservation Society Mr Robin Midgley	Criterion 2 should be restricted to saving only buildings of outstanding importance. Suggest amendments to text, to read: in line three, after building... <i>'of outstanding architectural, historic or scenic importance and it would secure the survival and restoration of the building which would otherwise be 'at risk'</i> .
O/4/5340/0456	Policy 75. Development in conservation areas.	Tamerton Foliot Village Conservation Society Mrs B Bebbington	Seek an additional clause in the policy, identical with AEV29 to specifically prevent the loss of garden space through the increase in housing density.
S/4/5453/0606	Policy 75. Development in conservation areas.	Penlee Vale Residents Association Brigadier P C Bowser	Supportive of policy
O/4/6785/2584	Policy 76. New conservation areas and boundary reviews.	Mr A E Cullen	Objects to exclusion from Turnchapel Conservation Area of Stamford Fort Cottages and land in the immediate vicinity. The buildings and land form part of the historic setting of, and are directly linked to, Stamford Fort, and this link should be recognised.
O/4/6809/2767	Policy 76. New conservation areas and boundary reviews.	Mr R H Hall	Concerned over the proposal for 'annual reviews' of Conservation Areas.
O/4/6809/2768	Policy 76. New conservation areas and boundary reviews.	Mr R H Hall	Policy does not make any reference to development within the curtilage of a property. Suggest a clearer definition on this subject.
O/4/5454/0625	Policy 76. New conservation areas and boundary reviews.	Stoke Damerel Conservation Society Mr Robin Midgley	Would like to see the proposed new Conservation Area for Millbridge combined with the existing Conservation Area at North Road West for 'administrative, managerial and economic considerations'. Wishes to see a criterion to achieve this, added to proposed Policy 76.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/4/5340/0455	Policy 76. New conservation areas and boundary reviews.	Tamerton Foliot Village Conservation Society Mrs B Bebbington	Concerned about possible implications of proposed 'annual' reviews of Conservation Areas, and that this gives an impression of 'vulnerability and instability'.
S/4/5453/0607	Policy 76. New conservation areas and boundary reviews.	Penlee Vale Residents Association Brigadier P C Bowser	Supports proposal for reviews of Conservation Areas.
O/4/6916/3224	Policy 77. Development setting.	Associated British Ports	Policy is overly prescriptive. Detail of policy might be contained with in supportive SPG.
O/4/6907/3142	Policy 77. Development setting.	Environment Agency Mr Mike Robins	Recommends that there should be reference to the use of SuDS to manage surface water run off from hardstanding areas.
O/4/6557/2101	Policy 77. Development setting.	Mr Andrew Philip Dart	Public views should only be protected if it can be demonstrated that they are genuinely of public interest. Suggest change.
O/4/6587/2187	Policy 77. Development setting.	Plymouth Roman Catholic Diocese Trust Registered	Policy is too onerous in that it is too prescriptive. 'Each application should be judged on its own merits in order that both creativity and flair in design is encouraged.'
S/4/5454/0614	Policy 77. Development setting.	Stoke Damerel Conservation Society Mr Robin Midgley	Policy supported. No change proposed.
S/4/5340/0453	Policy 77. Development setting.	Tamerton Foliot Village Conservation Society Mrs B Bebbington	Strongly support aims of policy.
O/4/6907/3143	Policy 82. Landscaping in development.	Environment Agency Mr Mike Robins	Welcome principles. Suggests that the following should be included: reference to use of 'natural species' in criteria 2/ any landscaping should only use native species/ wildlife corridors and refuges should form part of the overall landscaping of the development and should be safeguarded by making provision for their future management.
S/4/6224/1619	Policy 83. Gateways and approach corridors.	Bryant Developments	Policy supported.
O/4/6916/3225	Policy 84. Public art.	Associated British Ports	Policy is too prescriptive and should be reworded to make it clear that public art will be 'encouraged' in development schemes.
O/4/6790/2694	Policy 84. Public art.	House Builders Federation Ms Jo Hanslip	Policy is vague and imprecise. Residential areas are not always publicly frequented areas therefore contribution is questionable in relation to residential development. Policy is more appropriate to major commercial development where unrestricted public access is available.
O/4/5453/0608	Policy 84. Public art.	Penlee Vale Residents Association Brigadier P C Bowser	Too much importance attached to the benefits of public art. Should be greater emphasis on quality building and landscape design.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/4/5454/0626	Policy 84. Public art.	Stoke Damerel Conservation Society Mr Robin Midgley	Suggested change. Art in the vicinity of Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas should be referred to a panel of experts in Art and Conservation.
