

## 16. Issues and Options responses to: Cross Border Issues (Sherford and Minerals)

**Table 16: Summary of responses to Cross Border Issues (Sherford and Minerals) Issues and Options**

Number expressing concern	1297
Number expressing support	10
Number of other comments	40
<b>Total</b>	<b>1347</b>

### 16.1. Comments in support of the proposals

- 16.1.1. The Enquiry by Design has provided an ideal location for future growth back into the city. The Country Park is commendable and a far-sighted idea. However, it would appear sensible to delay work on Sherford until Plymouth's redevelopment is completed, or there could be a risk of competition for investment.
- 16.1.2. There is a need for provision of housing in the area, but must address needs of community. Plymouth can have very little influence, however, the proposal is imaginative and appears to provide some amenity/facility to satisfy the needs of the immediate community.
- 16.1.3. The proposed location is sustainable if it remains south of the Ridge Road. The principle of a new town in the South Hams was to create a sustainable high quality and independent community as an urban extension to Plymouth?
- 16.1.4. The Environment Agency supports the principle of the creation of a high quality, sustainable community in this area, and agrees with the issues PCC have raised regarding safeguarding the countryside and making better use of the countryside and greenscape for recreation and public enjoyment.
- 16.1.5. The South West Regional Assembly welcomes the approach adopted to explore cross-boundary issues. The idea of a joint Area Action Plan between South Hams District Council and Plymouth City Council for the Sherford allocation is endorsed.
- 16.1.6. SHARD supports the extension of the Country Park to the north of Elburton. The location agreed at the Enquiry by Design should not be changed. Plympton's traffic concerns can be overcome by closing Plympton Hill to through traffic.

### 16.2. Concerns raised

- 16.2.1. There are concerns about the location of the Sherford Valley development, as traffic congestion is already a problem. A pre-printed letter was circulated by the Plympton Community Council News, which raised the following concerns about the proposals:

1. "Proposed location squashed against the A38 nearest Plympton is unsustainable, contrary to South Hams First Deposit local Plan and the Devon Structure Plan.
2. The proposed development site will have unacceptable traffic implications for Plympton generally and Plympton St. Maurice in particular.
3. The principle of a new town in the South Hams was to create a sustainable, high quality and independent community not an urban extension to Plymouth.
4. The assumption that all future growth for this area of the South Hams should be on green field sites adjoining Sherford and within the City boundary.
5. The proposed Haye Road site is an inappropriate location for a park and ride serving the A379.
6. No proposals being made to separate industrial heavy goods traffic to Language from local Plympton commuters at Chaddlewood."

The letter was signed and sent in by 1 226 people.

- 16.2.2. Elburton Villa Football Club has organised a petition against the proposed interchange at Haye Road, as it would be a travesty to lose this sporting facility for the teams, and the community as a whole. The petition was signed by 7 385 people.
- 16.2.3. Elburton & Plymstock Independent Communities Ltd organised a petition which was signed by 177 householders against the relocation of the Sherford proposal, and the potential loss of King Georges Field and Elburton Villa football pitches.
- 16.2.4. Concern about sewage problems.
- 16.2.5. SHARD comments that the concerns from groups in Plympton are understandable, as they were excluded from the core sessions of the Enquiry by Design process. There is a lesson about genuine community involvement for the future.
- 16.2.6. The proposals for a road linking the Sherford development with Haye Road and a Park and Ride facility are contrary to the commitments given by the Council not to disturb recreational, green and community land.
- 16.2.7. Concerns about the effects of development at Sherford and Blue Circle Quarry on the Laira Bridge approach into the city. Also concerns about additional traffic at Elburton.
- 16.2.8. The Sherford site is unsuitable for dense housing as it is close to high ground.
- 16.2.9. Concern that comments submitted to SHDC have been ignored.
- 16.2.10. King George's playing field and Elburton Villa FC are the kind of things the community wants - a place for teenagers to go to. There is no reason for a Park & Ride, as there are two bus stops on Elburton Road.
- 16.2.11. Removing King George's Fields would increase the number of youths with nothing to do. Boundaries have changed and the infrastructure would not cope.
- 16.2.12. Concern about the loss of Elburton Villa FC.
- 16.2.13. Preference for original location, it will be difficult for Plympton and Plymstock to retain discrete identities.

- 16.2.14. A characteristic of all modern housing is the way that developers insist on clearing the site of all hedgerows and trees. Sherford development will best safeguard the countryside if laid out along the Sherford valley as originally proposed.
- 16.2.15. Radford and Hooe Lake Preservation Association question the need for housing on such a large scale. Suitable infrastructure will be needed. Existing countryside would be better left as farmland with an open aspect.
- 16.2.16. Concern about concept of a new town in this area. Plympton's existing problems have not been addressed.
- 16.2.17. Concerns about the need to safeguard the special character of Plympton St. Maurice. There are two main problems: the use of Bullers Hill as a means of accessing Plympton or Langage; and traffic and noise pollution affecting a designated conservation area.
- 16.2.18. Plymouth should not get involved with South Hams; South Hams should solve its own problems.
- 16.2.19. Concern that the proposal for development of Sherford has been expressed as though there was no alternative to creating a 4500 dwelling town on a greenfield site by 2016.
- 16.2.20. Concern about the burden on doctors and dentists.

