

TAMERTON FOLIOT

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



SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

This is a summary of some of the key issues emerging from the consultation process. Full copies of the representation can be viewed below:

Eleven representations were received from residents the majority of whom thought that the summary of the neighbourhood was a reasonable reflection of the neighbourhood. It was highlighted that the summary is leading towards a restrictive policy on future growth, and that the landscape and topography should not be an issue for future development.

Shopping

There are very limited shops, this is due to the isolation of the neighbourhood. There is a post office and general store, and shops at Southway. Most local people tend to use the large supermarket at nearby Roborough.

Local Issues

Noise from the pubs has been an unacceptable problem at times. There is a lack of community facilities and youth activities. There are concerns relating to traffic the area is used as a 'rat run' to avoid build up of traffic at Tavistock Road. It has been identified that there is a lack of executive housing. One consideration would be to extend the conservation area.

Greenspaces

The area is surrounded by greenspaces and are all considered important to the local community. People felt that future development should be restricted. There is a feeling of a 'village green' at TF06 and should remain that way.

Potential Development Sites

There have been a number of possible sites identified. The large greenspace between Old Warleigh Lane and Horsham Lane (TF01). TF04 close to Horsham Lane could allow the delivery of local community facilities.

Other Comments

- There are excellent and interesting paths and cycle routes that could be developed as a country leisure venue.
- It was highlighted that no development should be allowed to the Andy Stevens Nature Reserve.

Q2 – How are you connected with this neighbourhood?

Q3a – Do you generally agree with the summary of this neighbourhood?

Q3b – If not, what would you like to change?

Q4 – What do you think of the shopping facilities?

Q5 – Briefly in order of importance, what do you think are the biggest issues in the neighbourhood? e.g. youth facilities, traffic, affordable homes etc.

Q6a – Which green spaces/parks are important to you and why? (please identify them using the numbers on the map)

Q6b – Are there any areas of green or open space that are not shown which you feel should be protected? Please explain why

Q7 – Identify any sites you feel should or could be developed and for what purpose?

Full Name	Q3 a	3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q6b	Q7	Other comments	Upload
Mr Dennis Silverwood SNDDP47	No	The conservation area boundaries should have been shown.	Very limited. Would require much thought to make them more attractive and competitive.	<p>Maintaining the currently satisfactory controls of bad behaviour - in the past, behaviour of gangs of youths (often from outside the area) and noise from pubs has been unacceptable.</p> <p>Parking on Fore Street/ Whitsoncross Road (and on the pavements) has become a nuisance.</p> <p>Pressure on the village/ semi-rural nature of TF needs to be relieved. An extension of Conservation Area and other protections should be considered.</p>	All	<p>All are important to the nature of TF: here are specific reasons.</p> <p>TF01 - part of this covenanted against development; access is difficult; any development promises spillage into and AONB (Tamar valley)</p> <p>TF02 - looks like school playing field</p> <p>TF03 - looks like the playground</p> <p>TF04 - as comments for TF01 above plus the path to Horsham Farm needs protection from infringement by development</p> <p>TF05 - part of the important 'green finger'</p> <p>TF06 - this is covenanted to the village by PCC</p> <p>TF07 and TF08. Most of this is in the Conservation Area. Development would damage that which the area seeks to protect.</p> <p>TF09 - This is steep land with poor access; it is an important 'fly through' from the Tamar to the 'Andy Stephens' reserve; there has been encroachment and land grab of this</p>		<p>TF can be helped to develop as a 'country leisure venue' yet within the city. There are excellent and interesting paths and cycle routes; an area for parking could be assigned; local shops/ pubs potentially would benefit; people within Plymouth would have access to country without flogging up to the moor. Some joint action with S Hams would be needed.</p> <p>As a consultation, I don't believe that proper efforts have been made. W Park library is not an easy place to get to from TF and the argument that local centres which could house such a consultation are too expensive is a nonsense when compared to what must be the cost of informing and running the consultation.</p>	

