

Chapter 15 – Transport and accessibility

15.1 Introductory text

No objections have been specifically coded against the introductory text, but I wish to take this opportunity to draw the Council's attention to a typographical error in the last word on the 14th line of paragraph 15.36.

15.2 Policy TS (D T1) - Land Use Transportation Strategy

Several of the representations which have been coded against this policy, or its DV equivalent, put forward new proposals for such matters as the provision of a light rail system in the Bay; the banning of cars from Union Street, Torquay; the need to move Torquay's coach station next to the rail station; and the introduction of a new policy dealing with General Aviation. However, in line with my comments and recommendations in earlier Chapters, I consider that such matters are not appropriate within a strategy policy, which should serve the purpose of setting the scene for the topic in question. Because of this I have not dealt with these objections here, but rather under the appropriate existing policies, or in separate sections at the end of this chapter.

15.2.1 Objections

Refer to Appendix 15.a for details of objections

15.2.2 Issues

- a) Whether the policy accords with Government guidance on sustainable transport;
- b) the effect of traffic calming schemes on emergency services' response times;
- c) other minor matters.

15.2.3 Conclusions

Issue a

1. This policy and its DV equivalent attracted a number of objections, both from organisations and individuals (2933, 2890, 2885, 2888, 2899, 2901), on the grounds that the overall transport strategy has an 'anti-car' thrust. These objectors contend, amongst other matters, that Torbay is too hilly for walking and cycling to be effective modes of transport, especially as it has a large, elderly population, and that as public transport is infrequent, very expensive and uncomfortable, the car is therefore the only practicable means of transport. They suggest that the transport strategy should encourage motorists by the provision of good quality roads and high quality parking facilities, with reduced parking charges, otherwise shoppers and tourists will just go elsewhere.

2. A contrary view is taken by other objectors (7844, 7814, 7799), and particularly Friends of the Earth (*FotE* – 2808), who contend that the DV policy is not sustainable as it is much too car orientated. However I consider that many of the objections, which include such matters as the need for the strategy to seek to reduce car use and encourage better management of traffic; the need to make the transport system properly integrated; and the fact that the policy does not relate to the land use context, have been satisfactorily addressed by the changes made at RD stage, coupled with the PFCs.

3. As a result I share the Council's view that the transport strategy is not anti-car, but rather is seeking to follow the Government's sustainable transport agenda outlined in such documents as the Transport White Paper (*A New Deal For Transport: Better for Everyone*), The Ten Year Transport Plan and PPG 13 (*CD/8/11*). This latter document makes it clear, in its first paragraph, that although our quality of life depends on transport and easy access to jobs, shopping, leisure facilities and services, the way in which we travel, and the continued growth in road traffic, is damaging our towns, harming our countryside and contributing to global warming. The guidance goes on to point out that land use planning has a key role in delivering the Government's integrated transport strategy. By shaping the pattern of development and influencing the location, scale, density, design and mix of land uses, PPG 13 explains that planning can help to reduce the need to travel, reduce the length of journeys and make it safer and easier for people to access jobs, shopping, leisure facilities and services by public transport, walking and cycling.

4. Although parts of the Torbay area are, indeed, hilly and a relatively high proportion of elderly people live within the District, these do not constitute sound reasons why Government guidance should be ignored. In my opinion it is vitally important that the nature of integrated transport, as promoted by the Government, is fully understood. It does not mean, as mentioned by some objectors (2890), that a Docklands-style light rail system should be considered for Torbay. Paragraph 2 of PPG 13 explains that in order to secure mobility in a way that supports sustainable development there needs to be integration within and between different types of transport; with policies for the environment; with land use planning; and with policies for education, health and wealth creation.

5. This means that policies must be pursued which promote more sustainable transport choices both for people and for moving freight; promote accessibility to jobs, shopping, leisure facilities and services by public transport, walking and cycling; and reduce the need to travel, especially by car. Having said this, it is clear that the car will still have an important role to play. Indeed for many journeys, particularly in rural areas, it will remain the only real option for travel. However, much of Torbay is urban or suburban in nature and in my opinion there is considerable scope for many journeys, especially the shorter ones under 2km, to be undertaken by modes other than the private car, as long as there is a realistic choice of alternatives. In my opinion this is what policy TS seeks to achieve.

6. I generally support the changes made to the policy and introductory and explanatory text at RDV stage, although I share GOSW's (7652) view that there should be an explicit reference to reducing the need to travel by private car. The Council have addressed this matter and GOSW's concern about the wording of criterion 1 in PFCs 15/1 and 15/2. I shall recommend these PFCs, but as the White Paper recognised that mopeds and motorcycles can provide an alternative to the car for some journeys, particularly where public transport is limited and walking unrealistic, I shall amend the wording of re-introduced criterion 2.

7. It is a fact that not all the points raised by FotE have been taken on board by the Council. For example they sought a Private Motor Traffic Reduction target to underpin the whole of the Transport Chapter and contended that any strategy which places emphasis on proposals to improve the primary road network is simply unsustainable. However it is my view that as now amended (including PFCs 15/1 and 15/2), the strategy proposed by policy TS provides a clear land use framework against which transport proposals, and more detailed implementation matters, can be assessed. In this regard I am mindful of the fact that many of the matters mentioned in the representations, such as public transport operation and car parking charges, are not land use considerations and cannot, therefore be controlled through

the Local Plan. This is of course, where the Local Transport Plan (*CD/32/1*) comes into its own. The essential need for integration between the Local Plan and the Local Transport Plan is highlighted in paragraph 6 of PPG 13 and acknowledged by the Council in the introductory text to the 'Transport and accessibility' Chapter. Together, I consider that these two documents provide a sound basis for the promotion of sustainable and integrated transport in the area.

Issue b

8. The Devon Fire & Rescue Service (*DFRS – 2840*) commented that the present day volumes of traffic are such that the attendance of the fire service to an incident can be delayed, especially when the influx of visitors increases the levels of traffic. Accordingly it offered its support to any transport measures that can be implemented to manage the growth of traffic, but expressed concern that traffic calming measures incorporated in future developments could well compromise its ability to meet Home Office response time standards. Indiscriminate parking is also cited as another factor which could well affect response times.

9. However, traffic calming schemes have a number of purposes (discussed in paragraphs 64 to 69 of PPG 13), including to reduce the environmental impact of transport schemes and improve road safety and environmental conditions. These all form important elements of a balanced transport strategy, and accordingly are covered by a criterion of this policy. Moreover, the DFRS is not opposed to such measures, but is simply concerned that the existing procedures for consultation continue, in order to ensure that, as far as possible, solutions proposed to deal with identified difficulties are acceptable to all concerned parties. In view of this I see no need to recommend any modifications to policy TS.

Issue c

10. Stoke Gabriel Parish Council (*7835*) have objected to this policy, citing paragraphs 15.31 and 15.34 and contending that there would be overwhelming traffic problems. However, no further details have been provided, nor have any requested amendments been put forward. In my opinion this objection therefore provides an insufficient basis for recommending amendments to the policy. Similar comments apply to other individual objectors, (*2902, 2590*), who object to the general traffic situation along the western corridor route, and traffic problems associated with new housing proposals at Collaton St Mary, but provide no meaningful suggestions as to how they would wish to see this policy to be amended.

11. In response to the Countryside Agency's (*2836*) contention that the policy doesn't address the transport needs of rural communities, I share the Council's view that the predominantly urban and suburban nature of much of Torbay means that this matter does not warrant specific mention. Nevertheless, I consider that the RDV policy, as proposed to be amended by PFCs 15/1 and 15/2, includes criteria which are equally applicable to rural areas.

12. Finally, I have noted the concerns expressed by the RSPB (*2828*) that the policy is unclear regarding the relationship between environmental and economic factors, and its fears that this could result in economic pressures leading to transport systems which have adverse impacts upon the environment. As the Council have said, however, there are a number of considerations which have to be balanced when any planning decision is taken, and I share their view that the latest version of the policy enables all such considerations to be assessed in a fair and satisfactory way.

15.2.4 Recommendation

15.01 Modify policy TS, generally in line with PFCs 15/1 and 15/2, such that it reads:

‘Land use transportation strategy

A sustainable land use transportation strategy will be promoted which will:

- 1. reduce the environmental impact of transport systems;**
- 2. reduce the need to travel by private car;**
- 3. encourage sustainable alternatives to the private car and make provision for the needs of non-car users;**
- 4. improve road safety and ameliorate the environmental effects of traffic on communities;**
- 5. improve Torbay's economic competitiveness;**
- 6. improve public transport;**
- 7. improve service and goods access, particularly to town centres;**
- 8. improve accessibility for all sections of the community; and**
- 9. restrict new road construction to essential access and to schemes which can demonstrate significant environmental, safety or economic benefits.**

15.3 Policy T1 (D T32) – Development accessibility

15.3.1 Objections

- D/7297/4173/7758/T32/0 - Cavanna Homes Limited*
D/2828/4128/7195/T32/0 - RSPB
D/2959/4404/8571/T32/0 - Brixham Amenity Society & Residents' Association

15.3.2 Issues

- a) Whether alternative means of access need to be in place before the policy is adopted;
- b) the effect of this policy on proposals for employment development at Long Road South, Paignton.

15.3.3 Conclusions

Issue a

1. Cavanna Homes gave general support to the underlying objective behind this policy, but contended that it should be preceded by the provision of alternative means of transport so that such alternatives are available for future employees or users of the development. It further maintained that equivalent policies in other local authority areas are likely to be less prescriptive and negative, with the overall result that implementation of the policy would be likely to inhibit inward investments to Torbay. A contrary view is expressed by RSPB (2828), who consider that the threshold for access by foot, cycle and public transport is set too low at 50%, and should be increased to 75%.

2. I support this policy, with my only concern being that no reasoned justification has been given for the choice of a target figure of 50%. There is no doubt, however, that the objectives of this policy are consistent with the Regional Transport Strategy (*RTrS – see CD/5/2*), PPG 13 (*CD/8/11*) and the Local Transport Plan (*CD/23/2*), all of which contain policies or

objectives to increase accessibility by modes of travel other than the private car. Because of this I do not share Cavanna's view that equivalent policies elsewhere within the region are likely to be significantly different. All local authorities within the south-west will have to have regard to the same regional guidance and, of course, all authorities throughout the country are required to take the PPG 13 guidance on board.

3. Furthermore I do not agree with Cavanna that alternative transport provision should precede adoption of the policy. Indeed it is through the operation of the policy and the requirement for prospective development to take accessibility issues on board both prior to development by means of locational considerations, and after development through Company Transport Plans, that real moves towards genuine modal choice will be made.

4. In my opinion the Council are right to grasp the nettle on this matter because unless there are clear guidelines to potential developers, it is likely that little effort will be put into achieving more transport choice and therefore more sustainable development. The first choice for the location of development is therefore on sites which are already potentially accessible by a range of transport alternatives, notably walking, cycling and public transport. These principles have already been taken on board by the Council's allocation of specific sites for housing and employment, amongst other uses, as discussed elsewhere in this report. But sites which have not already been identified may still be suitable for development, if they comply with the requirements of this policy, including the preparation of Company Transport Plans where appropriate.

5. Paragraph 15.51 elaborates on the policy reference to Company Transport Plans, and points out that further details of the requirements of such plans can be found both in the Environmental Guide and in PPG 13. However, I consider that some clarification of what the policy means by 'larger sites' should be contained within the policy's explanatory text. This could be achieved by duplicating paragraph 8.7 from the Environmental Guide. Furthermore, as paragraphs such as 15.1, 15.29 and 15.30 emphasise the importance of integration of the Local Plan with the Local Transport Plan, and as strategy S2.6 of this latter document specifically relates to new development and Company Transport Plans, I consider that this fact should also be recognised in the explanatory text, possibly in paragraph 15.51.

Issue b

6. The Brixham Amenity Society & Residents' Association (2959), have stated that implementation of this policy would make the achievement of proposal D E7.19 (*Long Road South*) impossible. However, no further details have been submitted and I am uncertain what the objectors' specific concerns are. In view of this I consider that no modifications are necessary to this policy to address this objection.

15.3.4 Recommendations

15.02 Make no modification to policy T1.

15.03 End paragraph 15.51 after the word 'effectiveness' in line 20, and move the remaining text of that paragraph to the end of a new paragraph 15.52.

15.04 Begin the new paragraph 15.52 with the following, taken from paragraph 8.7 of the Environmental Guide:

‘All major non-residential development will be required to implement Company Transport Plans. This will include all major retail units, office and industrial units over 350m² ground floor area (gfa), hotels and holiday development with more than 15 bed spaces, leisure development of more than 250m² together with any other non-residential development requiring more than 10 parking spaces. In certain critical locations, smaller commercial development may also be included in these requirements, particularly where there is concern about the cumulative impact of a large number of small sites.’

15.05 Renumber existing paragraph 15.52 accordingly.

15.4 Policy T2 (D T2) – Transport hierarchy

15.4.1 Objections

<i>D/7844/4419/8594/T2/0</i>	- <i>Galampton Residents' Association</i>
<i>D/7799/4279/8157/T2/0</i>	- <i>Ms E Donovan</i>
<i>D/7799/4279/8158/T2/0</i>	- <i>Ms E Donovan</i>
<i>D/2808/5000/6676/T2/0</i>	- <i>Friends of the Earth, Torbay</i>
<i>D/2899/4297/8203/T2/0</i>	- <i>The Black Tulip, Licensed Restaurant</i>

15.4.2 Issue

Whether the policy is too anti-car, or whether it should be made even more restrictive.

15.4.3 Conclusions

1. Conflicting views were expressed about this policy with some objectors contending that it represented too much of an ‘anti-car’ stance (2899), whilst others took the view that it was not restrictive or robust enough in its attempt to discourage car use (7844, 7799, 2808). However, it seems to me that the policy has been drawn up with both national and regional guidance very much in mind. Indeed policy TRAN 10 in the RTrS (CD/5/2) states that local authorities, transport operators and other agencies should have regard to the sustainable transport hierarchy, giving priority to walking, cycling and public transport.

2. In my opinion the key to achieving a more sustainable pattern of transport is the changing of travel habits by the operation of a hierarchy such as this - not just in connection with new development but for all journeys. This point is made clear in paragraph 2.46 of the Transport White Paper, which states that using the car less is not as impossible as some think it is. It goes on to say that nearly 75% of all journeys are under 5 miles and 45% are less than 2 miles. Although many people could walk or cycle these short distances, or catch a bus, cars are used increasingly with a quarter of all car journeys now being under 2 miles in length.

3. I have already acknowledged, in the earlier section dealing with policy TS, that there are some journeys for which the car offers the only realistic option. Because of this I consider that the policy does not need to be made more restrictive. But even allowing for the hilly nature of much of Torbay, it is my view that there is significant scope for shorter journeys to be made by modes of travel other than the private car. This policy, which I recommend, will help to achieve a greater awareness of the need to move to more sustainable modes of transport, by highlighting this issue for all new development proposals.

15.4.4 Recommendation

15.06 Make no modifications to policy T2

15.5 Policy T3 (D T3) – Pedestrian routes

15.5.1 Objections

RD/7652/0001/9940/T3/ - Government Office for the South West*

RD/7251/0025/10046/T3/ - The Ramblers' Association*

D/7652/4048/9517/T3/0 - Government Office for the South West

D/2808/5000/6721/T3/0 - Friends of the Earth, Torbay

15.5.2 Issue

Whether there is a need for the policy.

15.5.3 Conclusions

4. DV policies T3 and T4 dealt with pedestrian routes and the protection of public rights of way respectively. Friends of the Earth objected to policy T3 on the grounds that it should be more proactive in seeking out pedestrian routes, and both policies were subject to objections from GOSW who stated that the policies appeared to duplicate highway law and should therefore be deleted in order to ensure clarity and concision of the Plan. The RA (7251) suggest a minor textual change to the RDV. Whilst the Council deleted policy D T4 at RDV stage, they retained its explanatory text, incorporating it with the supporting text to policy T3, which was also retained. As a result, GOSW maintained their objection. After further consideration the Council agreed, albeit reluctantly, with GOSW's view, and proposed the deletion of policy T3 through PFC 15/3.

5. I agree that the safeguarding of established pedestrian rights of way is already adequately covered by highways legislation, and consider that the creation of new pedestrian routes can be achieved under policy T2, which prioritises walking as the most sustainable means of transport associated with new development. Furthermore, the Council have also pointed out that proposals in the Local Transport Plan (CD/23/1) seek to improve pedestrian access, through strategies such as S1.1 'Strategy for improving accessibility for all'; S1.2 'Strategy to encourage walking' and S1.12 'Town Centre Access Management'. In these circumstances I consider that there is no need for policy T3.

15.5.4 Recommendation

15.07 Delete policy T3.

15.6 Policy T4 (D T5) – Cycling

As well as setting out a general policy for cycling, 5 specific routes are proposed under this policy, 2 of which were the subject of objections. In this section I deal with the objections received to the general policy, with the objections to the proposed routes covered in the following 2 sections.

15.6.1 Objections

<i>D/2971/4453/8914/T5/0</i>	- <i>Torquay Harbour Business Association</i>
<i>D/2962/4432/8632/T5/0</i>	- <i>Maidencombe Residents' Association</i>
<i>D/2828/4128/7187/T5/0</i>	- <i>RSPB</i>
<i>D/2808/5000/6679/T5/0</i>	- <i>Friends of the Earth, Torbay</i>
<i>D/2808/5000/6678/T5/0</i>	- <i>Friends of the Earth, Torbay</i>
<i>D/2888/4267/8104/T5/0</i>	- <i>Mr G Oliver</i>

15.6.2 Issues

- a) Whether the policy clearly and adequately sets out proposals for cyclists;
- b) other minor matters.

15.6.3 Conclusions

Issue a

1. None of the objectors were fundamentally opposed to the principle of this policy. Some, like Friends of the Earth considered that the Local Plan does not go far enough in promoting cycling, whilst others simply put forward suggestions for additional sections of route (2962), or alternative ways of making provision for cyclists (2971).
2. In response to FotE's objections, the RDV does set out a range of cycle routes for both commuting and leisure and cycling is given a high priority in policy T2 'Transport Hierarchy'. In addition, the provision of cycle parking, and the possibility of developer funding, is noted in paragraph 15.120. Furthermore more detailed strategies on implementation are set out in the Local Transport Plan, particularly strategy S1.3 'Strategy to encourage cycling'.
3. In view of the above points I consider that no modifications to policy T4 are necessary to deal with these objections. However, some of the objections made against the proposed routes, discussed in more detail below, lead me to conclude that there is a certain lack of clarity with the policy as it is currently worded. In particular, there is clearly some confusion as to the scope and standard of the proposed routes, which is not really clarified by the current version of the Local Transport Plan (CD/23/1). I shall therefore recommend some amendments to the policy and supporting text to address these matters.