O/4/6902/3069	Policy 85. Environmentally conscious design.	Cavanna Homes (Devon) Ltd Mr Michael Griffin	Policy is overly prescriptive and should be dealt with by means of SPG. Reference to PPG 12 in relation to avoiding over detailed plans.
O/4/6907/3144	Policy 85. Environmentally conscious design.	Environment Agency Mr Mike Robins	Strongly support inclusion of policy but suggest explicit links are made to regional or locally developed sustainable design principles supported through SPG.
O/4/6790/2695	Policy 85. Environmentally conscious design.	House Builders Federation Ms Jo Hanslip	Policy should be deleted from the Local Plan and covered by SPG.
O/4/6917/3364	Policy 86. Advertisements.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Considers that criterion 4 should be deleted, as listed buildings are dealt with by other policies of the plan. The sentence above criterion 5 does not make a clear basis for decision making and should be deleted. Criterion 5(a) should be deleted, as these designations are dealt with by other policies of the plan.
O/4/6829/2819	Policy 86. Advertisements.	Outdoor Advertising Association	The policy is too onerous and goes beyond government advice regarding the acceptability of the type of situation where advertisements can appropriately be displayed. The policy should be amended to provide for fewer exclusions and greater flexibility regarding the location of various types of advertisement.
S/4/6746/2565	Policy 86. Advertisements.	Miss J Whyte	Supports the aims of the policy, but concerned about its application and control of unauthorised adverts.
S/4/5340/0454	Policy 86. Advertisements.	Tamerton Foliot Village Conservation Society Mrs B Bebbington	Policy is supported, particularly in relation to listed buildings and conservation areas.
O/4/6907/3145	Policy 87. Pollution.	Environment Agency Mr Mike Robins	The policy is welcomed. However, the policy should make explicit the link between new development (particularly housing) and foul (and storm) water flows passed on to the various waste water treatment works.
O/4/6197/1577	Policy 87. Pollution.	Viridor Waste Management Limited Mr M G Oliver	There is a risk of some form of pollution with nearly all development. The policy should be reworded to exclude only developments that are likely to cause harm.
S/4/6507/2913	Policy 87. Pollution.	Plymouth Friends of the Earth Miss Sheila V Evans	Supports policy as any risk from pollution needs to be reduced or eliminated.
O/4/6917/3365	Policy 88. Contaminated land and land stability.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	This appears to place the burden of proof on development, which is contrary to the planning principles. The phrase 'the applicant can satisfactorily demonstrate that' should be deleted.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
S/4/6907/3146	Policy 88. Contaminated land and land stability.	Environment Agency Mr Mike Robins	Policy welcomed.
S/4/6507/2914	Policy 88. Contaminated land and land stability.	Plymouth Friends of the Earth Miss Sheila V Evans	Agree with policy, but concerned that development might be allowed on contaminated sites.
S/4/6599/2216	Policy 88. Contaminated land and land stability.	Railtrack	The policy is supported. Rail Track should be consulted on any planning applications abutting railway property where contaminated land might be disturbed.
O/4/6832/2842	Policy 89. Development in areas of flood risk.	Barratt Homes Exeter Ltd	The reason for the policy should be amended to reflect the true situation that the areas of flood risk prepared by the Environment Agency are only indicative and not necessarily at risk from flooding.
O/4/6907/3147	Policy 89. Development in areas of flood risk.	Environment Agency Mr Mike Robins	The policy should refer to the need for 'flood risk assessments' as recommended by government advice. Additional criteria should be provided to cover this and impact on essential civil infrastructure and the functional flood plain.
O/4/6917/3366	Policy 89. Development in areas of flood risk.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	The use of the positive phrase that 'development will be permitted' in the case of flood plains seems inappropriate and it should be re-worded.
O/4/6790/2696	Policy 89. Development in areas of flood risk.	House Builders Federation Ms Jo Hanslip	The policy takes a negative and prohibitive approach to development in areas of flood risk and fails to identify the positive and beneficial role that mitigation measures can play in achieving sustainable and successful development.
O/4/6907/3148	Policy 90. Development resulting in the loss of inter or sub tidal areas.	Environment Agency Mr Mike Robins	Policy is not clear about whether all inter-tidal infilling is prohibited. It could therefore be interpreted wrongly by developers. Urges that the policy should be stronger and include reference to policy 70. The Environment Agency would be opposed to all forms of private inter-tidal developments e.g. private slipways and quays, and the policy does not seem to be clear on whether these are prohibited.
O/4/6917/3367	Policy 90. Development resulting in the loss of inter or sub tidal areas.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Objects to policy on grounds that it is unclear. 'Normally' should be deleted to ensure more force against development which might harm the marine or coastal environment.