### **16.3. Other comments**

- 16.3.1. Elburton South sewage pumping station is not being operated within the parameters set by its discharge consent.
- 16.3.2. Need for a new primary school and additional sports facilities.
- 16.3.3. The deed for King George's playing fields refers to it being held as a playing field forever.
- 16.3.4. It is essential that the Sherford development does not eventually sprawl to cover the whole of the green area outside the Elburton boundary. Whatever transport infrastructure is put into place will not solve the surge in traffic from Sherford.
- 16.3.5. The pony field next to Dunstone Wood should be kept as it is and not developed on.
- 16.3.6. Allotment tenants could become more vulnerable. Proposals could have been made more accessible to the public.
- 16.3.7. Appears that little thought has been given to the road improvements necessary to carry the extra traffic that 5000 additional homes will generate.
- 16.3.8. Lack of any obvious solutions to transport problems. Either reconsider transport proposals, or put forward a plan which is realistic.
- 16.3.9. Derriford Hospital would be unable to cope with additional patients. It will only take a further small development to join Plympton, Plymstock and Elburton into one urban conurbation. Please reconsider the design and siting.
- 16.3.10. Development could be further towards Brownston, Bickham Bridge, Loddiswell area. Must keep green belt. Services are already overloaded i.e. sewage disposal, hospital. Affordable housing should be for local people

only - a residency qualification could be introduced. The proposed Park & Ride is in a poor position.

- 16.3.11. Buses must reach city centre, Langage and Seaton/Derriford area. Need to be faster than a car to persuade people to use them.
- 16.3.12. PCC should have an input at all stages. Transport issues regarding the A379 and Laira Bridge must be resolved. An area of land must be ring fenced for sport/recreation at the Blue Circle site. Plymstock must retain own public services. No 'finishing off' around Elburton.
- 16.3.13. Churches Together in Devon wishes to encourage PCC to adopt a similar approach to partnership working, as has been the case hitherto in relation to Sherford, and to include Churches Together in Devon in its list of potential service providers.
- 16.3.14. The Conservative Group Forum has concerns relating to development's location next to the A38. There is poor transport infrastructure and inadequate plans to address the issue. PCC should seek a significant contribution from the Sherford development to finance the transport infrastructure improvements required. The people of Plymouth should not be burdened with the cost. The Forum is also concerned about a Park and Ride facility being built on Villa Football Club land. There needs to be clear green space separating new developments and existing urban areas. They also have concerns about development in Plympton St. Maurice. There is no discussion of proposed power station at Langage, considering the vast repercussions it would seem sensible to consult on the power station proposals at this stage.
- 16.3.15. Sport England notes that a planned approach to the provision of facilities and opportunities for sport is necessary in order to ensure the sport and recreational needs of local communities are met.
- 16.3.16. Plymstock Community Forum is concerned that the impact of the development on current residents has received insufficient attention.
- 16.3.17. Plympton St. Maurice Civic Association is concerned that a response is called for before any concrete proposals are made indicating how the character of the Conservation Area will be safeguarded. The Association is willing to work with the City to discuss implementation of policy. It is also concerned about the lack of a joint plan with South Hams to coordinate a new large and significant settlement.
- 16.3.18. The Showmen's Guild of Great Britain requests that the preparation of the LDF takes into account the accommodation needs of Showpeople's sites.
- 16.3.19. Limosa Farms Ltd comments that any further development is unsustainable, due to inadequate sewage treatment facilities. Pollution problems are reaching a level in the river Yealm such that the existing shellfish beds at Fox Cove are threatened, and have been downgraded by the Food Standards Agency.
- 16.3.20. Plymouth Chamber of Commerce and Industry supports the broad thrust of the options set out. However, the lack of spatial expression leaves too much to trust and this should be addressed. They welcome joint working with SHDC, but caution that the proposals have the potential to clog the A38 and siphon off investment from the city centre. The need for, and delivery of, new infrastructure needs to be explored and made explicit.

- 16.3.21. DS Smith Plc notes that the area is no longer suitable for their type of industrial operation. The area could be reclassified for housing, which would facilitate their move locally and allow them to invest in the company's future.
- 16.3.22. Red Tree LLP comments that it is unfortunate that the document does not make it clear that PCC and SHDC have agreed to prepare a joint AAP. They are pleased that PCC endorses the Enquiry by Design solution, but believe that an opportunity has been lost to explain why it is located where it is. No clarity of purpose is provided for a green space link. Transport issues need to be coordinated.
- 16.3.23. The East End Partnership comments that new housing and other development at Sherford will exacerbate the existing traffic problems in the East End and welcomes measures, via the Eastern Corridor exercise, to alleviate negative impacts. Development at Sherford should incorporate planning obligations that can be used to alleviate worsened traffic problems in the East End.