Issue b

4. RSPB's objection, that the policy should make direct reference to the need to safeguard nature conservation interests, echoes many similar objections this organisation have made to other policies. I repeat my previous view on this matter, namely that as any decision maker is required to take all relevant Plan policies into account when determining planning applications, and as the Plan contains specific policies dealing with nature conservation, it is not necessary for nature conservation safeguards to be incorporated into other policies.

5. There is insufficient evidence before me for me to be able to realistically assess the practicability of extending any cycle route to serve Maidencombe, as suggested by the Maidencombe Residents' Association. In any case, matters of detailed implementation are more properly considered through the Local Transport Plan (CD/23/1).

15.6.4 Recommendation

15.08 Modify policy T4 to read as follows:

'The needs of cyclists should be taken into account in the design and implementation of all highway and traffic management schemes; by the provision of strategic cycle routes between the main focal points of Torbay (segregated from vehicular traffic where possible); and by the provision of facilities for secure cycle parking in town centres and other principal destinations.'

15.7 Proposal T4.2 – Cycling: Coastal Route

The objections preceded by an asterisk were all copies of the same typewritten form.

15.7.1 Objections

RD/7618/0231/117/T4/2	-	Churston Barony Settlement Trustees & Fuller Family
* D/2776/4013/6450/T5/2	-	Allsops Pitts ltd
D/2762/3999/6338/T5/2	-	Mr B Bolton
* D/2770/4007/6402/T5/2	-	Four Seasons
* D/2767/4004/6378/T5/2	-	Gaia
* D/2769/4006/6394/T5/2	-	Mr N Gray
* D/2779/4016/6474/T5/2	-	Mr V Hambly
* D/2778/4015/6466/T5/2	-	Mr P Hammond
D/2971/4453/8913/T5/2	-	Torquay Harbour Business Association
D/2785/4286/8175/T5/2	-	Mr P Hawkins
* D/2760/3997/6189/T5/2	-	Mr D Jones
D/2828/4128/7188/T5/2	-	RSPB
* D/2772/4009/6418/T5/2	-	Key Late Stores
* D/2777/4014/6458/T5/2	-	Komodromos Christos
* D/2761/3998/6197/T5/2	-	Mr GE Loye
* D/2782/4019/6498/T5/2	-	Mr MJ Martin
* D/2773/4010/6426/T5/2	-	Mr BD Morrison
D/2888/4267/8105/T5/2	-	Mr G Oliver
* D/2774/4011/6434/T5/2	-	Mr & Mrs JM Purdy
* D/2768/4005/6386/T5/2	-	Quay Stores
* D/2763/4000/6346/T5/2	-	Reflections of Torquay
* D/2765/4002/6362/T5/2	-	Stamp Shop
* D/2780/4017/6482/T5/2	-	Stork of the Town
D/2901/4299/8208/T5/2	-	Gresham Court Hotel
* D/2766/4003/6370/T5/2	-	Torbay Blinds
* D/2783/4020/6507/T5/2	-	Mrs M Turner

15.7.2 Issues

- The effect of the proposal on vehicular movements and parking along the coast road, on the public's perception of access to Torquay, and on the vitality and viability of Torbay's shopping centres;
- the effect of this proposal on the Roundham Head SSSI;
- the detailed routing in the vicinity of Churston Ferrers, Brixham.

15.7.3 Conclusions

Issue a

6. A significant number of objectors submitted the same typewritten objection to this proposal (*those prefixed by an asterisk in the above list*), which they summarised as the conversion of the main access highway to Torquay from Paignton into cycle lanes. Similar points were made by other objectors (2971, 2785, 2901). However, there is no firm evidence before me to indicate that this is, indeed, the intention of this proposal. To some extent I see this as an indication of a short-coming of this and the other cycle route proposals, as noted above. There is clearly some ambiguity and uncertainty about what the proposals actually entail.

7. Segregated cycle routes are referred to in the policy, but paragraph 15.58 appears to indicate that other measures, such as priority for cyclists at junctions, will also form part of the overall proposals for improving cycling conditions. Further guidance is contained in paragraph 79 of PPG 13, which explains that cycle priority routes will generally make use of existing highways, but may also include the use of redundant railways, linear parks, or space alongside canals and rivers. And paragraph 80 gives details of the types of measures which can promote cycling, such as the reallocation of carriageway to provide more space for cyclists; priority at junctions through the introduction of advanced stop-lines, cycle bypasses, cycle gaps and contra-flow cycle lanes; and the possible use of shared space with pedestrians (*as suggested by Mr P Hawkins – 4286*). Whilst I consider it unnecessary to include this degree of detail either in the policy or the explanatory text, there should be some indication that it is unlikely that all proposed routes will be completely segregated. Recommendation 15.08 above seeks to achieve this necessary clarification.

8. Although the creation of the coastal cycle route may well have an impact upon vehicular use at some locations, the Council have commented that cycle access to lower Torquay along the preferred route can be achieved without the loss of any on-street parking. In any case, provided that the overall result is a furtherance of the transportation and land use strategy promoted by policy TS, it is my view that the impact upon accessibility and Torbay's economic competitiveness should not be material.

Issue b

9. In response to the DV objection by RSPB, that the cycle route could have an adverse impact upon the SSSI south of Roundham Head, the Council have amended the proposed route to avoid this sensitive area.

Issue c

10. Finally, the objection made by the Churston Barony Settlement Trustees & Fuller Family (7618) has already been satisfactorily addressed by PCI 8/2, discussed in paragraph 8.15.3.8 of this report, dealing with the Recreation and leisure chapter.

15.7.4 Recommendation

15.09 Make no modifications to Proposal T4.2, the Coastal Route.

15.8 Proposal T4.4 – Cycling: Cockington circuit and link to coastal route

15.8.1 Objections

<i>D/2823/4053/6931/T5/4</i>	-	<i>Mr WJ Bagwell</i>
<i>D/2825/4434/8720/T5/4</i>	-	<i>The Cockington Valley Society</i>
<i>D/2824/4054/6939/T5/4</i>	-	<i>Mr JR Enoch</i>
<i>D/2821/4051/6918/T5/4</i>	-	<i>Mr A Jaffa</i>
<i>D/2828/4128/7190/T5/4</i>	-	<i>RSPB</i>
<i>D/2826/4056/6952/T5/4</i>	-	<i>Mrs MI Mc Laughlin</i>
<i>D/2950/4368/8484/T5/4</i>	-	<i>Mr BJ Mitchell</i>
<i>D/2827/4057/6957/T5/4</i>	-	<i>Mr H Savini</i>

15.8.2 Issues

- a) The impact on road safety and traffic flow at the junction of Torbay Road and Cockington Lane, and on the tranquillity of Cockington Village;
- b) the effect on cirl bunting habitat.

15.8.3 Conclusions

Issue a

11. Highway safety and the effect on traffic flow and congestion was a concern of the majority of objectors, particularly at the junction of Torbay Road and Cockington Lane. However, I share the Council's view that linking the Cockington Circuit cycle route with the Coastal Route will add to the attractiveness of both. I see no reason why, with careful design, this proposal cannot be implemented without giving rise to the problems envisaged by objectors for this junction. Similarly there is no substantive evidence to persuade me that the designation of this cycle route will have a significant impact upon Cockington Village itself. I shall recommend no changes in this regard.

Issue b

12. In a similar way the Council have commented that sensitive alignment of the route will ensure that there is no significant impact upon cirl bunting habitat. I agree, and consider that the RSPB's concerns do not, therefore, warrant any modifications to this proposal.

15.8.4 Recommendation

15.10 Make no modifications to Proposal T4.4, the Cockington Circuit and link to Coastal Route.

15.9 Policy T5 (D T6) – Improvements for pedestrians in shopping centres

15.9.1 Objections

RD/7652/0001/9941/T5/ - Government Office for the South West*
D/7814/4113/6986/T6/0 - CPRE, Torbay Group
D/7652/4048/9519/T6/0 - Government Office for the South West

15.9.2 Issue

Whether there is a need for the policy.

15.9.3 Conclusions

1. CPRE (7814) gave general support to this policy, but requested that reference be made to the need to serve areas of urban space outside of shopping hours. However GOSW objected at both DV and RDV stages, that the policy appears to add little of substance to either criterion 6 of policy TS (now criterion 7 following my recommendations), or to policies T6 to T8 dealing in detail with the main town centre areas of Torquay, Paignton and Brixham. They therefore recommended that the policy should be deleted, a course of action with which I agree. The Council have also accepted the points made by GOSW and have proposed the deletion of the policy through PFC 15/4.

15.9.4 Recommendation

15.11 Delete policy T5.

15.10 Policy T6 (D T8) – Torquay Town Centre improvements

This policy sets out 5 separate proposals for improving the environment of Torquay Town Centre. I deal firstly with objections to the general policy and then with 4 of the 5 separate proposals which were subject to objection.

15.10.1 Objections

Refer to Appendix 15.b for details of objections

15.10.2 Issues

- a) The effect on economic viability and on servicing arrangements;
- b) the implications of proposal T6.1 for vehicular movements in the Strand;
- c) the effect of the partial pedestrianisation of Fleet Street;
- d) the implications of proposal T6.3 on the stated aims of the Plan to provide good access to town centres; and
- e) whether proposal T6.4 should be pursued.

15.10.3 Conclusions

Issue a

1. The majority of objections coded to the generality of this policy raise concerns about the effects of pedestrianisation on the economic well-being of the town, and on the servicing arrangements for a number of town centre properties. Such concerns resulted in Scottish Widows (2868) contending that the policy could potentially undermine DV Strategic Aim 3 (*Improving Economic Prosperity*). However, I share the Council's view that the town centre improvements proposed by this policy will not disrupt the role of Torquay as a shopping centre. Rather, they are likely to enhance its shopping, commercial and social role by creating a more attractive and appealing environment, in line with PPG 6 guidance. This requires local authorities to develop comprehensive traffic management strategies that, amongst other matters, provide for good accessibility into town centres and protect and enhance the pedestrian environment (*Annex E*).
2. Similar aims are promoted in PPG 13, which cites the Transport White Paper's commitment to promoting schemes such as pedestrianisation as an element in urban renaissance. Accordingly, it is my opinion that the principle of the town centre improvements accords with national guidance on such matters.
3. More drastic options, such as the total banning of cars from Union Street and Fleet Street, as put forward by Mr GW Clark (2923) are, in my opinion, not practicable in view of the need to maintain a reasonable traffic circulation system for the town. This is borne out by the findings of the Torquay Central Area Transportation Study (*CD/23/8*).

Issue b

4. Two of the objectors to this proposal at DV stage (2869, 2784), considered it would be an unacceptable and radical move to restrict access for the motor car. They reached this conclusion by reading the proposal alongside Item 4.7.2.5 of the provisional Local Transport Plan, which they maintained indicates that one of the 2 carriageways exiting the Strand towards Paignton is to be removed from general traffic use, with only public service vehicles and bicycles allowed to use it. However, whilst this could well have been a proposal at that time, such a scheme no longer features in the currently operative Local Transport Plan (*CD/23/1*). Moreover, no such proposal is contained in the Final Report of the Torquay Central Area Transportation Study (*CD/23/8*), which simply seeks to manage the roadspace in this area in a more effective and efficient manor, whilst giving increased priority to pedestrians.
5. The remaining objectors (2741, 2900) objected to the pedestrianisation of the Strand. However, the Central Area Transportation Study referred to above makes it clear that complete pedestrianisation is not proposed for this area. In these circumstances I see no reason why modifications need to be made to this proposal.

Issue c

6. Both objectors submitted identical objections at DV stage claiming that the partial pedestrianisation of Fleet Street has had an adverse impact on what was once a vibrant trading area. The objectors sought a re-opening of Fleet Street to all traffic, on an experimental basis, arguing that this would improve access for the motor vehicle, and obviate the need for drivers

to use unsuitable residential streets to access The Strand and harbour area. They comment that the car is here to stay and that access must be made easy and not difficult.

7. Such arguments, however, fly in the face of current Government guidance on town centres (*PPG 6*), and on transport strategy generally (*PPG 13*). I share the Council's view that town centres are for people – to visit, shop, for leisure and for commercial purposes – not for vehicles. Of course good access is needed, but this does not have to be primarily by car. Nor do vehicles have to penetrate those areas that can reasonably be turned over predominantly to the pedestrian. Furthermore, the Council's Topic Paper 15 (*Transport and Accessibility*) makes it clear that a 1998 survey into options for Fleet Street showed 80% in favour of some form of pedestrian priority. The Central Area Transportation Study, carried out by independent consultants and already referred to above, also comes out firmly in favour of enhanced pedestrian priority. No firm evidence has been submitted to indicate that the pedestrian priority in Fleet Street has had a significant adverse impact on the vitality or viability of the area and, in these circumstances, I shall recommend no modifications to this proposal.

Issue d

8. As with proposal T4.2 (*see section 15.7 above*), the same typewritten objection was submitted by the majority of these objectors. They stated that further restriction of access to lower Torquay would conflict with the Plan's stated aim of providing good access to town centres, and that the lack of serviceable roads flanking the main shopping streets would simply push even more traffic onto the surrounding, longer routes. However, the key point to come from these representations is that the objectors are simply opposed to further pedestrianisation of the valley roads through Torquay, and Victoria Parade. There is nothing specific in these objections relating to the proposal to provide improved rear servicing to the premises fronting Union Street, and no realistic suggestions as to what the objectors are seeking – other than the abandonment of pedestrianisation proposals.

9. Details of this proposal are given in paragraph 15.64 of the explanatory text, which comments that full pedestrianisation of the upper end of Union Street between Market Street and Castle Circus is unlikely as it would involve significant diversion of local bus services and lead to difficult servicing arrangements for some properties. It goes on to state that a scheme for the improvement of Temperance Street/Lower Union Lane, which provides rear servicing to many properties, will be promoted with the possibility of its use for service traffic during the working day. In my opinion this proposal will help to improve the environment in Union Street for shoppers, and I note that further improvements are recommended for this area in the Central Area Transportation Study (*CD/23/8*). As there is no firm evidence to counter the Council's view that benefits to pedestrians will outweigh any costs to traders, I see no good reason to recommend any modifications to this proposal.

Issue e

10. This is another example of the same duplicated objection being submitted by the same group of objectors. The points raised by some 21 of the objectors to this proposal are exactly the same as for the previous proposal, namely an 'in principle' objection to further pedestrianisation on the grounds that unless there is good vehicular access to the main shopping streets – indeed along them – the town's economic viability will suffer. I repeat the conclusions I reached previously, namely that the measures proposed by the Council accord with Government guidance on town centres, and also with Government guidance on transport

and accessibility. I shall not recommend any modifications to this proposal to address these general objections.

11. The Torquay Harbour Business Association (2971) is another group that considers there should be better access for vehicles to the town centre streets, and contends that there is no evidence to show that the shopping public is in favour of restricting vehicular access. Moreover, it refers to a 1994 study commissioned by the Council from Hillier Parker which it says clearly states that shopping in Torquay could best be regenerated by re-opening the town to traffic through the valley. It maintains that the Council should not be continuing to ignore this advice. Similar comments are made by other objectors (2869, 2784), who object to the potential loss of on-street parking in Union Street and difficulties in servicing arrangements.

12. In response to those objectors who are opposed to the general principle of pedestrianisation, I repeat the comments I have already made in the likes of paragraph 15.10.3.1 above. I have also had regard to the comment that the Government's support for a motor-rail link between London and Penzance demonstrates that it accepts people will continue to use the private car (4451). However, this has to be put into context. As already noted, PPG 13 acknowledges that the car will continue to play an important part in any town's transport system, but this does not mean that the car is the most appropriate mode of travel for all trips - its use has to be balanced alongside other more sustainable and environmentally friendly modes of travel. In my opinion allowing more or less unfettered vehicle access into the heart of shopping centres creates a poor and unattractive environment for the shoppers themselves, a view expressed by those who objected to what they saw as a diluting of the Council's intentions to introduce pedestrian priority into the Union Street area (7391, 7389, 7388, 7390, 7387).

13. Matters have, in any case, moved on since the publication of the RDV, with the Torquay Central Area Transportation Study (CD23/7) now recommending a full pedestrianisation scheme for Lower Union Street. The Council have now considered the Study and have resolved to make the pedestrianisation of Lower Union Street a priority scheme, for implementation within the year 2002/2003. In addition, a scheme involving carriageway widening, and pedestrian priority measures has been proposed for the upper part of Union Street. This would still retain on-street parking, bus stops, taxi ranks and servicing facilities, but these would be managed in designated laybys. I consider that this type of proposal, which would be implemented through the Local Transport Plan (CD/23/1), would be appropriate for such an area. Taking all the above points into account I have formed the view that no modifications should be made to this proposal.

15.10.4 Recommendation

15.12 Make no modifications to policy T6.

15.11 Policy T7 (D T9) – Paignton Town Centre improvements

As with the previous policy, the Council have firstly coded general objections, and then objections to the 2 separate ways in which it is proposed to improve the town centre environment of Paignton. In view of the nature of these objections I have dealt with them all in the following section.

15.11.1 Objections

Refer to Appendix 15.c for details of objections

15.11.2 Issue

The effect of the proposals on trade.

15.11.3 Conclusions

1. The general points raised under this policy ranged from the view that the extent of pedestrianisation proposed should be increased (2808, 7571), to the contention that pedestrianisation brings about a loss of custom with a diversion of shoppers to out of town shopping centres (2070, 2177, 2114). Burton Menswear (2724) was supportive of the principle of pedestrianisation, stating that it creates a safe, enjoyable shopping environment for the customer, but it also contended that there are insufficient parking spaces to serve the town centre in the peak season and that parking charges are too high. Moreover, it considered that out of season, when the footfall is much lower, more attention needs to be paid to the local shopper.