O/4/6866/2965	Policy 90. Development resulting in the loss of inter or sub tidal areas.	Maritime Plymouth Captain A G Dyer	The policy does not include the needs of the commercial port. It should ensure that acceptable development must have regard for navigation rights relating to the military and the commercial port (item 3).
O/4/6746/2566	Policy 90. Development resulting in the loss of inter or sub tidal areas.	Miss J Whyte	Urges more protection to inter or sub tidal areas. Criterion 4 should include the following: 'any work on the east and west shores should be as unobtrusive as possible'. Another criterion should also be added to deal with contamination risks.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
<i>S/4/6898/3032</i>	<i>Policy 90. Development resulting in the loss of inter or sub tidal areas.</i>	<i>Devon Wildlife Trust Ms Alison Slade</i>	<i>This policy is strongly supported.</i>
<i>S/4/6897/3025</i>	<i>Policy 90. Development resulting in the loss of inter or sub tidal areas.</i>	<i>English Nature Mr Matt Low</i>	<i>Strongly supported.</i>
<i>S/4/6507/2915</i>	<i>Policy 90. Development resulting in the loss of inter or sub tidal areas.</i>	<i>Plymouth Friends of the Earth Miss Sheila V Evans</i>	<i>Supportive of policy but urges that exceptions to policy should be very strictly controlled. The precautionary principle 'unacceptable impact' needs to be well defined.</i>
<i>S/4/5340/0458</i>	<i>Policy 90. Development resulting in the loss of inter or sub tidal areas.</i>	<i>Tamerton Foliot Village Conservation Society Mrs B Bebbington</i>	<i>Policy is strongly welcomed, particularly in light of protecting Tamerton Creek from inappropriate commercial development.</i>
O/4/5212/0299	Policy 91. Renewable energy.	DTI (ETSU)	Whilst the thrust of the policy is supported, it is too waste-orientated and could usefully be re-drafted to reflect a broader range of environmental criteria and relying on the other waste policies of the plan to take account of waste planning interests.
O/4/6917/3368	Policy 91. Renewable energy.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	The policy fails to strike an appropriate balance between the benefits of renewable energy and other amenity/environmental interests. The policy should be amended to be more positive towards the benefits of renewable energy over the degree of harm that might arise.
O/4/6802/2782	Policy 91. Renewable energy.	Mr W R Crocker	The policy is premature in the absence of the evidence required to establish that energy from waste is the Best Practicable Environmental Option for each waste stream.
O/4/6332/2326	Policy 91. Renewable energy.	Roseland Plant Co Ltd	The policy is premature in the absence of the evidence required to establish that energy from waste is the Best Practicable Environmental Option for each waste stream.
O/4/5454/0627	Policy 91. Renewable energy.	Stoke Damerel Conservation Society Mr Robin Midgley	The policy should be reworded to better ensure protection of listed buildings and conservation areas.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
S/4/6507/2916	Policy 91. Renewable energy.	Plymouth Friends of the Earth Miss Sheila V Evans	Renewable energy should generally be encouraged. Caution should be exercised regarding the environmental impacts of waste to energy in regard to pollution and health issues.
S/4/6927/3546	Policy 91. Renewable energy.	South West of England Regional Development Agency	Supports policy. Refer to Objective 15 in reason for policy.
O/4/6907/3149	Policy 92. Surface water run off.	Environment Agency Mr Mike Robins	The potential to include areas of risk in relation to surface water run-off on the proposals map should be explored along with having one integrated flood risk policy. The policy wording needs clarification in relation to terms used regarding catchment areas. Supports policy intent, but clarify that it should apply to all developments.
O/4/6790/2613	Policy 92. Surface water run off.	House Builders Federation Ms Jo Hanslip	Objects to requirement to provide sustainable drainage systems in schemes. The policy and reasons for need to acknowledge the potential problems of getting the local authority and other agencies to agree to adopt and maintain these form of drainage systems.
O/4/6582/2163	Policy 93. Control of mineral workings.	Aggregate Industries UK Ltd	The word 'need' in criteria 2 requires qualification to reflect government policy. Need only has to be addressed if the application requires an environmental assessment. Providing there is no sound planning objection a minerals application can not be refused on lack of need alone.
O/4/6907/3150	Policy 93. Control of mineral workings.	Environment Agency Mr Mike Robins	Mitigation required if mineral development affects water environment. Management of mineral waste should be dealt with in this policy
O/4/6917/3369	Policy 93. Control of mineral workings.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Demonstration of need in item 2 is not required as a matter of course, and is not in line paragraph. 40 of MPG1.