						area (that owned by PCC) by adjacent houses; all in all, funnelling of development down the creek should be resisted.			
						the small patch of land at the junction of Milford Lane and Tamerton Foliot Road should be identified and preserved.			
Mr Steven Gerry SNDPD39	Yes	<p>I think that there is insufficient commentary about the fact that Tamerton Foliot (TF) maintains a real sense that it is still very much a self-contained 'village' which just happens to be within the City of Plymouth boundary. It is unclear what makes it thus, but probably the following factors help:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Its relative isolation – aside from a 'rat run' through to Roborough, most people who enter Tamerton Foliot are not simply passing through. • The existence of village 'essentials' – school; shops; church; Post Office; pubs. • Entry along Tamerton Foliot road under a canopy of trees for 100 metres gives a further sense of having left Plymouth behind. • The school has a close bond with the church – each at opposite ends of the village to one another. • A real sense of the existence of a community spirit or 'cohesion'. This is best witnessed at the time of the May Carnival but also at Christmas and on other less frequent occasions e.g. Queen Golden Jubilee. • A number of village groups – drama groups for children, youths and adults (Tamerton Village Players); carnival committee; conservation 	<p>The shopping facilities aren't fantastic but because of the relative isolation of the neighbourhood, I suspect that the business economics are such that it is unlikely to be able to sustain more than it currently has: one Post Office and a shop combined and one other shop plus a Chinese take-away. Most people do their weekly shop at a supermarket e.g. Tesco's at Roborough.</p>	<p>The biggest issues in the neighbourhood for me are:</p> <p>The usual lack of facilities for youths;</p> <p>The absence of a good quality Community Centre building at the heart of the Village. The facility in Cunningham Road is both dated and limited and too distant from the centre;</p> <p>Speeding motor vehicles – particularly outside of the shops. Which makes Fore Street a particularly dangerous road for small children at that point.</p> <p>Anti-social behaviour associated with the pubs late at night.</p>	<p>With the aim of maintaining a village 'feel' all of the neighbourhood's green spaces are important. However, some more so than others. I would particularly mention:</p> <p>TF06 – this is closest Tamerton Foliot gets to a 'village green' – it is where the annual Carnival is held and should be preserved as it is;</p> <p>TF02 – appears to be part of Mary Deans School grounds and their sports field. It should remain so.</p> <p>TF07 - appears to be part of the grounds of Cann House and should be maintained as it is.</p> <p>TF08 – is land behind the development off of Tamerton Foliot Road at William Evans Close/Cheshire Drive – it is shaded by Cann Woods and the nature reserve. I would imagine there is little scope for development here.</p> <p>TF01 – this is currently farmland. I feel that housing development should be resisted. Access is a problem, particularly through Old Warleigh Lane which isn't suitable for traffic travelling in two directions at the same time.</p>		<p>TF01 – As stated previously, whilst I wouldn't like to see housing development here, it may be that alternative uses should not be ruled out e.g. its south facing attitude would be suited to PV panels as recently proposed.</p>	<p>Reference to specific questions posed on your map:</p> <p>A 'northern expansion' should be resisted as it goes against the existing conservation area status. See previous comments re alternative uses - e.g. PV arrays.</p> <p>Land in Whitleigh accessible via Riverside Walk put forward for residential development - this could only be of limited scale due to the narrowness of Riverside Walk as an access road.</p> <p>Land adjacent to Cann Lodge put forward for residential development - I am unaware of any reasons why this should not be allowed.</p> <p>The former Methodist Church is still shown on your map as a 'PW' - place of worship, but it is now in private hands.</p>	

		society; horticultural society; martial art club etc.							
Mr William Nicholson SNDPD42	Yes		very poor	youth facilities	TF07 and TF08 especially the green field between Cann Lodge and Cann Woods/Cann House Residential Home. If we carry on building on these sites wildlife will disappear and there will be no green lung.	All green areas around Tamerton Foliot should be protected from development	There are none	I think this site is very difficult to navigate and I have been unable to get a good view of the Cann Lodge area. My wife Margaret Nicholson of this address is of the same opinion as myself on these matters. I have received no pamphlet on this so called consultation. I only had it drawn to my attention when for once I bought the Herald newspaper. THIS IS NOT PUBLIC CONSULTATION.	
Mr. Tony Kirk SNDPD81	Yes		The conservation society generally feels that as there is a general store and a post office and a supermarket free bus visiting weekly, the village is well served.	Youth facilities could well be develops in the north of the area; we note that there is an existing community club and space in and around the old naval estate for open air provision. We are concerned that traffic, particularly at peak periods often uses Roborough Lane as a means of avoiding congestion on the Tavistock Road; this causes a constant stream of traffic through the village particularly at around 1700 to 1800. We are rather concerned that parking around the junction of WhitsonCross Lane and Horsham Lane adds to the difficulties.	TF07 we are opposed to the development of houses on the land adjacent to Cann House. This provides a "green belt" between the city and the village which should be retained. There is an established avenue of trees along the Tamerton Foliot Road and it is hard to see that this would not be prejudiced to some extent by such a development. We agree that development out into the countryside should be resisted in TF01 and TF04. We are concerned to see from the map that there are proposals in Whitleigh to locate executive housing adjoining TF09. The houses would be alongside the exisiting creek which affords a delightful recreational walking facility, well used by people of all ages. The area would be considerably downgraded as a facility, if indeed access were to remain at all. Many local people, myself included, decline to use Milford Lane when travelling to Whitleigh/West Park/St.Budeaux as we consider it dangerous to two-way traffic. We fear that a roadway through to connect with Riverside Walk could create for some drivers, a "rat run" between Whitleigh and Tamerton Foliot. We are mindful too that the proposed development area is hard by the Andy Stephens Nature Reserve, we fear that more housing might detract from		I comment here on transport, not being able to see where it might otherwise be accommodated. We appreciate that the local bus company is a private concern, but would comment that a twice hourly bus service with no service in the evening except sometimes at weekends, is much less that other parts of the city which are not nearly as remote as is Tamerton Foliot		