2. However, as already noted in this Chapter, a balance needs to be struck in such situations. Ease of access for car drivers and their passengers has to be set against environmental improvements and more attractive conditions for shoppers within the town centre. In this case, for the reasons given in paragraphs such as 15.10.3.1 and 15.10.3.12 above, I share the Council's view that the benefits of pedestrianisation outweigh any adverse effect on traders. However, I do appreciate and understand the concerns being raised, especially by Fredmans Ltd (2070) who highlight the problems facing town centre furniture retailers. With regard to this objection I urge the Council to note the problems that have been raised about the standard of signing to the car park in Dendy Road. Whilst I have already expressed the view that cars should not be allowed unfettered access into shopping areas, I nevertheless recognise that cars will continue to play an important role in bringing shoppers and visitors to locations such as Paignton town centre. The available car parking should therefore be clearly signed and as accessible as possible in the context of the Council's overall transport strategy.

3. Mr Silley (2721) raised a number of concerns regarding the loss of on-street parking; the absence of adequate, cheap alternative parking; and the consequent dramatic reduction in trade in Victoria Street and the south end of Hyde Road. He referred to an average reduction in his customer volume of 32% between the hours of 0600 and 0930, a period chosen as being generally unaffected by either the weather or holiday makers. Whilst I have noted these concerns I am also mindful of the fact, as indeed are the Council, that not all visitors to the town centre are motorists, and even those arrive by car become pedestrians whilst within the town centre. Moreover, RD paragraph 15.69 makes it quite clear that the Council are concerned about the significant conflicts which arise between pedestrians and moving and parked vehicle in some parts of the town. It is to address these conflicts that these proposals

have been introduced, and I support their aims. In my opinion a safer and more attractive town centre environment is far more likely to encourage visitors and thereby boost trade, than are proposals which allow significant penetration of private vehicles into areas predominantly used by pedestrians.

4. The proposals to improve conditions for pedestrians in Victoria Street and Parkside Road attracted a significant number of objections at DV stage, with paragraph 8.95 of Topic Paper 15 summarising the areas of concern as transportation, trade, access, the environment and compliance with national policy. The Council acknowledged these concerns, but took the view that the benefits of the proposed improvements, especially increased safety for the disabled, elderly and young mothers with children, would outweigh any disbenefits. They therefore retained the proposals in the RDV, but amended the wording from 'pedestrian priority' to 'improving conditions for pedestrians' in order to provide a flexible framework for the proposal to be considered in detail in the Local Transport Plan (CD/23/1). No further representations were received at RDV stage and I understand that the proposals, which have been in an adopted Local Plan since 1985, were implemented in the Spring of 2001 without the need for planning permission, as they only involved works to the highway. As the works have been completed there is no need for the proposals to appear in the Local Plan.

15.11.4 Recommendation

15.13 Modify policy T7 by deleting the first proposal, such that the policy reads as follows:

'In Paignton town centre it is proposed to improve the environment by introducing environmental and pedestrian space enhancement schemes at:

- a) Hyde Road;
- b) Station Square;
- c) Esplanade Road; and
- d) the Harbour area.

15.12 Policy T8 (D T10) – Brixham town centre improvements

As with the previous 2 policies, the Council have firstly coded general objections, and then objections to 2 of the 5 proposals to improve the town centre environment of Brixham.

15.12.1 Objections

D/2895/4289/8186/T10/0	-	Mr JW Cooper
D/2895/4289/8188/T10/0	-	Mr JW Cooper
D/2808/5000/6688/T10/0	-	Friends of the Earth, Torbay
D/2894/4288/8184/T10/1	-	Ms SD Kew
D/2895/4290/8192/T10/4	-	Mr JW Cooper
D/2942/4358/11110/T10/4	-	Mr D Jowitt

15.12.2 Issues

- a) Whether the new town square should be retained;
- b) whether housing and shopping proposals should be pursued as part of any redevelopment of the town centre car park;
- c) other new proposals.

15.12.3 Conclusions

Issue a

1. A number of objectors (2895, 2895, 2942) contended that the new town square is not only unattractive and poorly utilised, but also gives rise to conflict between buses, cars and pedestrians. It was suggested that the loss of parking and setting-down for coaches is a great loss to the town and that the town cannot afford the loss of such a large area in the centre. A complete re-design was seen as the only solution, with one objector (2942) suggesting that part of the inner harbour should be filled in and planted up, to create an alternative town square whilst improving access.

2. The Council do not appear to have addressed these objections directly, nor have they given any meaningful response in Topic Paper 15. However, the Local Transport Plan (*LTP - CD/23/1*) acknowledges that many of the traffic problems arise primarily because of the topography and narrow street pattern in central Brixham which give the town its character, but which also mean that physical improvements are virtually impossible without major demolition. The LTP also acknowledges that there are difficulties accommodating all the demands for servicing, bus services, taxis and access traffic into the Town Square/Bank Street area. As a result it comments that compromises will have to be reached to ensure an acceptable level of service.

3. The LTP goes on to explain that a key strand of the transportation strategy is therefore to seek to reduce the volume of car traffic wanting to reach the town, by the encouragement of alternative means of transport, including park and ride (*see policy T12*). For any such strategy to succeed it is necessary for there to be good interchange facilities for public transport and taxis. This matter is covered by policy T11 (*see later*) and the RDV has introduced proposal T11.9 for interchange facilities at Bank Lane, in preference to the Town Square, in order to avoid conflicts with pedestrian enhancement proposals. It seems to me that the Town Square can serve an important function in the town centre improvement proposals, by linking the proposed interchange facilities with the new development area at the car park, and to the other pedestrianised areas. On a separate topic I have already indicated why I cannot support the suggested filling-in of part of the inner harbour, in paragraph 4.27.3.7 of this report.

Issue b

4. This second issue is linked to the first, as the main central multi-storey car park lies adjacent to the Town Square. Proposal T8.4 seeks to re-develop this car park, which the LTP indicates is in need of replacement in the near future because of deterioration of the structure. No firm evidence has been placed before me to indicate that the re-development of this area with short-stay parking for shoppers and visitors, together with some medium scale provision of shopping and residential uses, would be either inappropriate or unworkable. It seems to me that this would provide some opportunity to rationalise and reorganise current conflicting uses in this area. Furthermore, proposal T8.1 would provide an additional long-stay car park at Torbay Trading Estate on New Road, and this would offset the loss of long-stay parking in the

town centre car park. This additional car park is not, however, shown on the Proposals Map, even though it was included on the DV version. I shall recommend that the Proposals Map be amended accordingly.

Issue c

5. FotE made a general objection to the Plan, contending that there should be greater provision for pedestrians, particularly more pedestrianisation of town centres and pedestrian priority at road junctions, even for major roads. However, as they have not put forward any specific additional pedestrian proposals for Brixham, I see no reason to recommend any modifications to the policy to address this objection. Finally, Mr Cooper (2895) has suggested that the car park at Oxen Cove should be re-developed in preference to the central car park. The LTP comments that this is the second closest car park to the harbour, and is the main parking area for tourist coaches, but it suffers from an access route that is steep and narrow. I understand that proposals for improvements to this access are part of the Brixham Harbour Regeneration Project, although no further details of this project have been provided. Notwithstanding this shortcoming, it is my view that the re-development of this car park would have the disadvantage of displacing the tourist coaches and would not offer the same opportunity to re-organise bus and taxi operation in the town square area.

15.12.4 Recommendation

15.14 Make no modification to policy T8.

15.15 Modify Proposals Map sheets 30 and 33 by adding the annotation 'T8.5' to the Torbay Trading Estate on New Road.

15.13 Policy T9 (D T11) – Access for people with disabilities

15.13.1 Objections

D/2888/4267/8125/T11/0 - Mr G Oliver
D/2114/3320/5486/T11/0 - Mr DFJ Worth

15.13.2 Issue

Whether the policy adequately addresses the needs of people with disabilities.

15.13.3 Conclusions

1. Mr G Oliver objected to this policy because he considered there to be a need for more research into the access needs of people with disabilities. However, consultation with representatives of those with disabilities is part of the normal procedure when new transport proposals are being considered, and I am therefore not persuaded that any changes are necessary to the policy in this regard.

2. Mr Worth claimed that the pedestrianisation of Victoria Street in Paignton is already causing problems for people with disabilities and that the Council do not care about the problems of the disabled and elderly residents of the Bay. However, he has not provided specific details of the problems which he contends are being caused and, as a result, I am unclear in what way he wishes the policy to be modified.

3. It does seem to me, however, that the policy would be made clearer and more comprehensive if some of the points detailed in paragraph 15.74 of the explanatory text were actually referred to in the emboldened policy itself, even though I accept that the detail should go in the LTP. In addition, I consider that the second criterion falls foul of the general GOSW objection on policy formulation, covered by Recommendation 1.02. In my opinion this criterion gives no clear indication of what the council intend in terms of land-use policy or how they will deal with planning applications. Indeed, the council may well 'support the improvement of public transport and related facilities' by various means outside the statutory town planning framework. I shall recommend that this criterion be deleted with the gist of the wording being moved to the explanatory text.

15.13.4 Recommendation

15.16 Modify policy T9 by:

- 1) deleting criterion '2';
- 2) adding the following wording as a new criterion '2': 'identifying and addressing difficulties with car parks, pedestrian areas, and other related infrastructure to ensure that there is no particular disadvantage incurred by this group of travellers';
- 3) retaining the first sentence of explanatory paragraph 15.74, but amending the remainder of the paragraph to read: 'The Council will, through the Local Transport Plan, pursue improvement schemes such as dropped kerbs, pedestrian priority, tactile paving and the removal of highway obstructions to ensure ease of movement for people with wheel chairs, visual disabilities and other problems. The Council will also support the improvement of public transport and related facilities which will be accessible to people with physical and sensory disabilities'.

15.14 Policy T11 (D T13) – Transportation interchanges

This policy sets out a number of different locations at which the Council proposed improved interchange facilities. Objections have been coded to the generality of the policy and then to 3 of the specific locations.

15.14.1 Objections

RD/7844/0091/49/T11/* - Galmpton Residents' Association
 D/7652/4048/9525/T13/0 - Government Office for the South West
 D/7650/4141/7543/T13/0 - Railtrack Plc

Proposal D T13.5 – The Town Square, Brixham (Deleted)

D/2895/4289/8185/T13/5 - Mr JW Cooper
 D/2895/4289/8187/T13/5 - Mr JW Cooper
 D/2894/4288/8183/T13/5 - Ms SD Kew

Proposal T11.3 – Torquay Railway Station

D/2114/3315/5509/T1/0 - Mr DFJ Worth

Proposal T11.6 – Paignton Bus and Railway Stations

RD/7517/0724/9788/T11/6	-	Mr D HEAD
RD/7467/0723/9787/T11/6	-	Mrs MW Parnell
RD/7810/0052/10754/T11/6	-	Paignton Preservation Society
D/7814/4118/6992/T13/4	-	CPRE, Torbay Group
D/2373/4361/8435/T13/4	-	Mrs MW Head
D/7811/3314/5510/T13/4	-	Mr AD Moss
D/7811/3314/5511/T13/4	-	Mr AD Moss
D/2145/3238/4756/T13/4	-	Paignton Preservation & Local History Society

15.14.2 Issues

- a) Whether the wording of the policy is adequate and satisfactory;
- b) the suitability of Brixham Town Square as a location for a transport interchange;
- c) whether Torquay coach station should be relocated to the railway station;
- d) whether the proposal for Paignton Bus and Railway Stations is necessary, in view of their already close proximity.

15.14.3 Conclusions

Issue a

1. The Galmpton Residents' Association (7844) objects to the deletion of the direct reference to a 'partnership with bus and rail operators and appropriate authorities' in the amended RDV policy, as it considers that transport operators should be actively engaged in such matters. The Council's response, with which I agree, is that the explicit reference in paragraph 15.78 of the explanatory text is adequate in this regard.

2. GOSW's objection, which stated that if the policy was meant to represent definite proposals then this should be made clear, has been satisfactorily addressed by the amended wording proposed at RDV stage. Railtrack (7650) is generally supportive of the policy, but requested an amendment to the policy seeking developer contributions towards any such interchange improvements. However the issue of developer contributions is already covered in the Plan under policy CF6 (*see section 7.7 of this report*), and there is no need for an additional reference here.

Issue b

3. Both Mr Cooper (2895) and Ms Kew (2894) were critical of Brixham's Town Square for, amongst other reasons, the conflicts that they consider arise between pedestrians, buses and taxis. They sought a total re-think and re-design of this area. However, I have already recommended that no change be made to the pedestrianised Town Square in my consideration of policy T8 above. The specific concerns of these objectors regarding pedestrian/vehicle conflict has, however, been addressed by the substitution of Bank Lane for the Town Square as the proposed location for improved interchange facilities.

Issue c

4. The matter of relocating Torquay coach station adjacent to the railway station was raised by Mr Worth (2114) in the context of DV policy T1, but in my opinion it is more appropriately considered here. The Council agree that Torquay railway station would be an appropriate location for the coach station, and explain that they have considered this.

However, they go on to point out that there are operational problems with a lack of space and manoeuvring area, and that the railway station itself is not ideally located for the town centre. Furthermore, I understand that there is no agreement or serious proposal between Railtrack's successor or coach operators to relocate the coach station to Torquay railway station. As a result the Council have not included such a proposal in the Local Plan and I agree that this is the appropriate course of action in these circumstances.

Issue d

5. Both Mr D Head (7517) and Mrs MW Parnell/Head (7467/2373) accept that the rail and bus station area of Paignton needs upgrading to make it more attractive to visitors and shoppers, but they object to what is described as an undefined proposal which does not give any indication how the same or an increased amount of car parking will be made available. They contend that adequate car parking is essential to serve the needs of a large rural area from which much business can be generated. Mr AD Moss (7811) considered that with the rail and bus stations adjacent to one another, and the proximity of car parks, the town already has an integrated transport system. He was also critical of the lack of information on the proposed interchange proposal, stating that the public cannot be expected to comment on the unknown. Moreover he considered that it is essential to keep the existing Station Lane car park if the Victoria Street pedestrianisation scheme is to succeed.

6. This objector also submitted a similar objection on behalf of the Paignton Preservation Society (7810). Additional points raised were concerns that the case for more retail space in the town has not been proven; that any additional office space is likely to be difficult to let; that any new housing on the site would need to be low-rise; and there would be the possible loss of an historic railway station. Similar points were also raised by the Paignton Preservation and Local History Society (2145) who, in addition, were concerned that the proposals should not harm the character of the historic station. However, on this point I share the Council's view that matters relating to the conservation aspects of the existing station are more appropriately addressed through policies in the Built environment chapter (*Chapter 14*). The representation from CPRE (7814) did not amount to an objection but was simply a request for greater utilisation of Churston railway station, a matter covered by the introduction of proposal T11.8.

7. I have some sympathy with those objectors who complained about a lack of detail for this proposal, and indeed I have already raised similar points in sections 6.3 and 6.8.1 of this report. Furthermore, although the explanatory text to policy T16 (*see later*) explains that a development brief will have to be prepared for the area, I have expressed my disquiet that RD paragraph 15.93 seems to envisage this as a document prepared by developers rather than the Council (*see paragraph 6.8.3.4 of this report*). Nonetheless, in my opinion it is appropriate that the detail of any proposal will be subject to consideration and public consultation through such a brief, once the Council have given a clear steer on what they expect of the site in order to bring maximum benefit to the town. It is through an exercise like this that matters of concern to objectors, such as the retention of adequate car parking and respect for the conservation value and historical character of the area, can be fully considered.

8. These points apart, I am mindful of the fact that this proposal also forms part of the overall transport strategy for the town centre as described in the Local Transport Plan (*CD/23/1*). This makes the point that although the terminus facilities for public transport are well located in the town centre, the facilities for passengers urgently need upgrading. In this regard I have noted the existing proximity of bus and rail stations, but the fact that they lie on opposite sides of Great Western Road is not ideal for pedestrians, and this situation could

undoubtedly be improved by bringing both stations onto the one site. This would offer the opportunity to provide a safer, more attractive, and more efficient interchange facility and would enable the environment and range of facilities available to travellers to be appreciably improved. I therefore support this proposal.

15.14.4 Recommendation

15.17 Make no modifications to policy T11.

15.15 Policy T12 (D T14) – Park and Ride

The Deposit version of this policy proposed park and ride sites at Lawes Bridge, Torquay and Monksbridge, Brixham, with the first of these being retained in the RDV whilst the second was deleted. The Council have coded a number of objections to the generality of the policy. However, I consider that the primary purpose of the majority of these objection (preceded by an asterisk in the list in Appendix 15.d), is to put forward alternative locations for park and ride sites. I have addressed these alternative suggestions at the end of this section.

15.15.1 Objections

Refer to Appendix 15.d for details of objections

15.15.2 Issues

- a) Whether the policy should be retained;
- b) the appropriateness of designating a park and ride site at Lawes Bridge;
- c) whether the proposal for a park and ride site at Monksbridge, Brixham should be re-introduced into the Plan;
- d) whether any other specific site should be identified for park and ride purposes.

15.15.3 Conclusions

Issue a

1. The main thrust of Mr AJB Paterson's (2702) objection was that the Monksbridge site is unsuitable for park and ride purposes, but he also expressed the view that park and ride is a discredited theory which has proved to be an unsuccessful waste of money on most occasions. However, whilst there have certainly been some unsuccessful attempts to establish viable park and ride schemes, including one serving Brixham in the 1990s, there are also many extremely successful and popular schemes in operation throughout the country. In my opinion the danger is to think that park and ride can, on its own, solve a town or city's traffic problems. This clearly is not the case. Indeed this point is well made in PPG 13 which indicates that park and ride schemes, in appropriate circumstances can help promote more sustainable travel patterns, but that they need to be developed as an integral part of the planning and transport strategy for the area. In view of these points I see no good reason why park and ride should not be part of the overall package of transport improvements for the Torbay area, provided that the guidance in PPG 13 and other relevant documentation is heeded and acted upon.

2. Galmpton Residents' Association made a general objection to the deletion of a commitment to a park and ride scheme to serve Brixham, as they consider such a scheme

would be an important tool for dealing with the levels of summer holiday traffic. The deleted Monksbridge site which was proposed to serve this town in the DV is discussed in more detail below, but the fact remains that a site or sites have not been ruled out for Brixham. Indeed, explanatory paragraph 15.80 makes it clear that the consideration of possible schemes serving Brixham and Paignton are integral elements of the Council's transportation strategy. As this paragraph says, sites which come forward during the Plan period can be assessed on the basis of the criteria which were introduced into the policy at RDV stage.