O/4/6907/3151	Policy 94. The use of secondary and recycled materials.	Environment Agency Mr Mike Robins	The plan does not go far enough to encourage recycling. The plan should identify diversion tonnage based on government targets. Policy should positively discriminate in favour of re use of such materials. Links to earlier policies on sustainable construction would be appropriate.
O/4/6917/3370	Policy 94. The use of secondary and recycled materials.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	Support policy as being in line with paras 68-70 of MPG1, however, the council should consider identifying suitable sites for recycling of construction and demolition waste.
O/4/6582/2165	Policy 95. Non mineral development in Mineral Resource Areas.	Aggregate Industries UK Ltd	Terminology should be consistent with County and National policy ie Mineral Consultation Areas, and Buffer Zones. The wording in the plan is incorrect, and confusing.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
S/4/6918/3422	Policy 95. Non mineral development in Mineral Resource Areas.	Lee Mill Partnership	No specific grounds of support given.
O/4/6582/2166	Policy 96. Buffer zones.	Aggregate Industries UK Ltd	Terminology should be consistent with County and National policy ie Mineral Consultation Areas and Buffer Zones. The wording in the plan is incorrect, and confusing.
O/4/6582/2164	Policy 97. Restoration.	Aggregate Industries UK Ltd	Reference to continuing maintenance is not necessary, as 'aftercare' includes maintenance after restoration.
O/4/6907/3152	Policy 98. Waste management development.	Environment Agency Mr Mike Robins	The re-use of recycled material in construction should be extended to more mineral waste. This is not clear in the statement.
O/4/6917/3372	Policy 98. Waste management development.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	The policy should be amended to refer to 'practicable'.
O/4/6802/2751	Policy 98. Waste management development.	Mr W R Crocker	This criteria based policy is the government's least favoured form of approach to waste planning. A needs based assessment is required, the outcome of which will lead to a specification of what new facilities are needed. Policies and/or proposals can then be defined to support the provision of the facilities specified.
O/4/6332/2327	Policy 98. Waste management development.	Roseland Plant Co Ltd	This criteria based policy is the government's least favoured form of approach to waste planning. A needs based assessment is required, the outcome of which will lead to a specification of what new facilities are needed. Policies and/or proposals can then be defined to support the provision of the facilities specified.
O/4/6237/1638	Policy 98. Waste management development.	The National Trust	The policy should incorporate targets that are to be pursued in the plan period. Reference should be made in the policy as to how the principle of disposal to landfill as the last resort will be achieved.
O/4/6197/1578	Policy 98. Waste management development.	Viridor Waste Management Limited Mr M G Oliver	The policy should be amended to refer to 'practicable'.
S/4/6599/2215	Policy 98. Waste management development.	Railtrack	Supports the criteria that considers the 'adequacy of access to the strategic transport network'. Transportation of waste by rail is more sustainable and supported by government planning advice.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/4/6907/3153	Policy 99. Reducing and reusing demolition waste.	Environment Agency Mr Mike Robins	The last sentence of the reasons for the policy needs correction to make proper sense.
O/4/6917/3373	Policy 99. Reducing and reusing demolition waste.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	The final sentence of the policy needs clarification. If it intends to support re-processing on alternative sites, it would be helpful for the plan to indicate the types of location suitable for such facilities on a temporary or permanent basis.
O/4/6802/2750	Policy 99. Reducing and reusing demolition waste.	Mr W R Crocker	This policy does not allow for the disposal of such waste that might be the better environmental option than its re-use.
O/4/6332/2328	Policy 99. Reducing and reusing demolition waste.	Roseland Plant Co Ltd	This policy does not allow for the disposal of such waste that might be the better environmental option than its re-use.
O/4/6907/3154	Policy 100. Waste in commercial and industrial development.	Environment Agency Mr Mike Robins	The reason for the policy states that there is a similar requirement for new residential development, but no reference in policy 25 can be found.
O/4/6802/2749	Policy 100. Waste in commercial and industrial development.	Mr W R Crocker	The policy should include provision for disposal of residues and/or sub-standard materials/ products. The policy lacks evidence of likely commercial waste arisings and the need for facilities to deal with them.
O/4/6332/2329	Policy 100. Waste in commercial and industrial development.	Roseland Plant Co Ltd	The policy should include provision for disposal of residues and/or sub-standard materials/ products. The policy lacks evidence of likely commercial waste arisings and the need for facilities to deal with them.
S/4/6507/2917	Policy 101. Recycling facilities.	Plymouth Friends of the Earth Miss Sheila V Evans	Provision of existing and new recycling facilities is welcomed, providing recycling operates in a responsible manner. Caution must be exercised on the impacts of recycling activities on local populations.
