Mrs Burden & Mrs Wright,
CO Robert Young
Program Officer.

PLYMOUTH AND SOUTH WEST DEVON JOINT LOCAL PLAN 2014-2034 ID NO: 1002904

There has been further changes to the site TTV13 since the public consultation (EXC10B page204) and therefore I wish to put across the view of a resident of Kingsbridge and make sure that there is an understanding that the LPA’s plans for TTV13 site did not get good support from the town’s residents. This is the updated extract.

### Policy TTV13

#### The Quayside

Land at The Quayside is allocated for mixed-use re-development, including employment, commercial, residential and community uses. Provision is made for in the order of 100 new homes and 200 sq.m. of employment floorspace (Use Classes B1). Development should provide for the following:

1. **Delivery in accordance with a masterplan for the site that should be prepared and consulted upon in advance of the consideration of any planning application.**
2. **A high quality design for this estuary gateway site which reflects the quality and character of the South Devon AONB, conserves and enhances the character and provides for enhanced public realm and better connectivity for pedestrians and cyclists to the town centre and estuary.**
3. **Retention of appropriate levels of public car parking which is sensitively incorporated into the design of new development ensuring that car parking does not dominate the street scene.**
4. **Appropriate flood risk mitigation measures.**
5. **A site wide Sustainable Drainage Strategy to ensure that drainage requirements can be met on site without exacerbating water quality issues within the Salcombe to Kingsbridge SSSI and are designed to deliver landscape, biodiversity and amenity benefits.**
6. **Sufficient space to allow the retention of a tree canopy within and surrounding the site to conserve the green character of Kingsbridge in this area.**
7. **Investigation and remediation of contaminated land.**

---
Referring to the paragraphs.

1. This has been completed and the Master Plan consulted on did not go down well. By continuing with this in the JLP process, the LPA is ignoring the outcome of the consultation. It was rejected by the residents, the Kingsbridge Town Council & finally the South Hams District Council executive. 
   This process is complete and therefore the LPA should respect the outcome and remove the Quay Car Park area from the plan. The Planning Inspectors are being asked to confirm that the JL Plans legal compliance and are sound and yet the details have not been included in the public consultation procedure and there are no public detailed responses because it was not known what the LPA’s intentions were. Surely this will mean, as far as the TTV 13 plans are concerned, they will fail legal compliance. It cannot be correct that the general public are not given reasonable details of the LPA’s plans for the Kingsbridge Quay to enable them to question the proposed plans with regards to relevant law, NPPF or local planning documents and have independent inspection of their concerns. I as a member of the public, as have all members of the public, been denied the opportunity to be consulted on for this process because details were kept secret until after the consultations & until the JLP was submitted.

2. The LPA has a duty to conserve & enhance natural beauty and not character. It cannot enhance natural beauty by erecting buildings around the head of the estuary. Building on the quay will condemn the area to shadow and breezy corridors around the pedestrian area surrounding any buildings and reduce access to the general public to enjoy the estuary views.

3. The plans cause the loss of 57 parking places and therefore fail this aim.

4. Buildings would have to be constructed with a first floor level higher level than the current ground level of the area to comply with this aim.

5. It is not possible to design drainage to deliver landscape, biodiversity and amenity benefits when the buildings are alongside the water’s edge where flooding occurs. The LPA should demonstrate how they can achieve this aim.

6. Buildings will hide the current tree canopy as they will be positioned in front and obscure large areas of trees from many views. This aim is unachievable.

7. The Quay car park south of Tumbly Hill was filled in reclaimed land in 1965-1969 specifically to extend and increase town parking. It was not filled in with contaminated waste.

In light of these alterations, I wish to make further comments regarding TTV 13.
Kingsbridge TTV 13 site - Kingsbridge Quayside.

The Joint Local Plan has gone through its public consultation plan with the public with public consulted in August 2016, November 2016 and the final consultation March/April 2017. During this time the general public was kept in the dark about what the Local Planning Authority had in mind for this TTV 13 area with much secrecy. Therefore, there has been no real consultation in this Joint Local Plan for this area, only vague statements.

The LPA did not even produce a plan with the correct AONB boundary, as that was again vague, leaving out the quay area, which is in the AONB. (I note this has now been changed to a hatched area)

I have to admit, I was scratching my head as to where they intended to put all the housing proposed (100 houses).