3. Finally in this general section, FotE supported the principle of park and ride, but wanted to ensure that any such schemes link with other transport modes. They also contended that sites should be located at the source of demand, such as large villages and major road interchanges, and not just at the fringes of the urban areas. However I share the Council's view that if a site is located too far away from the area it is intended to serve, drivers will be less inclined to use the facility, especially if congestion is not unduly severe at that location. Experience has shown that in such circumstances drivers tend, instead, to drive on into the towns. Taking all the above points into account I consider that this policy should be retained.

Issue b

4. In considering objections to the Lawes Bridge proposal, which included comments that the site is both too far from the town centre (2887) and too close (2158), I have had regard to the Local Transport Plan (LTP - CD/23/1) and also the recently completed Torquay Central Area Transportation Study (TCATS - CD/23/8). Neither of these documents see park and ride as a particularly important element in the overall transportation strategy. The LTP comments that there is a relatively small commuter movement into central Torquay which could be transferred to a park and ride service, but that the majority of these commuters currently either park free on-street or have parking spaces provided by their employers. It makes the point that park and ride is only likely to be used in significant numbers if town centre parking is tightly controlled with an appropriate pricing policy although it sees its potential increasing as congestion on Riviera Way and Newton Road inevitably worsen.

5. The TCATS also sees little scope for a successful full time park and ride facility in Torquay, with paragraph 6.110 citing the availability of commuter parking in the town centre, the location of the traffic congestion and the limited ability to introduce bus priority measures as factors which would work against such a scheme. Other objectors fear that the Lawes Bridge site would divert potential town centre customers and visitors to the Willows shopping area (2869, 2887, 2784), and that it could potentially increase traffic flows and congestion at key junctions (7814, 2158).

6. I take the view, however, expressed by another objector (2888), that whilst park and ride is clearly not the complete solution to the town's traffic problems, it may serve a useful role as part of the overall strategy. In my opinion this site is fairly well located, beyond the main areas of congestion heading into Torquay (leaving aside the Kingskerswell area which I discuss later). I do not believe that it would significantly divert trade from the town centre to the Willows District Centre as this has ample free off-road parking already. Furthermore I share the Council's view that there could well be potential for the site to serve Torbay Hospital in conjunction with the need to address parking difficulties at the hospital (*see policy CF13 and its supporting text*). In line with the views expressed in the LTP I consider that there is clear scope for park and ride from this site to serve an increasing role in the town's overall transport strategy over the Plan period. I shall therefore recommend no modifications to the policy in this regard.

Issue c

7. The DV proposal for a park and ride site at Monksbridge, Brixham, attracted a significant number of objections, mainly on the grounds that it would have an unacceptable impact on landscape considerations at this 'gateway' site. A number of other issues were, however, also raised as detailed in section 8.142 of Topic Paper 15. These objections have been fully addressed by the deletion of this proposal and, in the absence of any counter objections, and the Council's view that the deletion is justified on environmental and landscape grounds, I see no reason to consider re-instating it.

Issue d

8. As noted at the beginning of this section, a number of objections coded by the Council to the generality of this policy primarily contained suggestions for additional sites. In addition, many of those objecting to both the Lawes Bridge and Monksbridge proposals suggested alternative sites for consideration. I do not repeat the objection numbers here, as they are all included elsewhere in this section, but for confirmation the following sites were suggested:

- For Brixham - Strawberry Bends; the field adjacent and to the south side of the Go Kart Track on Brixham Road, Churston (used for park and ride in the 1990s); land near Churston Railway Station; the Paignton side of Brokenbury Quarry; and land to the north-east of Brokenbury Quarry;
- For Torquay – Lymington Road coach station

9. I have no doubt that these suggestions have been genuinely made, but I have insufficient evidence before me to determine whether any of them would actually be appropriate locations for park and ride facilities to be established. It does seem to me, however, that sites in the vicinity of Churston railway station or Brokenbury Quarry may well be too far away from Brixham to prove attractive to motorists. Moreover, I share the Council's view that the scope for linked trips with the Paignton and Dartmouth Steam Railway should not be over-estimated, since this is a leisure rather than commuter route. Conversely I consider that the Lymington Road coach station in Torquay is likely to prove to be too close to the town centre, with drivers already having passed through areas of congestion to reach it.

10. In any case, and notwithstanding my initial views on these suggested sites, the appropriate way for them to be assessed is against the criteria which are now part of policy T12.

15.15.4 Recommendation

15.18 Make no modifications to policy T12.

15.16 Policy T13 (D T17) – Lymington Road Coach Station

15.16.1 Objections

D/7814/4121/6997/T17/0 - CPRE, Torbay Group
D/7814/4121/6998/T17/0 - CPRE, Torbay Group
D/2888/4267/8116/T17/0 - Mr G Oliver
D/2158/4249/8040/T17/0 - Ms J Williams
D/2158/4249/8042/T17/0 - Ms J Williams

15.16.2 Issue

The appropriateness of improving passenger facilities at this site.

15.16.3 Conclusions

1. Although the CPRE (7814) and Ms J Williams (2158) both considered this coach station to be an uninviting place which gives visitors a poor first impression of the town, I cannot support their suggestions that this facility should be relocated to the proposed Lawes Bridge park and ride site. This alternative location would be further away from the town centre, public transport interchanges and the principal holiday accommodation areas. Moreover, I consider that such a relocation would be unlikely to bring about any material improvement of traffic conditions, as no evidence has been submitted to indicate that the current coach station generates significant traffic volumes. Indeed explanatory paragraph 15.86 notes that only limited use is made of it by excursions or tour operators. Nor can I support the view that the Lymington Road site should be redeveloped for housing. I understand that this option has been considered by the Council but has not been pursued partly because there are no realistic sustainable alternatives to the current site, and partly because the presence of underground sewers would make the development of buildings difficult on the site.

2. Mr G Oliver (2888) did not make a specific objection to this policy, but rather considered that with additional tiers for park and ride the Lymington Road car park has potential for redevelopment. I have, however, already pointed out in the previous section why I consider that this location would be unlikely to be appropriate for park and ride facilities.

3. On balance, I agree with the Council that although this site is not ideally located, no realistic alternative has been put forward for the coach station facilities. I therefore consider that improvement of the existing facilities offers the best option and, accordingly, I shall recommend that no modifications be made to this policy.

15.16.4 Recommendation

15.19 Make no modifications to policy T13.

15.17 Policy T14 (D T18) - Railway land

15.17.1 Objections

- D/7652/4048/9529/T18/0* - *Government Office for the South West*
- D/2808/5000/6697/T18/0* - *Friends of the Earth, Torbay*
- D/2888/4267/8107/T18/0* - *Mr G Oliver*
- D/7650/4141/7545/T18/0* - *Railtrack Plc*

15.17.2 Issues

- a) Whether the policy adequately protects railway land from development;
- b) other minor matters.

15.17.3 Conclusions

Issue a

1. At DV stage FotE took the view that in light of the need to encourage the regeneration and increased use of the rail infrastructure in the area, the current policies represented a severe deficiency in the Plan. It contended that the policies should consider the capacity basis for all rail development options, with the potential for rail improvement schemes, quantified in terms of their overall contribution to transport provision, being identified in the Plan. However, the Council point out that they are only able to promote the railway network where this is supported by Railtrack (now Network Rail), or their Administrators. They explain that they are unable to directly fund rail capacity improvements and that schemes can only be proposed in the Local Plan if they are supported by Railtrack. In my opinion the amended version of this policy in the RD, adequately safeguards the operation of the railway system and I share the Council's view that the RDV sets out a supportive framework for promoting rail travel through such policies as TS (Land use transportation strategy) and T2 (Transport hierarchy). In addition, policy T11 (Transportation interchanges) includes Torre, Torquay, Paignton, Goodrington and Churston stations as interchange sites.

2. Railtrack's (7650) request for a reference in the policy to the need to ensure land required for operational purposes is safeguarded from development has been satisfactorily addressed by the RDV changes. These changes have also clarified the scope of the policy, thereby addressing the objection raised by GOSW.

Issue b

3. The representation from Mr G Oliver simply sought a rail link with a Waste Transfer Station. It has been coded by the Council as a new proposal. However, no further details have been submitted by the objector, and there is therefore insufficient evidence before me for me to consider making any such recommendation.

15.17.4 Recommendation

15.20 Make no modifications to policy T14.

15.18 Policy T15 (D T19) – New railway stations

15.18.1 Objections

<i>RD/7844/0096/54/T15/*</i>	-	<i>Galmpton Residents' Association</i>
<i>RD/7844/0096/10771/T19/*F</i>	-	<i>Galmpton Residents' Association</i>
<i>RD/7844/0101/10225/T19/*F</i>	-	<i>Galmpton Residents' Association</i>
<i>RD/7844/0101/59/T19/*F</i>	-	<i>Galmpton Residents' Association</i>
<i>RD/7814/0721/9786/T15/*</i>	-	<i>CPRE, Torbay Group</i>
<i>RD/7812/0720/10747/T15/*</i>	-	<i>Mr & Mrs T Edgell</i>
<i>RD/1289/0021/10001/T15/*</i>	-	<i>Teignbridge District Council, South Devon</i>
<i>RD/1289/0021/196/T15/*</i>	-	<i>Teignbridge District Council, South Devon</i>
<i>RD/7712/0718/9784/T15/*</i>	-	<i>Ms J Williams</i>
<i>RD/7712/0719/234/T15/*</i>	-	<i>Ms J Williams</i>
<i>D/7844/4422/8603/T19/0</i>	-	<i>Galmpton Residents' Association</i>
<i>D/2808/5000/6698/T19/0</i>	-	<i>Friends of the Earth, Torbay</i>
<i>D/7814/4122/7001/T19/1</i>	-	<i>CPRE, Torbay Group</i>
<i>D/7814/4122/7003/T19/1</i>	-	<i>CPRE, Torbay Group</i>
<i>D/2158/4250/8043/T19/1</i>	-	<i>Ms J Williams</i>
<i>RD/7814/0721/10748/T19/2F</i>	-	<i>CPRE, Torbay Group</i>

15.18.2 Issues

- a) The appropriateness of a new station at Scotts Bridge/Kerswell Gardens;
- b) whether the DV proposal for a station at Preston, Paignton should be reinstated;
- c) other minor matters.

15.18.3 Conclusions

Issue a

4. Teignbridge District Council contend that the proposed station at Kerswell Gardens is not in the most appropriate location to promote sustainable transport. They consider that it may adversely affect the prospect of a rail halt at Kingskerswell (promoted in the Devon Local Transport Plan) and that additionally it might have an adverse effect on the proposed Kingskerswell Bypass. Mr & Mrs T Edgell (7812) support the principle of improvements to rail travel, but consider that the proposed station would be too close to the proposed halt at Kingskerswell. They also believe that any new facility within the area of search should be limited to a rail halt, and not a full station with associated parking. In addition, Ms J Williams and the CPRE Torbay Group (7814) both considered that money would be better spent on track maintenance than on a new station, as they feared that a station at this location would not be well used. They contended that it would not be particularly convenient for visitors to either the Willows shopping centre or the hospital, as buses would give better penetration to both of these destinations.

5. However, I understand that the Council discussed the feasibility of the proposed station at Scotts Bridge with Railtrack, which resulted in the DV site being replaced by an area of search located towards Kerswell Gardens, to overcome technical problems with the curvature of the track. Railtrack have not objected to the Kerswell Gardens site, and have not identified any problems in relation to its proximity to a halt at Kingskerswell. There is no firm evidence before me to counter the Council's contention that a new station at Kerswell Gardens would be an important addition to sustainable transport in the area. The Council point out that a station is proposed in the A380 Kingskerswell study (CD/23/3) and is supported by the Local Transport Plan (CD/23/1). Moreover, they explain that as well as serving the Torbay Hospital

there are a number of proposed employment developments (E1.1, E1.2 and E1.3) nearby and also a significant residential population in the vicinity. I accept, as do the Council, that buses will continue to be an important and flexible element of public transport in the area, but this does not negate the potential benefits of the proposed station.

6. Notwithstanding Ms J Williams's objection already referred to above, at RDV stage she indicated her supports for a rail halt in this general location, but objects to a station with parking, as she considers this would create even more congestion on the local road network. However a second RD representation from Ms Williams objects to the detail of the site shown as an area of search, particularly at the eastern end, in the vicinity of Brown's Bridge, where her home is. She draws attention to a number of matters, including a safety barrier installed on the Riviera Way road embankment and an earth bank neither of which, she claims, can be interfered with; the presence of a large surface water pipe under Riviera Way; and the presence of a foul sewer following the same route. As a result of these points she claims that a station located between Brown's Bridge and the point at which the pipes go under the railway is unlikely to be viable. She contends that the area of search should, accordingly, be much smaller.

7. I have sympathy with these views, especially as the area of search occupies a track length of some 950 metres. In my opinion this is excessive, but my consideration of this matter is not helped by the absence of any meaningful response by the Council to the points raised by this objector. The Council have simply stated that the precise location of a station will be determined through the Local Transport Plan process, following further investigation of site characteristics. However, I consider that if there are technical difficulties with part of the area currently shown as an area of search, then these should be investigated and clarified as soon as practicable, in order to give some certainty to the proposal and allay the fears and concerns of nearby residents who may be affected by it. I shall therefore recommend that a more precise area of search be identified at the earliest possible opportunity.

Issue b

8. The CPRE Torbay Group objects to the RDV deletion of the proposed new station at Preston, which it sees as important in reducing traffic flows in and into Preston and Paignton, as well as providing an alternative means of local and long distance public transport. The Galmpton Residents' Association also supports the reinstatement of this proposal. However, although a halt previously existed at this location, paragraph 15.64 of the DV indicated that there are significant difficulties with creating a station on the elevated site which would satisfy modern standards. In particular, the Council point out that provision of disabled access is impracticable and would require extensive ramping or provision of a lift. I understand that there may also be signalling difficulties. Because of this the Council have taken the view that the cost of providing a station at Preston would be prohibitive and that there is no possibility of it being implemented during the Plan period. As the deletion of this proposal is supported by Railtrack, who confirm that new station proposals must be financially viable and satisfy certain physical requirements, I am not persuaded that there are any sound reasons to re-introduce it to the Plan.

Issue c

9. The Council have coded the representation from FotE as an objection to this policy, but it seems to me that it is more in the form of a general concern that rail improvement schemes should be identified in the Plan. FotE considered this to be important so that development can be directed to the vicinity of such proposals in order to promote facilities for rail interchange. In my opinion this is what the Kerswell Gardens proposal seeks to achieve, in view of the nearby presence of employment, retail and commercial sites.

10. Finally I have had regard to the suggestion from the Galmpton Residents' Association that a site should be safeguarded for a rail halt to be established below Blue Waters Drive. They contend that this would have the potential for serving the surrounding residential areas of Broadsands, Cherrybrook and Hookhills as well as holidaymakers using Broadsands Beach. However, I have noted that this location does not lie on the main rail network, but rather on the leisure route operated by the Paignton and Dartmouth Railway. In my opinion this is likely to limit its attraction as an all year round facility. Moreover, I share the Council's view that a new station at this location could well amount to a significant urbanisation of this part of the coast path. I am mindful of the fact that any development to the west of the line would be likely to affect the footpath, whilst development to the east would be within the Urban Landscape Protection Area as well as the Coastal Protection Zone. A new station could therefore conflict with the purposes of these areas.

11. Furthermore, although this objector suggests that access could be gained from either Broadsands Park Road or Blue Waters Drive, these are residential roads and I am not persuaded, on the basis of the evidence before me, that their use for such a purpose would be practicable. It is possible, as the Council have recognised, that there may be some merit in allowing a very minor halt to serve Broadsands Beach, but I consider that this would be unlikely to be of sufficient scale to warrant a Local Plan proposal. I shall not, therefore, recommend this proposal.

15.18.4 Recommendations

15.21 Make no modifications to the wording of policy T15.

15.22 Amend the area of search shown on the Proposals Map for the Kerswell Gardens station, following further detailed investigations, so as to define a smaller and more precise area.

15.19 Policy T16 (D T20) – Improvement of Paignton railway station

15.19.1 Objections

<i>RD/7517/0724/10750/T16/*</i>	-	<i>Mr D Head</i>
<i>RD/7811/0722/276/T16/*</i>	-	<i>Mr AD Moss</i>
<i>RD/7810/0052/358/T16/*</i>	-	<i>Paignton Preservation Society</i>
<i>RD/7467/0723/10749/T16/*</i>	-	<i>Mrs MW Parnell</i>
<i>D/7799/4280/8159/T20/0</i>	-	<i>Ms E Donovan</i>
<i>D/7799/4304/8234/T20/0</i>	-	<i>Ms E Donovan</i>
<i>D/7652/4048/9531/T20/0</i>	-	<i>Government Office for the South West</i>
<i>D/2373/4361/8436/T20/0</i>	-	<i>Mrs MW Head</i>
<i>D/7811/3313/5515/T20/0</i>	-	<i>Mr AD Moss</i>
<i>D/7811/3313/5514/T20/0</i>	-	<i>Mr AD Moss</i>
<i>D/2145/3312/5520/T20/0</i>	-	<i>Paignton Preservation & Local History Society</i>
<i>D/2145/3312/5519/T20/0</i>	-	<i>Paignton Preservation & Local History Society</i>
<i>D/7650/4141/7547/T20/0</i>	-	<i>Railtrack Plc</i>

15.19.2 Issues

The appropriateness of a scheme to improve Paignton railway station.

15.19.3 Conclusions

12. This policy explains that the redevelopment of passenger facilities and access arrangements at Paignton Station should be an integral part of the development proposed under policies H1, E1, S5 and T11. However, because of this I have formed the view, expressed in section 6.3 of this report, that the clarity of the Plan would be improved by bringing these various elements together in one place. This forms the basis of Recommendations 6.02 and 6.03 which I draw again to the Council's attention here. Nevertheless, as the objections detailed above were duly made against this proposal, and its DV equivalent, I discuss them in the following paragraphs.