O/4/6907/3156	Policy 102. Materials reclamation facilities and waste storage.	Environment Agency Mr Mike Robins	Considers it would be worthwhile to include a statement in strategy to ensure that the policy seeks the provision of waste storage facilities to accommodate waste from producers that may be reusable by others.
O/4/6802/2748	Policy 102. Materials reclamation facilities and waste storage.	Mr W R Crocker	This policy raises potential for conflict between the need for employment land and potentially land hungry waste management facilities. Facilities for waste management should be planned for and provided in a sub-regional context.
O/4/6332/2330	Policy 102. Materials reclamation facilities and waste storage.	Roseland Plant Co Ltd	This policy raises potential for conflict between the need for employment land and potentially land hungry waste management facilities. Facilities for waste management should be planned for and provided in a sub-regional context.
S/4/6507/2918	Policy 102. Materials reclamation facilities and waste storage.	Plymouth Friends of the Earth Miss Sheila V Evans	Agree with the policy and its criteria.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
<i>S/4/6507/2919</i>	Policy 103. Civic amenity recycling centres.	Plymouth Friends of the Earth Miss Sheila V Evans	Agree with policy criteria.
O/4/6907/3157	Policy 104. Community and large scale composting.	Environment Agency Mr Mike Robins	Composting does not assist waste minimisation but is waste recovery. Whilst supporting composting there are risks to the environment associated with it that need to be guarded against, particularly with community composting. There is also a potential risk to health that needs to be considered arising from the release of bio-aerosols from the composting process.
O/4/6802/2747	Policy 104. Community and large scale composting.	Mr W R Crocker	This policy raises potential for conflict between the need for employment land and potentially land hungry waste management facilities. Facilities for waste management should be planned for and provided in a sub-regional context.
O/4/6332/2331	Policy 104. Community and large scale composting.	Roseland Plant Co Ltd	This policy raises potential for conflict between the need for employment land and potentially land hungry waste management facilities. Facilities for waste management should be planned for and provided in a sub-regional context.
O/4/6197/1579	Policy 104. Community and large scale composting.	Viridor Waste Management Limited Mr M G Oliver	Given the likely need for composting infrastructure the location related requirements specified in criterion 1 are too inflexible. Either delete the criterion 1 or add 'farmland' to it.
<i>S/4/6507/2920</i>	Policy 104. Community and large scale composting.	Plymouth Friends of the Earth Miss Sheila V Evans	Supports the policy criteria that seek to protect residential and natural amenity, health and prevent pollution.
O/4/6907/3158	Policy 105. Waste to energy facilities.	Environment Agency Mr Mike Robins	Energy from waste plants should be developed as part of an integrated system that includes other waste management options and this should be informed by an assessment of the Best Practicable Environmental Option.
O/4/6838/2894	Policy 105. Waste to energy facilities.	Mr Brian Cheal	These facilities can release toxic pollutants, especially dioxins. The policy should require such developments to remain within acceptable limits of toxin releases.
O/4/6802/2746	Policy 105. Waste to energy facilities.	Mr W R Crocker	The policy is premature in the absence of a best practicable environmental option assessment. The policy may conflict with the achievement of higher levels of recycling. The policy should require re-use of heat and energy; otherwise the result will be pure incineration, which is unacceptable. The identification of a location for a facility to dispose of ash is critical to the environmental impact. The policy may conflict with the need to ensure a satisfactory supply of employment and housing land.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/4/6332/2332	Policy 105. Waste to energy facilities.	Roseland Plant Co Ltd	The policy is premature in the absence of a best practicable environmental option assessment. The policy may conflict with the achievement of higher levels of recycling. The policy should require re-use of heat and energy; otherwise the result will be pure incineration which is unacceptable. The identification of a location for a facility to dispose of ash is critical to the environmental impact. The policy may conflict with the need to ensure a satisfactory supply of employment and housing land.
O/4/6197/1580	Policy 105. Waste to energy facilities.	Viridor Waste Management Limited Mr M G Oliver	Criterion 9 is a matter for the Environment Agency and as such it should be deleted from the policy.
O/4/6907/3159	Policy 106. Landfill sites.	Environment Agency Mr Mike Robins	The policy should make reference to the need for landfill sites to be designed to recover energy from landfill gas and prevent venting of such gases to the atmosphere.
O/4/6917/3374	Policy 106. Landfill sites.	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	The policy should be amended to refer to 'practicable'.
O/4/6237/1639	Policy 106. Landfill sites.	The National Trust	The policy is too permissive; it should be amended to ensure that disposal to landfill is the last resort. A particular concern is the clause to first encourage the extension of an existing landfill site, particularly in relation to Chelson Meadow.