It came with disbelief & astonishment when in July 2017, the LPA came out of the closet with their plans. That they would even present a plan with an eight storey building at the central area of the Quay, in the AONB that it has the duty to ‘conserve & enhance’ was unbelievable. I was not the only one to think this!

This would be in the foreground of the view as you stood at the head of the estuary.

Not for the first time, you have to question the competence of a Local Planning Authority. That it would allow an eight storey block in the AONB in a prominent location to be put out for a public consultation is quite extraordinary.

Not surprisingly, there was an outcry from local residents of disapproval of this ‘Master Plan’ and the reality was, it was ditched by Councillors because of the complete lack of public support for it.

Now, the planning authority have their usual ‘carry on regardless’, head on & not listen to the Kingsbridge residents (or the councillors, both South Hams & Kingsbridge).

Let’s be clear. This is our house. Why should outside planners come in and ruin our (the residents of Kingsbridge) house?

I have to state, that I find it insulting that the LPA considers calling it regeneration of the Quay area, as though the quay is a rundown. The head of the estuary was completely overhauled in 1993 and therefore, not ancient by any means. Through the brilliant efforts of some local residents who work hard at the Britain in Bloom event, Kingsbridge has been well recognised as an attractive town winning ‘Britain in Bloom’ Gold again this year.

The ‘Master Plan’ even suggested the removal of the Tourist Information Centre from its current location. Probably one of the best Tourist Information centres I have seen for appearance, built when the head of the Quay area was improved. Roads, bus station and quay square improvements completed in the winter of 92/93.
And so it is with dismay that the LPA has the audacity to tag on to the end of the JLP period, its intentions, despite an outcry of public opinion. It is even worse because they kept their plans completely secret for the public consultation periods of the JLP, the public have not been consulted with full knowledge of the LPA’s intention.

If placed in the plan in this way (tail end of plan period), it will appear that it was with the support of the general public at the construction stage of the plan, when in fact it was not supported.

It is therefore extremely important that you give this, what might look like, insignificant submission your full planning analysis & not let it slip under the radar. It is an extremely important location for Kingsbridge.

There follows some extracts of the eventually released master plan, with the survey responses of residents to illustrate the lack of support for development on the Quay car park.

It is important that it remains an open sunny site as possible and that everyone, young, old & the less able have easy & full access to the quayside area. Level areas are hard to find in Kingsbridge.

I do not believe that it fits well that in an area that is dependent on tourism & in an area that is supposed to be recognised as an ‘Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty’ that the Market Town of Kingsbridge Quay frontage is a suitable location for retail & housing projects especially when it protrudes into the estuary on the end of the slip way. Retail in this location will further degrade the already struggling town centre high street. The LPA appears hell bent on destroying the character of Kingsbridge by building in prominent locations with wide visual impacts and is not in line with the NPPF paragraphs 115 & 116, Government guidance or the CROW Act (2000). This is one of them. This is therefore not a sustainable or a sound plan.

Yours sincerely,
Mr L N Pengelly
Tourist Information today.

The new Tourist Information Centre and public open area (safe from the busy road) - 1993

Overleaf: The Master Plan extracts.
7. **Quay Car Park**

**Key Constraints**
- Quay Car Park has a high utilisation rate and brings in significant annual revenue to the council.
- Flood Zone 3 restricts residential development on ground floor and requires the need for escape routes.
- Existing mature trees within car park area and along quay edge (Tree Trail) present tree constraints. An arboricultural tree survey has been carried out to grade every tree in terms of species and condition.
- Proximity to water's edge could result in direct impacts to the intertidal habitats (SSSI & LNR) and quay wall, as well as disturbance impacts to species using the waterbody. Further intertidal surveys, sediment sampling and surveys for otter and wintering waterfowl may be required. Mature trees provide habitat for roosting and commuting bats.

- A ground investigation survey has highlighted that any buildings will require piled foundations.
- Possible ground contamination. Requires further investigation prior to development.
- Fair week uses a significant part of the car park area on an annual basis (but potential to locate some uses off-site - e.g. accommodation).
- Existing skate park provision (however underutilised)
- Existing covenant to ensure that navigation remains unaffected by any quayside development.
- Existing Public Right of Way (PRoW) runs along the western edge of the Quay Car Park linking the Leisure Centre with the bottom of Tumblin Hill.