13. Both Mr D Head (7517) and Mrs MW Parnell/Head (7467/2373) accept that this focal area of Paignton needs upgrading to make it more attractive to visitors and shoppers, but they object to what is described as an undefined proposal which does not give any indication how the same or an increased amount of car parking will be made available. They contend that adequate car parking is essential to serve the needs of a large rural area from which much business can be generated. As I have already made clear under policy 11 (*paragraphs 15.14.2.5-8*), I have some sympathy with these concerns but consider that they could be satisfactorily addressed through an appropriately targeted development brief as referred to in RD paragraph 15.93.

14. Railtrack (7650) supported the principle of improving passenger facilities and access arrangements at the station, and I consider that their concerns regarding the amount and location of car parking for rail patrons can best be adequately addressed through the development brief referred to above.

15. The need for any re-development to respect the historic value of the existing station building is expressed by a number of objectors (2145, 7811, 7799). This is, of course, an important consideration, but I share the Council's view that such matters are satisfactorily covered by policy BE1 and the Built environment chapter generally. I see no need therefore to

recommend any modifications to the policy in response to these concerns, especially as RD paragraph 15.95 notes this matter as one which the proposed development brief will have to have regard to.

16. Mr AD Moss (7811) and the Paignton Preservation Society (7810) both consider that this policy should be deleted. This is because they maintain that Paignton already has a good interchange facility between car, bus and rail and that re-development of the station area is therefore unnecessary. Similar views are expressed by Ms E Donovan (7799). I have, however, already discussed the transport interchange issues of this proposal in paragraphs 15.14.2.5-8 above, and have indicated that I support proposal T11.6. In this regard I share the Council's view that although the interchange may currently work well, there is scope to bring about a significant improvement for the benefit of travellers and visitors to the town centre generally.

17. Matters relating to the need for more retail and office space, and the design of any housing for the site, have already been dealt with in earlier sections of this report (*see sections 3.10 and 4.14 and paragraphs 6.8.3.1-5*). The objection from GOSW has been satisfactorily addressed by the re-wording undertaken at RDV stage, which has clarified that the policy does indeed represent a firm proposal.

15.19.4 Recommendation

15.23 Make no modifications to policy T16.

15.20 Policy T17 (D T21) – Redevelopment of Goodrington railway station

15.20.1 Objections

D/7814/4124/7005/T21/0 - CPRE, Torbay Group
D/2808/5000/6722/T21/0 - Friends of the Earth, Torbay

15.20.2 Issues

- a) Whether the improvements for passengers and freight should also be extended to Churston Station;
- b) other minor matters.

15.20.3 Conclusions

Issue a

1. CPRE strongly supported this proposal, but in addition it considered that Churston railway station should also be developed for freight and passengers. As already noted above, Churston Station has been included in policy T11 as a location at which the Council are proposing improved interchange facilities. However, with regard to this specific request, the Council have indicated in Topic Paper 15 that the redevelopment of Churston Station is not viewed as a priority, nor is it seen as desirable in view of the attractive features and setting of the existing station. I agree with this view and consider that Churston Station does not lend itself to extension for freight purposes in the same way that Goodrington Station does.

Issue b

2. The objection from FotE was not specifically against this policy, but was a more general objection against the rail policies in the Plan, which they consider to be deficient. I have, however, already addressed these matters in section 15.17.3.1 above and the conclusions I reached there are also applicable to this objection.

15.20.4 Recommendation

15.24 Make no modifications to policy T17.

15.21 Policy T18 (D T22) – Water transport

15.21.1 Objections

*RD/7844/0103/61/T18 /** - *Galmpton Residents' Association*
D/7844/4423/8604/T22/0 - *Galmpton Residents' Association*

15.21.2 Issue

Whether the policy should be more positive in seeking to improve ferry facilities.

15.21.3 Conclusions

1. Galmpton Residents' Association is supportive of the principle of the ferry service between Torquay and Brixham, but considers that its attractiveness and convenience is limited by the poor accessibility of the current landing stages. It proposes that the Council should encourage this ferry service by arranging a Torquay landing stage inside the harbour, as close to Fleet Walk as is possible whilst retaining all-time access; and by arranging for services leaving Brixham to touch a landing stage on the south side of the harbour, convenient to the nearby large residential areas. It also contends that consideration should be given to winter services. At RD stage this organisation objected to the amended wording, which it sees as weakening the thrust of what it now describes as an inadequate and unimaginative proposal for alternative transport.

2. In response, the Council point out that the Local Plan is only able to address on-shore facilities for water transport and is unable to regulate services. They further comment that the exact positioning of landing stages is too detailed a matter for the Local Plan and more appropriately dealt with as part of the wider harbourside and waterfront regeneration proposals (*see policy TU1*), or by the Council in its capacity as Harbour Authority. Nevertheless, in view of the positive measures which are proposed for the regeneration and enhancement of these harbourside and waterfront areas through policy TU1, I consider that the explanatory text should be amended in order to satisfactorily address the above objections. Rather than just indicating that adequate provision will be made for landing facilities in association with improved ferry services 'when considering proposals for the redevelopment of the harbours', I shall recommend that an explicit reference be made to both the Torquay Waterfront Project and the Brixham Harbour Regeneration.

3. I have also noted that the Local Transport Plan (*LTP - CD/23/1*), referred to in paragraph 15.96 has the aim of encouraging the development of ferry services and associated quayside

facilities, but do not consider that any further elaboration on this matter is necessary in the Local Plan.

15.21.4 Recommendations

15.25 Make no modifications to policy T18.

15.26 Amend the third sentence of paragraph 15.96 so that it reads:

‘Adequate provision for landing facilities in association with improved ferry services will be made as part of the Torquay Waterfront Project, the Brixham Harbour Regeneration and when considering other proposals for the redevelopment of the harbours.

15.22 Policy T19 (D T24) – Major Road Network

15.22.1 Objections

* D/2776/4013/6452/T24/0	-	Allsops Pitts ltd
D/2762/3999/6340/T24/0	-	Mr B Bolton
* D/2770/4007/6404/T24/0	-	Four Seasons
* D/2767/4004/6380/T24/0	-	Gaia
* D/2769/4006/6396/T24/0	-	Mr N Gray
* D/2779/4016/6476/T24/0	-	Mr V Hambly
* D/2778/4015/6468/T24/0	-	Mr P Hammond
* D/2760/3997/6191/T24/0	-	Mr D Jones
* D/2772/4009/6420/T24/0	-	Key Late Stores
* D/2777/4014/6460/T24/0	-	Komodromos Christos
* D/2761/3998/6199/T24/0	-	Mr GE Loye
* D/2782/4019/6499/T24/0	-	Mr MJ Martin
D/2808/5000/6706/T24/0	-	Friends of the Earth, Torbay
D/2808/5000/6718/T24/0	-	Friends of the Earth, Torbay
D/2808/5000/6717/T24/0	-	Friends of the Earth, Torbay
* D/2773/4010/6428/T24/0	-	Mr BD Morrison
D/2888/4267/8110/T24/0	-	Mr G Oliver
* D/2774/4011/6436/T24/0	-	Mr & Mrs JM Purdy
* D/2768/4005/6388/T24/0	-	Quay Stores
* D/2763/4000/6348/T24/0	-	Reflections of Torquay
* D/2765/4002/6364/T24/0	-	Stamp Shop
* D/2780/4017/6484/T24/0	-	Stork of the Town
* D/2766/4003/6372/T24/0	-	Torbay Blinds
* D/2783/4020/6506/T24/0	-	Mrs M Turner
D/2870/4188/7874/T24/0	-	Hemingway Properties Ltd
D/2704/3934/6088/T24/0	-	United Benefice Of Brixham - Churston Ferrers & Kingswear

15.22.2 Issues

- Whether proposals for the Coastal Cycle Route have implications for this policy;
- whether the policy represents a sustainable transport option;
- other minor matters.

15.22.3 Conclusions

Issue a

1. Some 19 of the above representations (preceded by an asterisk) all comprise the same photocopied form which the Council have coded as objections to DV policy T24. However, I can find nothing in these representation, nor in those from Mr B Bolton (2762) and Mr G Oliver (2888), which goes to the heart of this policy. Instead, they appear to me to express opposition to anything which may reduce road capacity for motorists, the example given being DV proposal T5.2 (*Cycling: Coastal Route*). This is shown on the Proposals Map as running alongside the major road network (annotated as T24) in such locations as Livermead, Torquay, and it is possible that the objections have stemmed from a misunderstanding of these policies and proposals. This view is reinforced by the fact that the majority of these objections group DV proposal T5.2 and DV policy T24 together with the words 'conversion of main access highway to Torquay from Paignton into cycle lanes'.

2. I have already indicated in section 15.7 above that there is no firm evidence before me to indicate that the Coastal Cycle Route will significantly reduce highway capacity, and have recommended a rewording to address this matter. In these circumstances I see nothing in these objections to cause me to recommend any modifications to policy T19, which seeks to maintain the capacity of the highway network in order to cater for the longer distance movement of traffic and road based public transport.

Issue b

3. FotE raised an in-principle objection to the creation of additional road capacity, on the grounds that it increases unsustainable transport patterns and does not benefit the prosperity of an area. I have, however, already addressed such matters in section 15.2, and do not repeat those conclusions here, save to say that the amended policies which now appear in the RDV are in line with Government guidance and do, in my opinion, seek to promote a sustainable, integrated transport system.

4. To say that there should be no further road construction or no additional highway capacity is too simplistic a view of the transport system. It is much more important to work towards providing more and better opportunities for transport choice, in order to move towards more integrated transport. At times this may well involve an increase in highway capacity, but the key is how any such additional capacity is managed. I consider that policies such as TS, T1 and T2, all discussed earlier, show that the Council are committed to giving priority to the more sustainable and environmentally acceptable modes of transport, whilst still acknowledging that the private car will continue to play an important, but hopefully reducing role in the overall transport strategy. This view is further emphasised in policies T20 and T21 (discussed below), and elsewhere in this chapter. For these reasons I share the Council's view that imposing a blanket ban on new road building would harm Torbay's economic competitiveness. It would also hamper the Council's ability to reorganise and reallocate road-space to other more efficient transport modes.

Issue b

5. The final objection coded to this policy (2704) simply sought the improvement of the section of A3022 between the Kingswear junction at Churston and Monksbridge Road, Brixham by the addition of a footway to improve conditions for pedestrians, specifically school children. Whilst this may be a laudable request, I consider it to be too detailed for

inclusion in the Local Plan. It should be considered by the Council as Highway Authority through the Local Transport Plan. For these reasons it does not require any modification to policy T19.

15.22.4 Recommendation

15.27 Make no modifications to policy T19.

15.23 Policy T20 (D T25) – District Distributor Road Network

15.23.1 Objections

D/2808/5000/6707/T25/0 - Friends of the Earth, Torbay

D/2808/5000/6719/T25/0 - Friends of the Earth, Torbay

15.23.2 Issue

Whether the policy represents a sustainable transport option.

15.23.3 Conclusions

1. As with the previous policy, representations from FotE have been coded as an in-principle objection to the creation of additional road capacity. However, this policy does not seek to increase the capacity of the road system, but rather aims to accommodate development successfully within the existing road network. As such the policy serves a useful development control purpose, in that it enables and requires the safety and transport implications of new development proposals to be considered and assessed. Furthermore, the explanatory text makes it clear that district distributor roads provide key routes for local bus services, and important facilities for pedestrians and cyclists. By seeking to safeguard the function of these roads to ensure that travel conditions do not worsen for such groups of travellers (and indeed are improved through this and other policies), I consider that this policy will play an important role in the search for a sustainable and integrated transport system for the Bay area.

15.23.4 Recommendation

15.28 Make no modifications to policy T20.

15.24 Policy T21 (D T26) – Road improvements

15.24.1 Objections

- D/2808/5000/6708/T26/0* - *Friends of the Earth, Torbay*
- D/2808/5000/6720/T26/0* - *Friends of the Earth, Torbay*

15.24.2 Issue

Whether the policy represents a sustainable transport option.

15.24.3 Conclusions

1. This is another policy which, like the previous 2, attracted representations from FotE on the basis of an in-principle objection to the creation of additional road capacity. In fact FotE took the view that over time, the capacity of major roads (in particular their junctions), should be reduced as part of an overall traffic reduction strategy. They further contended that road development proposals must be presented as a total strategy and not a piecemeal programme as is often the case when treated as individual road segments or junction improvements.

2. However I accept the Council's view, detailed in explanatory paragraph 15.101, that there are likely to be occasions when local highway improvements are necessary in order to improve road safety, secure important environmental benefits, assist public transport operations, accommodate traffic from essential new development or relieve particular bottlenecks or hazards. In my opinion such improvements need not conflict with the move towards a sustainable transport system. This is reinforced by the latter part of paragraph 15.101, which states that where new road schemes are considered essential, it is important that they meet the overall aims of the Transport Strategy by providing adequate arrangements for vulnerable road users and public transport.

15.24.4 Recommendation

15.29 Make no modifications to policy T21.

15.25 Policy T22 (D T27) – Improved northern approach road

15.25.1 Objections

<i>RD/1289/0021/10002/T22/*</i>	- <i>Teignbridge District Council, South Devon</i>
<i>D/2943/4359/11003/T27/0</i>	- <i>Federation of Small Businesses</i>
<i>D/7652/4048/9521/T27/0</i>	- <i>Government Office for the South West</i>
<i>D/2838/4138/7507/T27/0</i>	- <i>The Environment Agency</i>
<i>D/2808/5000/6724/T27/0</i>	- <i>Friends of the Earth, Torbay</i>
<i>D/2888/4267/8109/T27/0</i>	- <i>Mr G Oliver</i>
<i>D/2158/4256/8057/T27/0</i>	- <i>Ms J Williams</i>
<i>D/2158/4256/8056/T27/0</i>	- <i>Ms J Williams</i>

15.25.2 Issues

- a) Whether the policy represents a sustainable transport option;
- b) other minor matters.

15.25.3 Conclusions

Issue a

1. FotE made a general objection to this policy at DV stage (and also to the following 2 policies D T28 and D T29), on the grounds that by seeking to create new road capacity it does not accord with national guidance. They also contended that all road schemes must be reassessed on a cost-benefit basis in order to test whether or not they are consistent with the objectives of the Local Plan, and the Transport White Paper. However, as the Council point out, Government policy does not state that all new road building is unsustainable, particularly when it is part of an integrated strategy. Indeed the Regional Planning Guidance for the South West (*RPG10 – CD/5/2*) states, in paragraph 3.47, that integrated transport packages should be developed to address problems of congestion at Kingskerswell, including the possibility of a bypass, to increase accessibility to Torbay and assist regeneration.

2. Furthermore, I have had regard to the recently completed A380 Newton Abbot to Torquay Corridor Study (*CD/23/3*), which undertook a wide-ranging assessment of a variety of possible options to improve this route. These assessments covered such considerations as environment, safety, economy, accessibility and integration, and resulted in a recommended strategy comprising a Kingskerswell Bypass, complementary measures of traffic restraint on the existing A380 and further complementary measures to encourage modal shift. The Study comments that together with the bypass these schemes would provide an overall sustainable transport solution in line with both national and local objectives. I agree.

Issue b

3. The Environment Agency (2838) were not opposed to this proposal, but they indicated that construction of the Kingskerswell Bypass is likely to have an adverse effect on flooding in the neighbouring Teignbridge District Council area, unless satisfactory flood alleviation measures are implemented. The Council recognises this fact and have indicated that such measures may be required, following the publication of a detailed route alignment. No modifications to the policy are therefore necessary to address this objection.

4. Mr G Oliver and the Federation of Small Businesses & Torre Traders (*FSBTT - 2943*) were both fully supportive of the proposed bypass, but objected to what they saw as an unnecessarily long timescale for implementation. The Council indicate, however, that the estimated date for completion of Autumn 2009 is considered realistic by the Government, although the Council are currently exploring whether there is any possibility of 'fast-tracking' this scheme. On a related point, the FSBTT indicated at the inquiry that they had serious concerns about the latest proposed route alignment, which was the subject of public consultation at that time. These, however, are matters of detail which do not materially impact upon that part of the bypass which would lie within the Torbay Borough Council area. They do not, therefore, point to the need for any modifications to this policy. To acknowledge such concerns the Council have put forward PFC 15/5 which not only introduces the word 'indicative' before 'route' in the policy wording, but also amends the Proposals Map to clarify the land to be safeguarded within Torbay. This PFC, which I recommend, has satisfactorily addressed the objection raised by Teignbridge District Council at RDV stage.

5. Ms J Williams raised objections concerning the effect of the proposed Kingskerswell bypass on the attractive landscape in the vicinity of the boundary between Teignbridge and Torbay. However, these do not amount to in-principle objections to the bypass, but rather relate to issues which need to be carefully considered at the detailed design stage.

15.25.4 Recommendations

15.30 Modify policy T22 by adding the word 'indicative' before 'route' in the 3rd line.

15.31 Modify sheet 4 of the Proposals Map in accordance with the plan attached to PFC 15/5, in order to clearly indicate the area to be safeguarded.

15.26 Policy T23 (D T28) – Western corridor

Essentially this policy contains the same 5 proposals in both the DV and RDV, 3 of which were subject to objection. The Council also coded objections to the generality of the policy. These are all considered below. However, several of the general objections (preceded with an asterisk in the list in Appendix 15.e) appear to simply be objections to the proposed new road between Churscombe Cross and the bottom of Kings Ash Hill. I have therefore considered them under proposal T23.1. In a similar way the objection preceded with 2 asterisks relates to the proposal for Tweenaway Cross and I have therefore dealt with it under proposal T23.2. Finally, many of the remaining general objections put forward alternative proposals and I have dealt with these at the end of this section. In addition the Council proposed a Change at Inquiry (PCI) to delete proposal T23.1 and counter-objections were received when this was placed on deposit. These counter-objections (suffixed CO) are also considered here.

15.26.1 Objections

Refer to Appendix 15.e for details of objections

15.26.2 Issues

- a) Whether proposal T23.1, for a new road between Churscombe Cross and the bottom of Kings Ash Hill should be re-introduced to the Plan;
- b) whether proposal T23.2 (improvements to Tweenaway Cross junction) should be retained;
- c) the likely effect of proposal T23.4 (improvement to Windy Corner junction) on Galmpton Warborough Common;
- d) whether any alternative proposals should be pursued for this route; and
- e) other minor matters.