O/4/6197/1581	Policy 106. Landfill sites.	Viridor Waste Management Limited Mr M G Oliver	The policy should be amended to refer to 'practicable'.
S/4/6507/2921	Policy 106. Landfill sites.	Plymouth Friends of the Earth Miss Sheila V Evans	Agree that new landfill sites should not be permitted unless they meet all the criteria suggested. 'unacceptable' impacts' should be properly defined.
S/4/6599/2214	Policy 107. Waste transfer.	Railtrack	Supports the requirement for a road-rail freight interchange to accommodate the handling of waste.
5. Representations relating to Part Five: Local Plan Appendices.			
S/5/5075/0115	Appendix 3	CPRE Plymouth & South Hams Group Mr Roger Gage	Supports the linking of the city's housing development to an urban regeneration strategy, but notes the importance that quality residential development will play in securing an environment in which people will want to live, and the need to avoid fringe-of-town megastores which exacerbate traffic problems.
O/5/6790/2697	Appendix 5	House Builders Federation Ms Jo Hanslip	Object to SPGs being used to identifying Council policy. They should only be used to supplement policies and proposals in the local plan.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/5/6850/2925	Appendix 5	Plymouth Primary Care Trust Mr A Vickers	Although there is an unimplemented planning permission on part of Mount Gould Hospital, this is not likely to be implemented, and should be deleted from proposals map, and Appendix 5.
O/5/6226/1622	Appendix 5	The National Trust Mr John Longworth-Krafft	The Site on the Ride should not be shown as a committed Housing site as it was approved as gypsy accommodation, it is not suitable for either, because it would: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - affect listed buildings, - prejudice future development at Chelson Meadow. - affect enjoyment of Plym Valley Cycle Trail - result in the loss of parking for recreational users.
O/5/6570/2134	Appendix 6	Warner Village Cinemas	Considers that site specific guidance should be included as part of the Plan, and not left as a future non-statutory process.
S/5/6654/2377	Appendix 6	South West RSL Planning Consortium	Support use of SPGs on Affordable Housing
S/5/6654/2378	Appendix 6	South West RSL Planning Consortium	Support the aim to provide a proportion of lifetime homes
S/5/6654/2379	Appendix 6	South West RSL Planning Consortium	Support use of SPGs on Affordable Housing
O/5/6900/3064	Appendix 7	Sport England South West Region Mr Gary Parsons	There should be a monitoring indicator for the formal provision of formal sport and informal recreation for both outdoor sport and indoor facilities that links with objectives 7 & 13. Several possible examples given.
O/5/6197/1552	Appendix 7	Viridor Waste Management Limited Mr M G Oliver	Additional output indicators should refer to recycling, composting and waste arising within the Plan area with compatible targets derived from the National Waste Strategy, or regionally derived figures if they are available.
O/5/6916/3226	Appendix 10	Associated British Ports	It is onerous and does not reflect PPG13. With C3 dwellings there is no provision for visitors. The cycle standard for flats is too excessive.
O/5/6654/2380	Appendix 10	South West RSL Planning Consortium	Object to the inflexibility of parking standards for social housing.
O/5/6654/2381	Appendix 10	South West RSL Planning Consortium	Object to the inflexibility of parking standards for social housing.
O/5/6654/2382	Appendix 10	South West RSL Planning Consortium	Object to the inflexibility of parking standards for social housing.
O/5/6654/2383	Appendix 10	South West RSL Planning Consortium	Object to the inflexibility of parking standards for social housing.
O/5/6908/3182	Appendix 11	Plymouth & South West Co-operative	Object to the definition of 'retail' contained in the Glossary. Also requests the addition of further definitions of retail terms

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
6. Representations relating to Local Plan Proposals Map and Annexes.			
O/6/5039/0052	Annex 2B	Sir Robert Gerken	Waterfront walkway map is inaccurate and lacks ambition – from west to east. Some parts of the walkway eg Artillery Tower to Millbay Road are already established. Other important parts are missed out eg Millbay Pier and the coast line. Suggests amending plan to reflect 'facts and opportunities'.
O/6/6587/2186	Annex 4 Greenscape Schedule	Plymouth Roman Catholic Diocese Trust Registered	The information presented in the Annex is overly prescriptive and will overly complicate the assessment of development proposals, which would stifle development in the City. It is unclear as to how the annotations of the various levels of importance of the greenscape functions have been derived and why it is necessary to present this level of detail in the plan. The provisions of the annex fails to recognise opportunities for development on such area, particularly on underused land. The decision-making status of the annex is questioned. It is unclear as to what weight the different levels of importance will carry in the decision making process. AS the annex is onerous, ambiguous and serves no useful purpose it should be deleted.