**Key Opportunities**
- Potential for mixed use redevelopment delivering quayside residential properties and commercial units. Potential for proximity to waterfront to maximise development value.
- Existing waterfront is poorly utilised - potential to improve the quayside public realm and maximise value of waterfront.
- Potential to reallocate some parking to alternative town centre car parks.

---

8. **Slipway**

**Key Constraints**
- Slipway in poor condition and not suitable to cater for all types of boat launching.
- Existing mature trees adjacent present tree constraints.
- Proximity to quay could result in direct impacts to the intertidal habitats (SSSI & LNR) and quay wall, as well as disturbance impacts to species using the waterbody. Further intertidal surveys, sediment sampling and surveys for otter and wintering birds may be required.

**Key Opportunities**
- Potential to improve slipway through width reduction and steepening.

---

**Car Parks:**

Car parks in Kingsbridge have a range of utilisation, which peaks at 102%, and dips at 43%. The Fore street and Quay car parks both experience a high level of utilisation, presumably due to their location and attractiveness to patrons.

Overall, parking in Kingsbridge is has utilisation in excess of 65% in a few months of the year. This indicates that a loss of car parking would need to be managed through the provision of an active management system and or provision of additional parking.

There are instances where popular car parks experience over 100% utilisation, this is due to the methodology not accounting for those that do not stay for the duration of their parking ticket.

The level by which a management system would better manage the parking to maximise parking opportunities and the need for additional parking will need to be assessed against the preferred masterplan option. However, based on the spare capacity it is likely that additional parking capacity will be required, in addition to the parking requirement needed to serve the development.
3.10 Landscape and Visual Appraisal

A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment will be key to understanding the impact that any potential development on the quay could have to the surrounding environment.

Work has undertaken to collate the necessary baseline data to better inform any future planning application. The initial appraisal was undertaken in accordance with the Landscape Institute’s Guidance for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment; but does not comprise a full Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment. The illustrative Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) is based upon the appraisal of a 24m and so represents a worst case visual impact. Lower building heights would result in a reduced visual envelope.

Views of the potential development on Kingsbridge Quay are tightly constrained by the local terrain. A 24m high development would be visible within the locality of the quay, from the west on rising ground towards West Alvington, from the countryside to the north, and south along the estuary. Site visits have confirmed that locations from outside the ZTV, within the South Devon Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), have no visibility of the quay. In addition, there is limited visibility of the quay from areas within the ZTV to the north and west, due in part to the lack of public access, together with hedgebanks, woodland and existing buildings which screen views of the quay and are not taken account of within the ZTV model.

Any development would be seen in the context of the existing built form of Kingsbridge from these southern vantage points.

Overall the proposed development is within the urban context of Kingsbridge and the initial analysis has shown that visibility from the surrounding countryside is very constrained. The most significant visual effect is likely to be in near views where there would be a change in the character of the quayside.

Good design will play a significant part in ensuring that any new development reads as part of the urban form and responds well to its context. It terms of design mitigation, the materials and fenestration of the proposed buildings will be carefully considered in order to alleviate any potential negative visual effects. This would include the design of lighting in order to minimise any negative visual impacts at night and in order that the development reads as part of the local urban form.

Note: This twitter content is not from the Master Plan Document.

A 24 metre high building on the Quay Car Park outlined!!

Katy Bowen @DrKatyBowen - Jul 7
Unbelievable that @SouthHams_DC would consider such a grotesque plan?
kingsbridge-today.co.uk/article.cfm?id... #Kingsbridge #Torquay #Brixham #Devon #CPRE

![Image of Kingsbridge Quay](Image)
TIC could be relocated

Public realm improvements to Town Square

New café with deck seating

Quay wall improvements

Ferry turning space maintained

Improved harbourside public realm and circular promenade

Improved pedestrian link at Tumbly Hill

Mixed-use development including residential & commercial and associated parking provision

Boat access maintained

Potential launch platform/pontoon and additional moorings

Potential pedestrian pontoon

Development opportunity at prominent location at the end of the quay
5.1 Stakeholder Consultation

An initial stakeholder workshop event was held on 14th September 2016 inviting key stakeholders to input and comment upon key site constraints and opportunities for development options for the K2 development site.

Attendees comprised Local and District Councillors and representatives from:
- Kingsbridge Town Council,
- South Hams District Council,
- Salcombe Harbour Master,
- Devon County Council,
- South Devon AONB,
- Natural England,
- Environment Agency, and
- South West Water.