					the enjoyment of the Reserve.				
Neal Jillings SNDPD110	No	The summary seems to be leading towards a very restrictive policy approach towards future growth. Whilst it is true that landscape and topography are issues that require addressing it is not necessary to state that they limit development. The summary refers to the requirement for local employment, green spaces and accessible community facilities. In our view, these are more likely to be delivered if the issue of growth and development is looked at in the round. Allowing some residential development, subject to control over issues such as landscape impact and design for instance, will enable the delivery of some of the facilities that the community requires.	No comment	Community facilities, including playing pitches for the school, could be provided as part of an inclusive look at the development needs of the village. Provision of employment facilities mixed in with an appropriate amount of residential development is also much needed to address out commuting. An area of land could be set aside for a country park open to the general public. there is no 'order of importance' in my view as all elements of a successful growth strategy for the neighbourhood are equally important. Delivery of community benefits relies on the realisation of value via the planning system allowing higher value uses, such as housing.	This is a leading question aimed at eliciting negative responses towards currently undeveloped land being suitable for expansion.	No comment	We consider that the sympathetic development of TF01 (and possibly TF04) would allow delivery of the community benefits that are required.	As a key city in the South West Region, Plymouth is understandably expected to accommodate a relatively high number of dwellings to meet the identified need over the period 2006 to 2026. The Secretary of State's Proposed Changes to the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) increase the requirement from 24,500 to 33,000 over the twenty year time span of the RSS. This gives an annual requirement of dwellings, assuming the final RSS maintains the higher figure, of 1,650. Plymouth City Council's Annual Monitoring Report states that in the period 2006-2008, 2,120 dwellings were completed and also states that the short term outlook for completions is that they will tail off slightly. There are clearly significant allocations because of the City Council's sterling work in progressing the Local Development Framework. Nevertheless, the overriding requirement is for suitable, deliverable and available land to deliver the likely housing targets. Our client welcomes the opportunity to discuss the availability of his land as part of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. Following on from the recognition above about the 'top down' housing targets, Plymouth City Council has a clear vision for the future development of the City. This is unambiguously set out in the adopted Core Strategy, where Strategic Objective 1 highlights the need to deliver Plymouth's Strategic Role. Part of this objective will be accommodating high rates of growth to allow it to function as the economic hub of the far south west. This strategic objective also clearly highlights that part of the vision is to become a city of over 300,000 people. Supporting text refers to a range of 300,000 to 350,000 population, from a 2005 population of 246,000. I am sure that I am not highlighting anything that you do not know already, but I am referring to these demanding targets and aims to illustrate the point that some bold decision making will be required to deliver. Policy CS16 of the adopted Core Strategy sets out that priority will be given to development on previously developed land and refers to key areas within the city where development will be focussed. There are certain development hotspots, such as the city centre/waterfront and Derriford/northern corridor areas for instance, which are largely being dealt with through various Area Action Plans. However, with demanding targets there will need to be a spread of development throughout the city, linking in with existing communities. The Local Development Scheme highlights the fact that Sustainable Neighbourhoods Development Plan Document (including key site allocations) will be consulted on in the latter half of 2009, with an examination likely in 2011. This SHLAA submission is the first stage in the preparation of the LDF, particularly the Sustainable Neighbourhoods DPD, in alerting the City Council to the land's availability for development. There are clearly technical issues, referred to below, that will require addressing and we reserve the right to provide this information on highways and access etc, at the appropriate time. I do attach a landscape and visual impact assessment which is self explanatory. The land shown on the attached is located adjoining Tamerton Foliot. We note the City Council's sustainable neighbourhoods study on the settlement. This study systematically went through a number of issues and used a 'traffic light' system to indicate whether various objectives were realised. For instance, the	File Attached