O/6/6587/2186	Annex 4 Greenscape Schedule	Plymouth Roman Catholic Diocese Trust Registered	The information presented in the Annex is overly prescriptive and will overly complicate the assessment of development proposals and which would stifle development in the City. It is unclear as to how the annotations of the various levels of importance of the greenscape functions have been derived and why it is necessary to present this level of detail in the plan. The provisions of the annex fails to recognise opportunities for development on such area, particularly on underused land. The decision making status of the annex is questioned. It is unclear as to what weight the different levels of importance will carry in the decision making process. As the annex is onerous, ambiguous and serves no useful purpose, it should be deleted.
O/6/6605/2282	Annex 4 Greenscape Schedule	Mr & Mrs R Westlake	The designation will unreasonably prejudice the determination of applications, so that they will not be determined on their merits but only against the 8 functions identifies in the policy and annex. The basis of the assessment of the functions, their existence and status, is questioned and the subjective method of the conclusions reached. The annex should be deleted as it is overly prescriptive, fails to recognise government guidance, lacks clarity and will hinder development.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
S/6/6485/2034	Annex 4 Greenscape Schedule	Plympton Pathfields Preservation Group Mr K Owen	Supports the creation of greenscape areas.
O/6/6897/3010	Format of proposals map	English Nature Mr Matt Low	Objects to the lack of an overall (summary) proposals map, because the overall context is lost by having it on individual maps.
8. Representations relating to omissions (i.e. things not included in the First Deposit Version of the Local Plan).			
O/8/5918/1273	Omission of proposal for the consideration of city centre as a conservation area	English Heritage Mr Duncan McCallum	No consideration of the city centre area as a conservation area, despite the recommendations of Jeremy Gould in his report 'Plymouth Planned. Seek to include a policy/proposal to consider designation.
O/8/6836/2862	Part 2. Objective 3	Peter D Mulley (Mr), Rail Future – South West	Strategy statement 2 does not include the safeguarding of land with potential for rail passenger traffic. Statement should be reworded as follows: 'Safeguard existing railway land with potential for the promotion of rail freight <i>or rail passenger traffic.</i> '
O/8/5019/0022	Policy Omission Social Housing	Mr D J Camp	There should be a policy to require provision and improvement of social housing.
O/8/5063/2865	Policy Omission Smoking Indoor Facilities	Mr Derek Unitt	Indoor facilities should provide facilities where people can smoke. 30% of the population smoke – they along with smokers partners are discriminated against.
O/8/5340/0448	Proposal Omission Quiet Lanes	Tamerton Foliot Village Conservation Society Mrs B Bebbington	The designation of some lanes as "Quiet lanes" should be considered at some locations where walkers and riders have priority.
O/8/5404/3515	Policy Omission MOD	Defence Estates South West Mr Mike Blowers	Objects yo absence of policy in the plan dealing with MOD buildings and their future use if they are declared surplus.
O/8/5452/0591	Policy Omission No Provision for Places of Worship	Plymouth St Budeaux Kingdom Hall Project Committee Mr F W James	Sites appropriate for places of worship should be allocated in the plan to enable community facilities to re-locate/re-develop.
O/8/5918/1274	Policy Omission Protection Historic Parks & Garden	English Heritage Mr Duncan McCallum	The plan should include a policy which protects Historic Parks & Gardens.
O/8/6226/1623	Policy Omission Gypsies	The National Trust Mr John Longworth-Krafft	No policy for gypsies. The present site on The Ride is not suitable. PPG12 and the Devon County Structure Plan refer to the need to make adequate provision for gypsy sites in the Local Plan. There is no reference to this in the Housing Needs Study and no evidence that alternative sites have been considered
O/8/6251/1660	Policy Omission Aviation	General Aviation Awareness Council Ms Anna Bloomfield	Omission of a general aviation policy and airport safeguarding policy and provides suggested wordings.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/8/6557/2093	Presentation	Mr Andrew Philip Dart	Objects to presentation of plan. Each section is individually numbered, which is confusing. Absence of paragraph numbering also causes confusion, which will make planning application process and appeals more difficult. Urges Council to adopt consecutive page numbering from Part One to Part Five, and to insert paragraph numbers.
O/8/6578/2148	Policy Omission Fire Safety	Devon Fire & Rescue Service	Plan fails to mention many Fire Safety issues and should be amended to include them.
O/8/6579/2153	Policy Omission of AONB Management Plan	South Hams Coast & Countryside Service	The statutory Management Plan for South Devon AONB should be formally adopted as Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) by the City Council and that should be reflected in the list of SPG documents referred to in the Local Plan Annex.