The attendees were asked to sit in groups to focus on key topic areas: Place & Public Realm, Access & Parking, and Estuary, Flooding & Drainage. The discussion was then focussed initially on ‘site issues & constraints’ and then on ‘Ideas and Opportunities’.

Key Issues and Opportunities raised included:
- Consideration of the identity of Kingsbridge and the importance of the town to attract tourists, as well as provide for the local community.
- Potential for waterfront to become a key asset for the town – not the best place for a car park.
- Need to consider wider benefits to the whole town.
- Potential to enhance the Town Square and improve connectivity between Fore Street and the Town Square/Quayside.
- Potential to improve the Quayside, including a potential promenade/circular walk.
- Importance of the landscape context and views from to the AONB.
- Potential to enhance leisure and maritime activities and provide more activity on the water.
- Flood issues.
- Desire to retain car parking levels and improve legibility of signage to car parks to encourage use of other car parks.
- Importance of parking pricing to encourage use of other car parks.
- Importance of existing trees (although some of these block views to the estuary) and the SSSI/wildlife.
- New development should reflect the character of Kingsbridge and enhance the evening economy.
- Use peripheral sites to provide housing, and focus other activities on the waterfront.

5.2 Kingsbridge Town Council Consultation

A series of workshops and meetings were held with Kingsbridge Town Council’s Working Group to ensure that the masterplan options reflected the needs of the town and considered local issues and priorities.

In addition to attendance at the stakeholder workshops, Kingsbridge Town Council were consulted on various occasions by SHDC and were participants of a design workshop which took place on 27th April to develop concept ideas and improvement principles for Market Square, town connectivity and highways.

Kingsbridge Town Council also held their own public open forum meeting on the 3rd July 2017 within the public consultation period to discuss potential development at the Quayside as proposed by the public consultation information.

Kingsbridge Town Council provided the following summary in response to the proposals detailed within the Kingsbridge Quayside public consultation:
- Kingsbridge Town Council do not support the development as it stands.
- Greater community engagement is required within Kingsbridge for the whole scheme. No further action should be contemplated beforehand. The rapid pace to progress is not understood nor beneficial.
- There should be no residential development within Areas 1 and 2 and no open market housing within the whole scheme.
- Areas 3 and 4 should be an independent project for affordable and community housing. This should be addressed as a priority given Kingsbridge’s need. We formally ask that if this is not likely to happen then that land be given to Kingsbridge Town Council to allow us to develop truly affordable and community homes.
- The online questionnaire still presents leading questions, does not actually work in places and the deadline was too tight.
- SHDC should be aware of Pell Frischmann’s Kingsbridge Catchment Study (anticipated completion September 2017) which will identify the town’s flood risk.
Consultation Results

A summary of the consultation responses, with representative samples from the consultation feedback, is set out on the following pages:

- The highway and infrastructure improvement opportunities identified in Area 1, in conjunction with Town Council, were not well supported, with a general feeling of “it ain’t broke, so don’t fix it.”
- Improvements and repairs to the quayside walls were seen as a priority in terms of infrastructure improvements.
- Resistance to any development on the quay and if any it should be at a scale that is not out of place with Kingsbridge.
- Strong disagreement that the consulted concept achieved the right balance between development and retention of car parking. The consulted scheme indicates a net loss of 57 spaces but with the provision of investment in improved signage and car park management.
- Strong agreement that the scheme should prioritise provision of affordable housing for the local community.
- Some recognition that development of Kingsbridge quayside is needed to support costs of improvements to public realm and provision of affordable housing.
- There was little support for a walkway or bridge across the end of the Quay. Anecdotally, there was support for an increase in mooring provision for boat owners and anything that improved water access and utilisation.

Q3. What activities could be provided on the quay to create a more attractive place for local people and visitors to Kingsbridge? (Please tick your top 3 choices)

- Improvements to the Quayside Walk (casing, paving, artworks etc)
- Facilities to support water-based activities (e.g. slipway, moorings etc)
- Opportunities for pop-up kiosks (ice cream kiosks, etc)
- Cafes/Restaurants
- Attractive architecture
- Parking

Q7. Do you think that the proposals achieve the right balance between development and improvements and retention of car parking within the town centre?

- Yes: 19.97%
- No: 80.03%

Q8. Do you in principle, support the development of Kingsbridge Quayside recognising that some development would be needed to support the cost of improvements to public realm and provision of affordable homes?

- Yes: 35.41%
- No: 64.59%