15.26.3 Conclusions

Issue a

1. Almost without exception, those objecting to the proposed new road between Churscombe Cross and the bottom of Kings Ash Hill (also referred to as Stage 3 of the Ring Road), cite the significant adverse environmental impact which they consider would be caused to the Westerland Valley if it were to be constructed. This is a view shared by Halcrow Fox, consultants engaged by the Council to develop a Transportation Strategy for the Western Corridor area (*see CD/23/2*). Moreover, this Study concludes that the key constraint on the corridor is the Tweenaway Cross junction, and accordingly a new road scheme to bypass Kings Ash Road would have little impact on journey times in the area. Because of this the Study also concludes that the only significant factor in favour of such a road scheme would be the removal of traffic, in particular heavy goods vehicles (HGVs) from the steep section of Kings Ash Road.

2. Largely as a result of this Study, but also in the light of the changing national guidance on the need to promote sustainable methods of transport (*see PPG 13 – CD/8/11*), the Council put forward PCI 15/2A to delete proposal T23.1. The specific reasoning given is that the new road is not required in the life of the Local Plan; there is no likelihood of funding during the life of the Plan; and its inclusion does not accord with advice in PPG 12 (*CD/8/10*) on safeguarding.

3. However, a number of counter objections to this deletion were received. The Kings Ash Residents' Association (7873) are concerned that deletion would leave Kings Ash Road as the only main access route for all traffic to and from the far end of the Bay and the main industrial estates in the area. Councillor M Hytche (7874) refers to the new road as the most vital part of a successfully planned new Trunk Road, taking the view that it would be of national importance and, as such, beyond the remit of a Unitary Authority to delete it from the Local Plan. However this is not factually correct as the A380 (which comprises the Ring Road) is not a Trunk Road but part of the National Primary Route Network. As such it comes under the jurisdiction of the Council as Highway Authority. Furthermore, I consider it relevant that RD paragraph 15.06 states that the road's prime function is to accommodate traffic with both origin and destination within Torbay.

4. The Chambers of Trade and Commerce for Torquay (7875) and South Devon (2970), together with Havill and Co (7879), all consider the re-introduction of the new road to be vital to the economic well-being of the area. In particular they take the view that the road is essential to improve access to Yalberton Industrial Estate and to encourage new development at White Rock. In addition, both Chambers of Trade and Commerce comment on the sub-standard nature of the existing Kings Ash Road and its inability to cater for the volume and type of traffic it is required to carry, particularly articulated lorries and other HGVs.

5. My attention has also been drawn to the fact that a number of accidents have occurred on this stretch of road, including a fatal accident involving a car and motor-cycle in June 2002. However I am also mindful of the comments in paragraph 2.73 of the Western Corridor Study (CD23/2) which states that the observed accident figures for a 3 year period beginning in October 1995 suggests that the corridor has a lower than average accident rate. Although these figures are now a little old, no evidence has been placed before me to indicate that there has been a significant change in this situation in more recent years.

6. Having considered all the points raised I am, however, persuaded to support the Council and go along with PCI 15/2A for 3 principal reasons. Firstly, the Council have made it clear that there is no likelihood of funding for such a scheme during the lifetime of the Plan. This view is supported by the Torbay Western Corridor Study which concludes, in paragraph 8.3, that Central Government funding is unlikely to be made available to local authorities who seek to satisfy travel demand by simply increasing road capacity, rather than seriously promoting alternative and more sustainable modes of travel. The fact that there is little likelihood of the road's construction during the life of this Local Plan is accepted by the South Devon Chamber of Trade and Commerce, although this organisation urges the Council to indicate clearly its longer term support for the scheme by retaining it within the Plan. But to do so would run counter to the clear guidance in PPG 12 (CD/8/10), especially paragraph 5.17 which states that authorities should only include proposals in plans which are firm, with a reasonable degree of certainty of proceeding within the Plan period and which are identified as such in the Local Transport Plan (LTP – CD23/1). In this case the LTP acknowledges that a new road to bypass Kings Ash Hill cannot be justified, although some improvement to the hill and surrounding network is clearly necessary.

7. The second reason is, as the Western Corridor Study concluded, the fact that the new road would not significantly improve journey times or congestion in the area, as junctions such as Tweenaway Cross form the major constraint on traffic flows.

8. Finally the scheme would, quite simply, work against the transportation strategy that the Council is seeking to pursue for the area. Having said that, I acknowledge that the decision not to pursue proposal T23.1 will not ease traffic problems along the western corridor in itself.

I have no doubt that the Council will have to work hard in promoting their sustainable transport strategy if they are going to achieve the sort of switch from private car to other modes of transport that is likely to be necessary. Nevertheless, as paragraph 2.11 of CD/23/2 points out that some 75-80% of trips on the Ring Road are local in nature, and that average journey lengths are correspondingly low, there seems to be considerable potential for walking, cycling and good quality public transport to satisfy a greater share of travel demand, especially if complemented by effective company travel plans.

9. In reaching this conclusion I have noted that the Inspector who reported on stages 3 and 4 of the Torbay Ring Road in 1997 (CD/23/4A) concluded strongly in favour of the construction of a new road as envisaged in the Devon Development Plan, having also formed the view that the problems of Kings Ash Road could not be resolved by acceptable on-line improvements. However I am also aware that the Secretary of State was not wholly persuaded by the Inspector's conclusion (CD/23/4), particularly as there had been no apparent re-assessment of the proposal in the context of the Government's commitment to sustainable development and integrated transport solutions.

10. With regard to this latter point I have the benefit of the Western Corridor Study (CD/23/2) and have noted its firm conclusions that if its Recommended Strategy is implemented, the development planned for the Ring Road area could be allowed to proceed without having an unacceptable traffic impact on the locality. But as the problem of HGVs on Kings Ash Road would still remain the Council will need to give serious consideration to alternative solutions. The Study indicates that these could range from the provision of a climbing lane alongside the existing route, to the introduction of a lorry management strategy to minimise the impact at peak times. As already noted, pursuing such a strategy will not be easy, nor will it be universally popular. However, in view of the predominantly local nature of traffic on the Ring Road, it seems to me that the success of the strategy lies firmly in the hands of the Council, local businesses and Torbay residents themselves. The policies to bring about the required changes in travel patterns are contained in this Plan and the Council will have to rigorously enforce them and be pro-active in encouraging the use of alternative modes of transport.

Issue b

11. The Torbay Group of CPRE contended that in the light of the Halcrow Fox Western Corridor Study (CD/23/2), the proposal to improve the Tweenaway Cross junction should be taken out of the roads programme. However I do not agree that this is a correct interpretation of the Western Corridor Study as its Recommended Strategy makes it clear that there needs to be a significantly enhanced network of bus services, with bus priority at key locations in particular Tweenaway Cross and Windy Corner. Furthermore, the LTP explains that a key issue for the Western Corridor is peak hour and seasonal congestion at junctions such as Tweenaway Cross and Windy Corner, and that a detailed design study has recently looked at the design options for the improvement of the junction. This is contained in CD/23/6, which comprises a Transportation Assessment of the impact of proposed employment development adjacent to the Ring Road in this area. Further amended, indicative designs were discussed at the inquiry (see figure 4 of Document 33, handed in to the inquiry on 2 May 2002). The improvement scheme for the Tweenaway Cross junction proposed by this Assessment seeks to make best use of land already owned by the Council and, as such, differs significantly from the Ring Road Stage 4 proposal which involved land-take from about 50 owners.

12. In view of these points I am satisfied that an improvement scheme for the Tweenaway Cross junction is necessary and should remain in the Plan. The detailed design issues, and the possible re-routing of certain movements away from the junction suggested by Halcrow Fox (a concern to Mr D Bowden (2902)), are matters which do not affect the principle of this proposal.

Issue c

13. The Galmpton Residents' Association were concerned that any improvement to the Windy Corner junction should not impinge upon Galmpton Warborough Common Land, for example by general carriageway widening. This is an important area of open land, covered by an Urban Landscape Protection Area designation (ULPA), and I understand the concerns of the objector in this regard. However, the Council have explained that although they cannot rule out the need for a small amount of common land for junction improvement purposes, there are no current plans for road widening or the creation of a separate bus lane on common land. Because of this, and the importance of this junction within the overall Western Corridor strategy, I consider that the proposal should remain in the Plan.

Issue d

14. A number of alternative proposals have been put forward to improve the Western Corridor Route, mainly by those opposed to proposal T23.1. These range from a crawler lane on Kings Ash Hill (7258, 2077), a gyratory system to avoid the Tweenaway Cross junction (2896), traffic signals and box markings at junctions on Kings Ash Road (858), and general exhortations to seek to reduce car use (2145) and provide alternative measures to reduce congestion on Kings Ash Hill (7571). However none of these have been put forward in sufficient detail for me, or indeed the Council, to consider recommending them as new proposals for inclusion within the Plan. Nevertheless, it is clear that measures to improve traffic conditions on Kings Ash Road need to be found and implemented. I shall therefore recommend a new proposal T23.1 to address this matter.

Issue e

15. Finally, Mr AC Easterbrook (2889) and Hallbaron Limited (2872) objected to the fact that the Council intend to seek contributions to the improvement schemes for the Western Corridor from developments in the area. In support of this view they contended that much of the new traffic generated will arise from recently approved housing schemes, which have not been required to contribute in this way, and from the major employment areas proposed along the Ring Road. It seems to me, however, only equitable that development which generates additional traffic should be required to make reasonable and proportional contributions towards addressing any transport problems so caused. I shall therefore recommend no change to the policy or the explanatory text in this regard.

15.26.4 Recommendations

15.32 Modify policy T23 by deleting the current wording for proposal T23.1, and its annotation on the Proposals Map (Maps 18 and 20), and replacing it with the following:

“improvements to Kings Ash Road, and the surrounding road network if necessary, to address the difficulties experienced by HGVs and coaches on this section of Ring Road”.

15.33 Add an annotation for the new T23.1 proposal, to Kings Ash Road.

15.34 Modify paragraph 15.111 of the explanatory text by deleting all text after “problem” on line 7, and replacing it with the following:

“Improvements will therefore be carried out to Kings Ash Road, and the surrounding road network if necessary, to address the particular problems experienced by HGVs and coaches”.

15.35 Modify paragraph 15.112 of the explanatory text by deleting the words “The remainder of” in the first line.

15.27 Policy T24 (D T29) – Torquay Northern Distributor Road

15.27.1 Objections

<i>D/7814/4126/7008/T29/0</i>	-	<i>CPRE, Torbay Group</i>
<i>D/7814/4126/7009/T29/0</i>	-	<i>CPRE, Torbay Group</i>
<i>D/2944/4360/8427/T29/0</i>	-	<i>Mr D Kelly</i>
<i>D/2808/5000/6725/T29/0</i>	-	<i>Friends of the Earth, Torbay</i>
<i>D/2892/4295/8199/T29/0</i>	-	<i>Mrs MR Phillips</i>
<i>D/2892/4295/8200/T29/0</i>	-	<i>Mrs MR Phillips</i>
<i>D/2158/4252/8047/T29/0</i>	-	<i>Ms J Williams</i>

15.27.2 Issue

The sustainability of the proposal and its effect on the living conditions of nearby residents.

15.27.3 Conclusions

1. CPRE contended that traffic on Browns Bridge Road is already causing problems for residents in the new Scotts Bridge/Barton housing area, and that as Happaway Road passes through a residential area heavy traffic should not be encouraged on this route. Indeed they considered that this circuitous route would not prove popular with drivers anyway and that measures to reduce traffic levels are the only acceptable solution. Similar views were expressed by Ms J Williams.

2. Mr D Kelly (2944) and Mrs Phillips (2892) also considered that the proposal would be in conflict with sustainable transport policy, with this latter objector contending that Happaway Road and Combe Road are unsuitable for heavy traffic flows as they are narrow with a poor alignment and have no footways. She also indicated that traffic on these roads gives rise to air pollution, and suggested an alternative route along Jacks Lane and Moor Lane where roads can be widened without disruption to residents. As with the previous policy, FotE objected on the grounds that seeking to create new road capacity does not accord with national guidance.

3. However, on this latter topic I have already pointed out that the construction of new roads need not necessarily be in conflict with Government policy, especially where they assist the operation of public transport. In this case the Council explain that policy T24 would complete

a set of improvements, contained in the Adopted Torbay Local Plan (CD/1/3), aimed at providing an improved local distributor route across northern Torquay. The Council consider that this would serve a large number of residential properties and the employment area at Lummaton Quarry and would thereby improve accessibility to cars and public transport to the northern part of Torquay. They say that it would also create a better link with the A379 coastal route, and south to the St Marychurch Bypass, and would therefore benefit tourism.

4. In addition the Council see the scheme as improving accessibility to the north of Torbay and helping to increase bus penetration, whilst also offering opportunities to improve road safety and increase pedestrian provision, especially as there is no footway on part of the existing road. There is no firm evidence before me to counter this point of view, and so I therefore see no good reason to recommend any modification to this policy. In reaching this view I have also been mindful of the fact that although RD paragraph 15.113 states that the implementation of the proposal will depend on further study, the Council have decided that need for the road improvement has become more apparent. The scheme is now contained within the Local Transport Plan capital programme for implementation in 2004/5 and 2005/6 and it seems to me that there is therefore every likelihood that it will be implemented in the Plan period.

15.27.4 Recommendation

15.36 Make no modifications to policy T24.

15.28 Policy T25 (D T30) – Traffic Restraint Zones

15.28.1 Objections

<i>RD/7652/0001/9942/T25/*</i>	-	<i>Government Office for the South West</i>
<i>RD/7391/0715/10745/T25/*</i>	-	<i>Mr DB Job</i>
<i>D/1253/1221/2724/T30/0</i>	-	<i>Preston Down Residents' Association</i>
<i>D/7652/4048/9522/T30/0</i>	-	<i>Government Office for the South West</i>

15.28.2 Issue

Whether the policy should be retained and, if so, whether the proposed Traffic Restraint Zones should be shown on the Proposals Map.

15.28.3 Conclusions

1. GOSW objected at both DV and RDV stage, on the grounds that if the policy represents definite proposals, as is sought by PPG 12 (CD/8/10), then this should be made clear with the areas in question being shown on the Proposals Map. Otherwise the policy should be deleted. I agree with the Council that it is appropriate to retain the policy within the Plan, as paragraph 66 of PPG 13 (CD/8/11) indicates that well designed traffic management measures can contribute to planning objectives in a number of ways.

2. However, I also share GOSW's view that the areas where Traffic Restraint Zones are proposed should, as far as possible, be indicated on the Proposals Map as this would help to create certainty for the local community. I have noted the Council's preference for such zones to be identified through the Local Transport Plan, which I agree is the appropriate place for the

detailed proposals to be spelled out. Nevertheless, paragraph 15.114 explains that the Council is undertaking a series of investigations to identify those areas which would benefit most from measures to restrain or manage traffic, and I see that funding is now programmed in the Local Transport Plan up to 2005/6 and beyond, for Traffic Impact Reduction schemes. Because of this I see no good reason why the broad areas where such proposals will be implemented cannot be indicated on the Proposals Map, especially as the reference within the policy to 'residential and other sensitive areas' is somewhat ambiguous. In my opinion such an annotation would add clarity to the Plan both for local residents, who may be directly affected, and for developers who may be required under the policy to contribute to such works.

3. The representation from the Preston Down Residents' Association (1253) is concerned with specific proposals for Preston Down Road which I draw to the Council's attention. However, there is insufficient submitted evidence for me to form a view as to whether this area should be covered by this policy. The remaining objector (7391) raises concerns about the Union Street area of Torquay, which I have more appropriately dealt with already under policy T6.4.

15.28.4 Recommendations

15.37 Modify policy T25 to read as follows:

'Traffic Restraint Zones will be implemented in the areas shown on the Proposals Map, in the interests of safety and amenity. Within these zones measures will be introduced to reduce the speed of traffic, reduce unnecessary use of local roads and achieve safer routes to schools, shops and other local services. New development within or adjacent to these zones will be required to make appropriate contributions to these works.'

15.38 Modify the Proposals Map as necessary to show those areas already identified for such measures, in accordance with the Capital Programme set out in the Local Transport Plan.

15.29 Policy T26 (D T33) – Car parking in new development

15.29.1 Objections

<i>RD/7297/0166/10186/T26/*</i>	-	<i>Cavanna Homes Limited</i>
<i>RD/7799/0739/275/T26/*</i>	-	<i>Ms E Donovan</i>
<i>RD/7799/0739/10751/T26/*</i>	-	<i>Ms E Donovan</i>
<i>RD/7652/0001/9943/T26/*</i>	-	<i>Government Office for the South West</i>
<i>RD/7635/0268/136/T26/*</i>	-	<i>WM Morrison Supermarkets Plc</i>
<i>RD/7630/0260/127/T26/*</i>	-	<i>Tesco Stores Ltd</i>
<i>RD/2206/0037/85/T26/*</i>	-	<i>South West RSL Planning Consortium</i>
<i>D/7297/4173/7759/T33/0</i>	-	<i>Cavanna Homes Limited</i>
<i>D/7652/4048/9523/T33/0</i>	-	<i>Government Office for the South West</i>
<i>D/2959/4405/8572/T33/0</i>	-	<i>Brixham Amenity Society & Residents' Association</i>
<i>D/2808/5000/6701/T33/0</i>	-	<i>Friends of the Earth, Torbay</i>
<i>D/2808/5000/6729/T33/0</i>	-	<i>Friends of the Earth, Torbay</i>
<i>D/2808/5000/6723/T33/0</i>	-	<i>Friends of the Earth, Torbay</i>
<i>D/7630/4166/7657/T33/0</i>	-	<i>Tesco Stores Ltd</i>
<i>D/2206/3348/6225/T33/0</i>	-	<i>South West RSL Planning Consortium</i>
<i>D/2867/4179/1198/T33/0</i>	-	<i>Morley Properties Ltd</i>

15.29.2 Issues

- a) Whether the schedule of maximum parking standards satisfactorily accords with national and regional guidance;
- b) other minor matters.

15.29.3 Conclusions

Issue a

1. Before turning to the main issue, it is relevant to point out that this policy has undergone substantial changes from that which appeared in the DV. In particular, the schedule of parking standards has been moved from the Environmental Guide to the policy itself, to address an objection from GOSW. In addition, the deletion of the DV policy's second paragraph, and the amendments introduced by PFC 15/6 (to adopt the PPG 13 maximum standards and have regard to paragraph 62 of PPG 3), satisfies objections made by Cavanna Homes Ltd (7297) and WM Morrison Supermarkets Ltd.