O/8/6579/2154	Policy Omission AONB	South Hams Coast & Countryside Service	The Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) designation should be given formal recognition in the main text or policies of the plan.
O/8/6584/3450	Presentation	Persimmon Homes South West Limited	Objects to absence of paragraph numbering.
O/8/6599/2226	Policy Omission Development Criteria affects Railway Land	Railtrack	Omission of railway requirements on proposals and allocations that straddle, adjoin or are close to railway land. Need for caveats and conditions relating to works, landscaping and fencing, to avoid increased risk of danger to the railway.
O/8/6654/2375	Policy Omission Mix of Housing	South West RSL Planning Consortium	Policy 25.7 is not explicit enough. There should be a specific policy encouraging provision of a mix of housing types and sizes to ensure balanced communities.
O/8/6654/2384	Omission of Green Paper guidance.	South West RSL Planning Consortium	Object to absence of reference to implications of planning green paper, especially as some requirements of green paper do not require legislation: Lord Falconer has already local authorities to follow some measures in green paper straight away. In this light, urges Council to consider sites for 100% affordable housing.
O/8/6802/2753	Omission Waste Facility	Mr W R Crocker	The plan makes insufficient provision for the management and disposal of municipal solid waste.
O/8/6802/2754	Policy Omission BPEO (Best Practicable Environmental Option)	Mr W R Crocker	It is necessary to undertake an assessment of the BPEO to properly support the waste planning strategy and subsequent policies.
O/8/6802/2755	Omission Waste Management	Mr W R Crocker	The plan makes insufficient provision for the management and disposal of commercial/ industrial waste and construction/demolition waste.
O/8/6802/2756	Proposal Omission Waste Transfer Site	Mr W R Crocker	The plan does not allocate any sites for waste transfer facilities.
O/8/6802/2757	Omission Waste Facilities Outside City	Mr W R Crocker	Objects to absence of reference to waste management provision outside the city or how waste can be addressed on a sub-regional basis. This should be considered as part of any assessment of the Best Practicable Environmental Option.
O/8/6833/2855	Policy Omission Rights of Way	Mr J C Emery	Plymouth CC have failed in the past to investigate and record PROWs lawfully. There should be a policy on PROWs.

Table 3. Summary of general and policy representations			
Reference	Part of Plan	Objector / Supporter	Summary of representation
O/8/6833/2857	Policy Omission Transport Infrastructure	Mr J C Emery	The local transport infrastructure is not considered. The transport modes and highway hierarchies are not considered.
O/8/6833/2858	Policy Omission Historic & Archaeological Sites	Mr J C Emery	Ditto
O/8/6834/2859	Policy Omission Archaeological Sites	Plymstock Community Forum Mrs G M Whillock	Concerned that there is no protection within the proposed Local Plan for the historic interest of Mount Batten. Provision should be made for an historic interpretation centre.
O/8/6838/2903	Policy Omission Lighting Pollution	Mr Brian Cheal	Plan should include a policy to prevent/reduce light pollution.
O/8/6900/3044	Policy Omission Housing Proposals provide Sport & Recreation.	Sport England South West Region Mr Gary Parsons	New housing sites should adequately provide sport and recreation (outdoor and indoor) facilities on-site or pay a financial contribution in lieu of adequate on-site provision. This is legitimate re C1/97 and PPG17 and a number of councils are operating this. 66 housing proposal sites are made reference to.
O/8/6900/3062	Policy Omission new Housing provide Indoor Sport & Recreation	Sport England South West Region Mr Gary Parsons	There should be a new policy for house builders to provide, on site, where appropriate new facilities for indoor sport and recreation. Where this is not appropriate, a financial contribution should be made. An SPG and annual costings of sport and recreation facilities and code of practice would have to be produced. A sports and recreation needs assessment is also required as a foundation.
O/8/6907/3155	Policy Omission New Waste Processing Facilities	Environment Agency Mr Mike Robins	Within the South West region there is a notable lack of waste re-processing facilities, e.g. paper & glass, meaning that recyclable waste must be transported long distances for reprocessing. Consideration should be given to the need for a policy in the plan that would facilitate the location of new waste processing facilities in the area.
O/8/6917/3371	Policy Omission Minerals	Government Office South West Mr Richard Ormerod	No aggregates provision policy or landbank for minerals sites as required by MPG6.
O/8/6918/3406	Presentation	Lee Mill Partnership	Objects to absence of paragraph numbering.
O/8/6926/3500	Proposal Omission Light Rapid Transit	South Hams District Council Mr Alan Robinson	Support the principle of LRT but do not think it should be a policy but a proposal instead – hence an omission.