							<p>existence of links with the public transport network is highlighted, but also that many residents choose to use the car, rather than public transport. It is also highlighted that residents have poor access to employment within the neighbourhood and the lack of access to private farmland is referred to. There are of course, many other issues, which will be addressed by further submissions in due course.</p> <p>The topography of the site is such that this is likely to be a key design issue. In our view, the landscape can be seen as both a constraint and as an opportunity. In terms of it being a constraint, any development will have to take the impact fully into account. However, as noted in the sustainable neighbourhoods study, the landscape is on the doorstep of local residents, but is not fully accessible, beyond any public footpaths that exist. Clearly, not all of the site is necessarily ripe for intensive development. However, significant areas of the land can be developed acceptably and we believe that this development would open up the opportunity of providing much improved public access to greenspace within and adjoining the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty for residents of the city as a whole. My submission makes reference to the possibility of a country park being delivered. I see this as an exciting opportunity for delivery of new green infrastructure outweighing any concerns there may be over landscape impact, which would be appropriately addressed in any event.</p> <p>One issue that is apparent in the sustainable neighbourhoods study for Tamerton Foliot is that the existing built form does not provide and appropriate mix in terms of social, built form and uses. Releasing part of the land shown on the attached provides an opportunity to redress these imbalances. Any residential development would need to form a truly mixed community with the suitable level of affordable housing and could include elements of small scale employment, including live/work units, to aid something the sustainable neighbourhoods study has highlighted as a particular deficiency.</p> <p>Highways issues will also be at the forefront in deciding on the suitability of the land for development. Development can, to some extent, increase the self containment, and thus the sustainability, of Tamerton Foliot. It can also provide the critical mass necessary to allow improved public transport.</p>	
Mr David Seaton PCL Planning Ltd SNDPD123							See attached.	File Attached
Ms Sue Wearne-Handforth SNDPD163	Yes		Shop facilities are limited and difficult for all to access to the steep gridlines of the main street.	Traffic and parking. The narrowing and winding roads and with much on-road parking poses dangers for all road users. Access to Mary Dean School is a nightmare (cul-de-sac housing estate)				
B Thorne SNDPD174	Yes		Post office provides a good	Traffic in Milford Lane causes noise and congestion	Riverside walk accessed land adjacent to creek - I run in		I feel that to develop the northern edge would impact greatly on the area. Many residents from Whitleigh and Southway walk along	

			local service		this area regularly and many residents enjoy the walk to the village from Badgers wood and Holy Park.			the creek and enjoy the views of green fields. Development would cause traffic congestion, pollution and noise and deprive residents of opportunities to walk in the countryside from their homes. Links between Tamerton Foliot and Whitleigh should be encouraged.	
Mr. Tony Kirk SNDPD327		<p>The first, concerns the 42 bus route. When I made my submission, previously, I was unaware of the proposal to divert the service up Dunnet Road and down Southway Drive and vice versa, making it similar in many respects to the previous 42A which operated intermittently. We feel that this would be retrograde; the service to the city is not fast, since it provides a link via the Derriford Hospital. We cannot see that more Tamerton folk will be encouraged onto public transport if the route becomes extended. Dunnet Road and Southway Drive are well and frequently served, by the 40 and 41 services.</p> <p>A major concern raised was the contribution to the consultation of ADG Architects Design Group who propose house building for South Hams DC in the triangle of land at the junctions of Allern Lane, Roborough Lane and Whitson Cross Lane. We feel this would destroy the appearance of the Devon lanes currently contained within typical hedgerows. We are also very concerned that S.Hams should be encouraging building right up to the city boundary, where the new residents would be principally using Plymouth facilities whilst making no contribution to the Council Tax of the city. A very real worry concerns the additional traffic that would be generated down through Whitsoncross Lane and Fore Street. There are real concerns at present, especially but not exclusively, in the morning and evening travel to work periods. Some drivers on the A386 use Roborough Lane to avoid the bottlenecks at and beyond the "Tesco"</p>							

		<p>roundabout. Particularly in the evening, there is a constant procession of vehicles passing through, but not to the area. The proposed development can only make this bad situation worse.</p> <p>I have used the S.Hams consultation email service to make my submission to them.</p>							
Mr & Mrs William & Margaret Nicholson SNDPD301	Yes	Facilities for youth , less pubs	<p>Poor- but small supermarket at Southway.</p> <p>Tamerton Foliot has well used post office which will hopefully stay.</p>	<p>youth facilities</p> <p>litter</p> <p>traffic speeding in Tamerton Foliot Road and noise.</p>	<p>TF8, 7, 9, and 5.</p> <p>They provide a green lung for the area and habitat for birds, animals etc.</p>	none	none	<p>Would not support building on TF08, 07, or 09</p> <p>Stop motorcycles entering Cann Woods. The nature reserve must be protected.</p> <p>Attempt to clear litter in Tamerton Foliot along Station Road.</p> <p>With owners permission attempt to open up walk /cycle path from Tamerton Foliot along Station Road over railway line, and to Lopwell Dam.</p> <p>Stop Parking on Pavements in the area.</p> <p>Create walkway along riverside from Tamerton Foliot to Tamar bridge.</p>	
Mr Richard Phillips SNDPD356				Lack of executive housing			TF9 and land besides it in Whitleigh would be an ideal site for executive housing.		