2. However, although the Council is of the view that this PFC would bring the parking standards into line with both PPG 13 and PPG 3, GOSW have maintained an objection on the grounds that the proposed residential standard of 2 spaces per dwelling appears to be in conflict with guidance in paragraph 62 of PPG 3. This indicates that car parking standards that result, on average, in development with more than 1.5 off-street car parking spaces per dwelling are unlikely to reflect the Government's emphasis on securing sustainable residential environments. The Council have commented, in a response to Ms E Donovan (*see later*), that PPG 3 suggests a maximum standard for any dwelling of 1.5 spaces, although there does not seem to me to be any proposal to reduce the 'straightforward' dwelling house standard below the 2 spaces per dwelling contained in the RDV.

3. Having said this, it is clear that to have an average of 1.5 spaces per dwelling, some dwellings must have more than this. Hence I see nothing wrong with retaining the proposed RDV standard of 2 garages or car parking spaces per dwelling, provided that such dwellings are part of a development which has an overall average parking provision in line with the guidance in paragraph 62 of PPG 3. To address this matter I shall recommend that an additional note be added to the schedule. Furthermore I shall recommend amended wording to that put forward in the PFC, in order to align the schedule more closely with the PPG 3 guidance.

4. Because of my views on these previous points, it follows that I do not agree with Tesco Stores Ltd (7630), who argue that car parking standards should not be prescriptive. I accept their point, that the extent of existing public transport provision, existing parking provision in the locality, and the needs of the particular development in question are relevant. But, unless there is an overall target or constraint (such as is offered by maximum parking standards), tied into the aims of the land-use transportation strategy, then it is difficult to see how the reduction in the growth of private car trips will be achieved.

5. Morley Properties Ltd (2867) sought the introduction of a new parking standard for non-food bulk goods, arguing that this should allow more parking than would normally be the case with large non-food retail, because of the very nature of 'bulky goods retailing'. They suggested that 1 parking space for every 18.5m² would be appropriate and would be consistent with the retail cash and carry standards operating in the neighbouring local authority areas of

Teignbridge and South Hams. There is, however, no firm evidence to persuade me that bulky goods retailing necessarily warrants the provision of more parking spaces than other non-food retail developments. In any case, the parking standard for non-food retail now proposed in the Plan, as a result of PFC 15/6, is a maximum of 1 space per 20m² of gross floorspace. This does not differ significantly from that requested by the objector and I therefore consider that there is no justification to recommend a different standard for this particular class of goods.

6. The South West RSL Planning Consortium (2206) contended that the parking standards should be more restrictive for social housing developments, but as the proposed standards are maxima there is no compunction on a developer to provide more parking than he considers necessary and appropriate.

7. Ms E Donovan (7799) seeks an increased parking standard for sheltered accommodation, of 2 spaces per 3 units. However, paragraph 61 of PPG 3 explains that local authorities should revise their parking standards to allow for significantly lower levels of off-street parking provision in certain circumstances. These include developments in locations such as town centres, where services are readily accessible by walking, cycling and public transport; and those which provide housing for elderly people, students or single people where the demand for car parking is likely to be less than for family housing. In addition I am mindful of the fact that policy CF 15 (*Accommodation for people in need of care*) seeks to locate uses such as sheltered housing close to public transport, local shops and other everyday facilities, which will also militate against the need for extensive parking in such developments.

8. Because of these points I share the Council's view that a maximum provision of 1 space per 2 sheltered dwellings is appropriate and complies with Government guidance. Should such developments require additional provision for disabled drivers, which is perhaps more likely in sheltered housing schemes than general housing schemes, then this would be provided for by Note 3 of Annex D to PPG 13, which the Council indicate is also introduced to the parking standards schedule by PFC 15/6. This latter point does, however, highlight the fact that there does not appear to be any specific reference to parking for disabled persons within the schedule. As PPG 13 points out that development proposals should provide adequate parking for disabled motorists in terms of both numbers and design, and that such parking should be additional to the maximum parking standards, I consider that an indication of what the Council are seeking in this regard should be clearly set out in the schedule.

9. The objection from the Brixham Amenity Society & Residents' Association (2959), that implementation of this policy would make the achievement of DV proposal E7.19 (*Long Road South, Paignton*) impossible is noted, but no further details as to how or why the Association believes this to be the case have been submitted. As the policy and maximum standards are in accordance with regional and national advice, I see no reason why the policy needs to be modified to address this objection.

Issue b

10. In addition to seeking maximum parking standards, FotE also contended that such standards should be based on road capacity and not on land availability or demand. Whilst I appreciate the underlying concerns behind such suggestions, I consider it likely that such a system would be difficult to understand and complicated to operate. In view of this, and the absence of any detailed proposals for such a system, I am not persuaded that any changes to the proposed standards are warranted.

11. Finally, although not the subject of objections, I wish to draw to the Council's attention the fact that the parking standards do not contain figures for Storage or Distribution (*Use*

Class B8). As this category appeared in the DV schedule, and as no reasons for its deletion have been given, I consider that it should be re-introduced to the schedule at a standard no greater than that contained in the RPG (CD/5/2), namely 1 space per 200m².

15.29.4 Recommendations

15.39 Make no modification to the text of policy T26.

15.40 Modify the Schedule of Maximum Car Parking Standards attached to policy T26 by the following:

- **For 'a) Dwelling Houses', add the following text to the 'Estimated Requirement' column, after 'to be served': 'In locations such as town centres where services are readily accessible by walking, cycling or public transport this standard may be lowered to 1 garage/parking space per dwelling'; and add the following text to the 'Notes' column: 'Developers should have regard to the need to keep average car parking provision to no greater than 1.5 off-street spaces per dwelling, in line with the advice in PPG 3'.**
- **Replace the 'Estimated Requirement' for the sections on shops, places of entertainment and assembly, offices and industry and higher and further education with the standards in Annex D to PPG 13, together with the 4 notes given in Annex D.**
- **Add a new category to the 'Type of Development' column entitled 'Shared Use Of Parking'; add the following to the related 'Estimated Requirement' column: 'Shared use of parking, particularly in town centres and as part of some mixed use proposals, will be sought, especially where peak parking levels from the different uses do not coincide and there is good access by public transport'; and add the following to the related 'Notes' column: 'This standard applies to all developments where there is a realistic potential for shared parking'.**

INSPECTOR'S NOTES:

- *The Council should consider re-introducing 'Storage/Distribution Uses as described in Class B8 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987' into the Schedule, with a standard of 1 car space for every 200m² of gross floor area.*
- *The Council should give consideration to setting out disabled parking standards within the schedule, both in terms of the size of parking bays and the quantum of spaces, so that potential developers clearly understand their obligations in this regard.*
- *There are 2 typographical errors in the explanatory text to this policy. In the 10th line of paragraph 15.118 'advantage' should read 'disadvantage'. And in the first line of paragraph 15.120 'though' should read 'through'.*

15.30 Policy T27 (D T34) – Access from development on to the highway

15.30.1 Objections

D/2959/4406/8573/T34/0 - Brixham Amenity Society & Residents' Association

15.30.2 Issue

The appropriateness of the policy as a means of securing satisfactory access points to the highway.

15.30.3 Conclusions

1. As already noted in paragraph 15.29.3.8, the Brixham Amenity Society & Residents' Association stated that this policy would militate against the achievement of DV proposal E7.19 (*Long Road South, Paignton*). However, no further details as to how or why the Association believes this to be the case have been submitted. It seems to me that the policy contains clear criteria, which will serve to ensure that any new access points are constructed to be safe and have acceptable environmental impacts. Accordingly I see no reason why the policy needs to be modified.

15.30.4 Recommendation

15.41 Make no modifications to policy T27.

15.31 Policy D T4 – Protection of public rights of way (Deleted)

15.31.1 Objections

*RD/7844/0090/75/T4/*F - Galmpton Residents' Association*
D/7652/4048/9518/T4/0 - Government Office for the South West
D/2892/4284/8169/T4/0 - Mrs MR Phillips

15.31.2 Issue

Whether there is a need for the policy.

15.31.3 Conclusions

1. This policy, which sought to safeguard public rights of way was deleted at RDV stage, largely because GOSW pointed out that it appeared to duplicate highways law, to the detriment of the clarity and concision of the Plan. Although the Galmpton Residents' Association have objected to this deletion, the fact that public rights of way are already adequately safeguarded under other legislation means that there is no need for this policy to be included in the Plan. Its deletion in no way weakens the protection afforded to public rights of way.

2. Mrs MR Phillips's objection (2892) is more in the nature of a request to make Torquay town centre more compact, than any specific objection to this policy. Her representation has

already been addressed under policy T8, and does not warrant the re-introduction of DV policy T4.

15.31.4 Recommendation

15.42 Make no modification to the Plan in terms of re-introducing DV policy T4.

15.32 Policy D T15 – Bus network (Deleted)

15.32.1 Objections

<i>RD/7844/0100/58/T15/*F</i>	-	<i>Galmpton Residents' Association</i>
<i>RD/7844/0102/10226/T15/*F</i>	-	<i>Galmpton Residents' Association</i>
<i>RD/7844/0098/56/T15/*F</i>	-	<i>Galmpton Residents' Association</i>
<i>RD/7844/0097/55/T15/*F</i>	-	<i>Galmpton Residents' Association</i>
<i>RD/7844/0088/45/T15/*F</i>	-	<i>Galmpton Residents' Association</i>
<i>D/7844/4421/8601/T15/0</i>	-	<i>Galmpton Residents' Association</i>
<i>D/7844/4419/8597/T15/0</i>	-	<i>Galmpton Residents' Association</i>
<i>D/2923/4334/8314/T15/0</i>	-	<i>Mr GW Clark</i>
<i>D/2808/5000/6712/T15/0</i>	-	<i>Friends of the Earth, Torbay</i>

15.32.2 Issue

Whether there is a need for the policy.

15.32.3 Conclusions

1. This policy was deleted at RDV stage, following DV objections from GOSW to the effect that if the policy did not represent definite proposals, then it did not appear to have any clear development implications and should therefore be deleted.
2. This deletion gave rise to counter objections from the Galmpton Residents' Association (7844), who state that the successful diversion of journeys from private cars to public transport requires the fostering of a good bus service throughout the Bay and to and from neighbouring towns. They further contend that this was implicit in the commitment to bus priority measures for route 12 (linking Brixham, Paignton, Torquay and Newton Abbot), detailed in DV explanatory paragraph 15.55 and DV policy T15. In addition, they consider that sufficient is known of traffic congestion throughout Torbay for a list of sites for bus priority measures to be identified and listed in the Local Plan.
3. Because of the importance which the Council ascribe to improved public transport in the land use and transportation strategy, I agree with this view. The Residents' Association have submitted a list of 7 locations which they consider should feature in the policy, but I have been provided with evidence for only 3 of these, namely the junctions at Windy Corner, Tweenaway Cross, and between the A379 and A3022 at Churston. These are detailed in policy T23 (*see above*), which states quite clearly that improvement schemes will provide measures to assist the development of efficient bus services. Furthermore, paragraph 8.41 of the Western Corridor Study (*CD/23/2*) states that the implementation of a bus strategy (one of the elements of the Recommended Strategy) would include a significantly enhanced network of bus services, bus priority at key locations (in particular Tweenaway Cross and Windy Corner), and improved bus infrastructure at stops.

4. In the light of these points I shall recommend that DV policy T15 be re-introduced to the Plan, but that it be made more positive, with firm locations for improvements listed, in order to address GOSW's concerns. I shall suggest the 3 junction locations listed above, but the Council should investigate the other locations suggested by the Galmpton Residents' Association, together with other likely locations. This exercise should also consider the proposal for a road train service between the Torquay Town Hall Car Park and the Strand which has been suggested by Mr GW Clark (2923), but of which I have no further details. The re-introduction of this policy in a more positive form will address the FotE's objection.

15.32.4 Recommendation

15.43 Re-introduce DV policy T15 to the Plan, reworded as follows:

“The Council will implement measures to give buses priority where congestion occurs in order to improve the efficiency and frequency of services. Locations at which such measures will be introduced will include:

- 1. Tweenaway Cross junction, Paignton;**
- 2. Windy Corner junction, Paignton;**
- 3. the A379 Dartmouth Road/A3022 New Road junction, Churston.”**

15.33 New Policy – Light Rail System

15.33.1 Objections

D/7844/4419/8593/T1/0 - Galmpton Residents' Association
D/2863/4177/7836/T1/0 - The Churston Barony Settlement Trustees & Fuller Family
D/7571/4245/8034/T1/0 - Torbay District Labour Party
D/2114/3316/5497/T1/0 - Mr DFJ Worth

15.33.2 Issue

Whether the Plan should contain a specific policy to introduce light rail systems to the Bay.

15.33.3 Conclusions

1. The Galmpton Residents' Association have already indicated their strong support for a commitment to improved public transport in their objections to the deletion of DV policy T15, discussed above. However, they have taken the view that buses are not the only form of public transport which should be considered, and they refer to trams and light rail options. In particular they pressed for the introduction of a policy or strategy statement committing the Council to actively pursue this potential transport solution on routes between Brixham, Paignton, Torquay and Newton Abbot. They specifically referred to the possibilities of exploiting the rail route from Torquay to Churston and on to Brixham, by extending the rails to Brixham and Torquay's Fleet Walk and integrating buses running along the “tarmaced in” rails from Goodrington to Torquay between the existing but infrequent rail services.

2. The Churston Barony Settlement Trustees & Fuller Family were similarly supportive of alternative public transport solutions, stating that it is proposed to construct a narrow gauge

light railway linking a possible park and ride site at Churston with Brixham Town. They suggested that a light railway could run from a location adjacent to the existing Churston Station and follow the now redundant old Brixham railway line to North Boundary Road and thence into Brixham, possibly by means of a rack and pinion track to the quayside. The Torbay District Labour Party (7571) would like to see the proposal for improvements to Goodrington Station include an additional proposal for the development of a light railway from Paignton to Brixham. And finally, Mr DFJ Worth (2114) considered that trolley buses or a light rail system could be beneficial for the Bay.

3. I appreciate the points raised by these objectors and certainly see no good reason why the Council should not be open-minded regarding such suggestions. However, I share the Council's concerns regarding the likely very high cost of tramway or light rail systems. Furthermore, no detailed plans or costings have been submitted to indicate that any of the systems put forward would be in any way practicable for the Bay area. On the specific matters raised, I consider it highly unlikely that buses could be integrated with trains along the same track in a cost-effective and meaningful manner. Moreover, it seems to me that the significant level difference between the New Boundary Road area and Brixham quayside means that it would be very difficult to develop a viable tramway or light rail system on this route. This is not to say, however, that such systems cannot be considered. But if any firm proposals come forward it is my view that they can adequately be assessed under such policies as TS and T2. In the light of these points I consider there to be no justification for a specific policy reference to such transport alternatives.

15.33.4 Recommendation

15.44 Make no modification to the Plan in terms of the suggested introduction of a specific policy reference to light rail, tramway or trolley bus systems.

15.34 New Policy – General Aviation

15.34.1 Objection

RD/623/0128/374/TS/ - General Aviation Awareness Council*

15.34.2 Issue

The appropriateness of introducing a General Aviation policy to the Plan.

15.34.3 Conclusions

1. The General Aviation Awareness Council propose that a policy be incorporated into the Local Plan setting out considerations for the establishment of flying sites. Paragraph 5, Annex B of PPG 13 is argued to endorse such a policy.

2. The Council have indicated that they are not opposed to aviation development in principle. Indeed, they recognise that such development could bring tourism and other benefits to the area. However, paragraphs 3.1 and 3.11 of PPG 12 indicate that Local Plans should not be over elaborate, and I am mindful of GOSW's objections which have encouraged the Council to simplify and reduce the number of Policies in the Plan. So, notwithstanding the benefits which could well arise from aviation development, I share the Council's view that a

policy on such a topic would only be used very infrequently in Torbay and would merely duplicate other considerations set out in the Plan. In this regard I have noted that DV policy T23 (*Helicopter landing area*) was deleted partly due to amenity concerns and partly because there was no clear demand for such a facility (*TP/15, Paragraph 8.259*).

3. I also agree with the Council that if aviation proposals requiring planning permission arise during the Plan period, they can be adequately considered against existing policies within the Local Plan, such as policy TS (*Land Use Transportation Strategy*), and/or policy R2 (*Outdoor Recreation Development*). These points, coupled with the absence of any current commercial interest in such development, leads me to conclude that no modifications should be made to the Plan to address this objection.

15.34.4 Recommendation

15.45 Make no modification to the Plan in terms of the suggested introduction of a General Aviation policy.

Appendix 15.a – Policy TS - Land use transportation strategy

Those objections preceded by an asterisk have been dealt with either under the appropriate existing policy, or in the “New Policy” sections above.

15.34.5 Objections

RD/7844/0087/44/TS/* - Galmpton Residents' Association
 RD/7844/0086/43/TS/* - Galmpton Residents' Association
 RD/7652/0001/10135/TS/* - Government Office for the South West
 RD/7810/0338/10798/TS/* - Paignton Preservation Society
 RD/7835/0066/370/TS/* - Stoke Gabriel Parish Council
 D/7844/4419/8596/T1/0 - Galmpton Residents' Association
 * D/7844/4419/8593/T1/0 - Galmpton Residents' Association
 D/2840/4140/7515/T1/0 - Devon Fire & Rescue Service
 * D/623/0651/1535/T1/0 - General Aviation Awareness Council
 D/2902/4300/8214/T1/0 - Mr D Bowden
 D/2933/4344/8351/T1/0 - Mr PR Brewis
 D/2890/4282/8179/T1/0 – Mr & Mrs RN Carter
 D/2890/4282/8180/T1/0 – Mr & Mrs RN Carter
 * D/2863/4177/7836/T1/0 - The Churston Barony Settlement Trustees & Fuller Family
 D/2923/4334/8305/T1/0 - Mr GW Clark – (considered under policy T6)
 D/7814/4106/6979/T1/3 – CPRE, Torbay Group
 D/7814/4110/6983/T1/7 – CPRE, Torbay Group
 D/2885/4219/7972/T1/0 - The Conservative Group on Torbay Council
 D/7799/4279/8156/T1/0 - Ms E Donovan
 D/7652/4048/9516/T1/0 - Government Office for the South West
 D/2828/4128/7183/T1/0 - RSPB
 D/2808/5000/6705/T1/0 - Friends of the Earth, Torbay
 D/2808/5000/6709/T1/0 - Friends of the Earth, Torbay
 D/2808/5000/6631/T1/0 - Friends of the Earth, Torbay
 D/2808/5000/6632/T1/0 - Friends of the Earth, Torbay
 D/2808/5000/6716/T1/0 - Friends of the Earth, Torbay
 D/2808/5000/6699/T1/0 - Friends of the Earth, Torbay
 D/2808/5000/6726/T1/0 - Friends of the Earth, Torbay
 D/2808/5000/6727/T1/0 - Friends of the Earth, Torbay
 D/2808/5000/6634/T1/0 - Friends of the Earth, Torbay

D/2888/4267/8124/T1/0 - Mr G Oliver
 D/2888/4267/8111/T1/0 - Mr G Oliver
 D/2888/4267/8123/T1/0 - Mr G Oliver
 D/2899/4297/8202/T1/0 - The Black Tulip, Licensed Restaurant
 D/2836/4131/7431/T1/0 - The Countryside Agency
 * D/7571/4245/8034/T1/0 - Torbay District Labour Party
 D/2590/3783/5642/T1/0 - Mrs R Spillman
 D/2901/4299/8209/T1/0 - Gresham Court Hotel
 D/2114/3330/5881/T1/0 - Mr DFJ Worth
 D/2114/3315/5509/T1/0 - Mr DFJ Worth – (considered under policy T11)
 D/2114/3315/5500/T1/0 - Mr DFJ Worth
 * D/2114/3316/5497/T1/0 - Mr DFJ Worth

Appendix 15.b – Policy T6 (D T8) – Torquay Town Centre improvements

Objections were coded to the policy in general, and also to 4 of the 5 separate proposals.

15.34.6 Objections

RD/7387/0711/10741/T6/* - Mr S A Teague
 D/2868/4180/7850/T8/0 - Scottish Widows
 D/2923/4334/8306/T8/0 - Mr GW Clark
 D/2943/4359/8422/T8/0 - Federation Of Small Businesses
 D/2891/4283/8164/T8/0 - Mr N Hatton
 D/2808/5000/6686/T8/0 - Friends of the Earth, Torbay
 D/2888/4267/8127/T8/0 - Mr G Oliver
 D/2888/4267/8128/T8/0 - Mr G Oliver
 D/2892/4284/8168/T8/0 - Mrs MR Phillips
 D/7607//10971/T8/0 - (The Post Office) Consignia
 D/2212/3350/4851/T8/0 - The Post Office
 D/2212/3350/4852/T8/0 - The Post Office
 D/2114/3315/5499/T8/0 - Mr DFJ Worth
 D/2114/3319/5489/T8/0 - Mr DFJ Worth
 D/2114/3331/5887/T8/0 - Mr DFJ Worth

Proposal T6.1 - Improving pedestrian areas and servicing areas on The Strand, Cary Parade and Victoria Parade

D/2869/4184/7863/T8/1 - Scottish Widows
 D/2741/3973/6158/T8/1 - Mrs SK Linder
 D/2900/4298/8206/T8/1 - The Beulah, Holiday Apartments
 D/2784/4448/8899/T8/1 - Torquay Branch of South Devon Chamber of Trade

Proposal T6.2 - Reducing volumes of traffic accessing Fleet Street

D/2869/4185/7865/T8/2 - Scottish Widows
 D/2869/4185/7867/T8/2 - Scottish Widows
 D/2784/4449/8901/T8/2 - Torquay Branch of South Devon Chamber of Trade
 D/2784/4449/8903/T8/2 - Torquay Branch of South Devon Chamber of Trade

Proposal T6.3 - Providing improved rear servicing to Union Street

D/2776/4013/6448/T8/3 - Allsops Pitts ltd
 D/2762/3999/6203/T8/3 - Mr B Bolton
 D/2770/4007/6400/T8/3 - Four Seasons
 D/2767/4004/6376/T8/3 - Gaia
 D/2769/4006/6392/T8/3 - Mr N Gray
 D/2779/4016/6472/T8/3 - Mr V Hambly
 D/2778/4015/6464/T8/3 - Mr P Hammond

D/2785/4287/8177/T8/3 - Mr P Hawkins
 D/2760/3997/6187/T8/3 - Mr D Jones
 D/2772/4009/6416/T8/3 - Key Late Stores
 D/2777/4014/6456/T8/3 - Komodromos Christos
 D/2761/3998/6195/T8/3 - Mr GE Loye
 D/2782/4019/6496/T8/3 - Mr MJ Martin
 D/2773/4010/6424/T8/3 - Mr BD Morrison
 D/2774/4011/6432/T8/3 - Mr & Mrs JM Purdy
 D/2768/4005/6384/T8/3 - Quay Stores
 D/2763/4000/6344/T8/3 - Reflections of Torquay
 D/2765/4002/6360/T8/3 - Stamp Shop
 D/2780/4017/6480/T8/3 - Stork of the Town
 D/2766/4003/6368/T8/3 - Torbay Blinds
 D/2783/4020/6503/T8/3 - Mrs M Turner

Proposal T6.4 - Improve pedestrian conditions in Union Street in phases

RD/7391/0715/9755/T6/4 - Mr DB Job
 RD/7389/0713/9753/T6/4 - Mr JD Reeves
 RD/7388/0712/9752/T6/4 - Mrs S Reeves
 RD/7390/0714/9754/T6/4 - Mr R Teague
 RD/7387/0711/9751/T6/4 - M S A Teague
 D/2776/4013/6449/T8/4 - Allsops Pitts Ltd
 D/2762/3999/6204/T8/4 - Mr B Bolton
 D/2770/4007/6401/T8/4 - Four Seasons
 D/2767/4004/6377/T8/4 - Gaia
 D/2769/4006/6393/T8/4 - Mr N Gray
 D/2779/4016/6473/T8/4 - Mr V Hambly
 D/2778/4015/6465/T8/4 - Mr P Hammond
 D/2971/4455/8917/T8/4 - Torquay Harbour Business Association
 D/2971/4455/8918/T8/4 - Torquay Harbour Business Association
 D/2785/4287/8178/T8/4 - Mr P Hawkins
 D/2869/4181/7855/T8/4 - Scottish Widows
 D/2760/3997/6188/T8/4 - Mr D Jones
 D/2772/4009/6417/T8/4 - Key Late Stores
 D/2777/4014/6457/T8/4 - Komodromos Christos
 D/2761/3998/6196/T8/4 - Mr GE Loye
 D/2782/4019/6497/T8/4 - Mr MJ Martin
 D/2773/4010/6425/T8/4 - Mr BD Morrison
 D/2888/4267/8113/T8/4 - Mr G Oliver
 D/2774/4011/6433/T8/4 - Mr & Mrs JM Purdy
 D/2768/4005/6385/T8/4 - Quay Stores
 D/2763/4000/6345/T8/4 - Reflections of Torquay
 D/2765/4002/6361/T8/4 - Stamp Shop
 D/2784/4451/8908/T8/4 - Torquay Branch of South Devon Chamber of Trade
 D/2780/4017/6481/T8/4 - Stork of the Town
 D/2766/4003/6369/T8/4 - Torbay Blinds
 D/2783/4020/6504/T8/4 - Mrs M Turner

Appendix 15.c – Policy T7 (D T9) – Paignton Town Centre improvements

15.34.7 Objections

D/2070/3145/4558/T9/0 - Fredmans Ltd Furnishers
 D/2724/3956/6126/T9/0 - Burton Menswear
 D/2724/3956/6128/T9/0 - Burton Menswear
 D/2808/5000/6687/T9/0 - Friends of the Earth, Torbay

D/7571/4244/8029/T9/0 - Torbay District Labour Party
 D/2177/3307/5153/T9/0 – Mr & Mrs A Sie
 D/2114/3331/5888/T9/0 - Mr DFJ Worth
 D/2727/3959/6133/T9/1 - Boots Opticians Ltd
 D/2727/3985/6172/T9/1 - Boots Opticians Ltd
 D/2757/3994/6181/T9/1 - Mr S Beatty
 D/2726/3958/6132/T9/1 - Thresher Wine Shop
 D/2753/3990/6177/T9/1 - Mrs V Bradley
 D/2933/4344/8359/T9/1 - Mr PR Brewis
 D/2728/3960/6134/T9/1 - British Heart Foundation
 D/2750/3987/6174/T9/1 - Mr P Cardwell
 D/2788/4045/6516/T9/1 - Sophisticut
 D/2746/3980/6167/T9/1 - Fredmans Ltd
 D/2730/3962/6136/T9/1 - Devonshire Car Specialists
 D/2891/4283/8165/T9/1 - Mr N Hatton
 D/2734/3966/6142/T9/1 - Mr VW Hatton
 D/2748/3984/6171/T9/1 - Mr P Honah
 D/2758/3995/6182/T9/1 - Mr RW Hooper
 D/2758/4365/8468/T9/1 - Mr RW Hooper
 D/2733/3965/6141/T9/1 - Mr G Keen
 D/2888/4267/8114/T9/1 - Mr G Oliver
 D/2743/3976/6163/T9/1 - Mr S Richford
 D/2755/3992/6179/T9/1 - Mr M Rivers
 D/2725/3957/6131/T9/1 - Oliver Timpsons
 D/2725/3957/6130/T9/1 - Oliver Timpsons
 D/2749/3986/6173/T9/1 – Mrs J M Schofield
 D/2744/3978/6165/T9/1 - Mr M Seal
 D/2752/3989/6176/T9/1 – Mr & Mrs A Sie
 D/2721/3975/6162/T9/1 - Mr PJ Silley
 D/2721/3953/6120/T9/1 - Mr PJ Silley
 D/2722/3954/6123/T9/1 - Tesco Stores Ltd
 D/2722/3954/6122/T9/1 - Tesco Stores Ltd
 D/2718/3950/6115/T9/1 - Mr AJ Wallis
 D/2751/3988/6175/T9/1 – Mr & Mrs AR Wallis
 D/2745/3979/6166/T9/1 - Mr R Webber
 D/2756/3993/6180/T9/1 - Mr W Wilkes
 D/2719/3951/6118/T9/1 - Central Fruit Stores
 D/2719/3951/6117/T9/1 - Central Fruit Stores
 D/2719/3983/6170/T9/1 - Central Fruit Stores
 D/2754/3991/6178/T9/1 - Mr C Worrall
 D/2721/3953/6121/T9/2 - Mr PJ Silley

Appendix 15.d – Policy T12 (D T14) – Park and Ride

15.34.8 Objections

RD/7844/0093/51/T12/* - Galmpton Residents' Association
 * RD/7392/0716/9782/T12/* - Mr N Brown
 * RD/2835/0022/10005/T12/* - South Devon Area Of Outstanding Natural Beauty Joint Advisory Committee
 * RD/7604/0019/9998/T12/* - South Hams District Council
 * RD/7604/0020/104/T12/* - South Hams District Council
 * D/2693/3919/6064/T14/0 - Mr WA Aris
 * D/2698/3926/6074/T14/0 – Mr & Mrs Benton
 * D/1942/3916/6059/T14/0 - Mr NJ Brown
 * D/2863/4177/7825/T14/0 - Churston Barony Settlement Trustees & Fuller Family
 D/2808/5000/6696/T14/0 - Friends of the Earth, Torbay
 * D/941/3936/6092/T14/0 - Mr M Newberry

- * D/2887/4266/8090/T14/0 - Torre Traders
- D/2702/3932/6083/T14/0 - Mr AJB Paterson
- * D/2688/3913/6051/T14/0 - Mrs L Reay
- * D/7604/4162/7600/T14/0 - South Hams District Council
- * D/7604/4162/7601/T14/0 - South Hams District Council
- * D/2704/3934/6086/T14/0 - United Benefice Of Brixham - Churston Ferrers & Kingswear

Proposal D T14.1 - Lawes Bridge, Torquay

- D/7814/4119/6993/T14/1 - CPRE, Torbay Group
- D/7814/4121/6999/T14/1 - CPRE, Torbay Group
- D/2869/4183/7861/T14/1 - Scottish Widows
- D/2869/4181/7856/T14/1 - Scottish Widows
- D/2887/4266/8088/T14/1 - Torre Traders
- D/2888/4267/8115/T14/1 - Mr G Oliver
- D/2784/4452/8911/T14/1 - Torquay Branch of South Devon Chamber of Trade
- D/2158/4248/8039/T14/1 - Ms J Williams

Proposal D T14.2 - Monksbridge, Brixham (Deleted)

- D/2693/3919/6063/T14/2 - Mr WA Aris
- D/2698/3926/6073/T14/2 - Mr & Mrs Benton
- D/7393/0822/1882/T14/2 - Miss R Bowyer
- D/7393/0822/1883/T14/2 - Miss R Bowyer
- D/2863/4177/7800/T14/2 - Churston Barony Settlement Trustees & Fuller Family
- D/2863/4177/7806/T14/2 - Churston Barony Settlement Trustees & Fuller Family
- D/2895/4290/8190/T14/2 - Mr JW Cooper
- D/7814/4120/6995/T14/2 - CPRE, Torbay Group
- D/2885/4219/7978/T14/2 - The Conservative Group on Torbay Council
- D/2885/4219/7977/T14/2 - The Conservative Group on Torbay Council
- D/2696/3924/6097/T14/2 - Mr CS Cunningham
- D/2968/4444/8677/T14/2 - Brockenbury Action Group
- D/2968/4444/8678/T14/2 - Brockenbury Action Group
- D/2705/3935/6089/T14/2 - Mr PT Griffin
- D/2695/3923/6069/T14/2 - Mr WD Harrison
- D/2894/4288/8182/T14/2 - Ms SD Kew
- D/2959/4402/8569/T14/2 - Brixham Amenity Society & Residents' Association
- D/941/3936/6091/T14/2 - Mr M Newberry
- D/2702/3932/6084/T14/2 - Mr AJB Paterson
- D/2688/3913/6050/T14/2 - Mrs L Reay
- D/2955/4379/8528/T14/2 - Mr C Slack
- D/2955/4379/8524/T14/2 - Mr C Slack
- D/2700/3928/6077/T14/2 - Mr & Mrs Soul
- D/7406/3915/6056/T14/2 - Dr RI Tricker
- D/2704/3934/6085/T14/2 - United Benefice Of Brixham - Churston Ferrers & Kingswear
- D/2114/3306/5151/T14/2 - Mr DFJ Worth

Appendix 15.e – Policy T23 (D T28) – Western corridor

15.34.9 Objections

General

- * RD/7258/0732/10167/T23/* - Mr D & Mrs R Rogers
- * RD/7835/0056/360/T23/* - Stoke Gabriel Parish Council
- RD/7255/0726/9619/T23/* - Mr K Wilby
- ** D/2902/4300/8218/T28/0 - Mr D Bowden
- D/7799/4281/8162/T28/0 - Ms E Donovan
- D/7799/4281/8163/T28/0 - Ms E Donovan

D/2889/4277/8151/T28/0 - Mr AC Easterbrook
 D/858/0939/1974/T28/0 - Mr F Longden
 D/2145/3311/5523/T28/0 – Paignton Preservation & Local History Society
 D/2145/3311/5526/T28/0 - Paignton Preservation & Local History Society
 D/2872/4199/7898/T28/0 - Hallbaron Limited
 D/7571/4247/8038/T28/0 - Torbay District Labour Party
 D/2896/4292/8195/T28/0 - Mr PJ Silley
 D/2077/3160/4615/T28/0 - Collaton St Mary Residents' Association
 D/2077/3160/4614/T28/0 - Collaton St Mary Residents' Association
 * D/2034/3146/4560/T28/0 - Colleton St. Mary Residents' Association
 * D/7835/4440/8666/T28/0 - Stoke Gabriel Parish Council

Proposal T23.1 New road from Churston Cross to Kings Ash, Marldon

RD/7256/0728/9620/T23/1 – Dr TJ Avis
 RD/7257/0729/9621/T23/1 – MJ Balster
 RD/7260/0734/9624/T23/1 – DJ Best
 RD/7842/0728/10313/T23/1 - Dr LJ Bocking
 RD/7672/0730/213/T23/1 - Mrs PAS George
 RD/7671/0727/212/T23/1 – Mr EI Hamilton
 RD/7259/0733/9623/T23/1 – Dr NA Orchard
 RD/2967/0067/210/T23/1 - Marldon Parish Council
 RD/7604/0019/9999/T23/1 - South Hams District Council
 RD/7258/0732/9622/T23/1 – DR Rogers
 RD/7673/0731/214/T23/1 – CV Selfe
 RD/7835/0055/359/T23/1 - Stoke Gabriel Parish Council
 RD/7712/0688/10732/T23/1 – Ms J Williams
 D/2199/3308/5852/T28/1 - Mrs H Coetzee
 D/2196/3309/5846/T28/1 - Mr P Coetzee
 D/2829/4129/7358/T28/1 - Devon Wildlife Trust
 D/7652/4048/9527/T28/1 - Government Office for the South West
 D/2758/4365/8453/T28/1 - Mr RW Hooper
 D/2828/4128/7194/T28/1 - RSPB
 D/1092/1131/2399/T28/1 - Mr GC Martin
 D/2386/4291/8193/T28/1 - Mr AD Moore
 D/7811/3310/5529/T28/1 – Mr AD Moss
 D/2967/4443/8673/T28/1 - Marldon Parish Council
 D/7604/4162/7597/T28/1 - South Hams District Council
 D/7571/4247/8037/T28/1 - Torbay District Labour Party
 D/2034/3146/4561/T28/1 - Colleton St. Mary Residents' Association
 D/2158/4251/8046/T28/1 - Ms J Williams
 D/2158/4251/8045/T28/1 - Ms J Williams

Proposal T23.2 Improvement of the Tweenaway Cross Junction

D/7814/4125/7007/T28/2 – CPRE, Torbay Group

Proposal T23.4 Improvements to Windy Corner junction, Galampton, Paignton

D/7844/4415/8588/T28/4 - Galampton Residents' Association

Counter-objections to PCI 15/2A

CO/7873/7531/11159/PCI15/2A – Kings Ash Hill Residents' Association
 CO/7874/7532/11160/PCI15/2A – Councillor M Hytche
 CO/7875/7533/11161/PCI15/2A – Torquay Chamber of Trade & Commerce
 CO/7879/7540/11169/PCI15/2A – Havill & Co
 CO/2970/7543/11175/PCI15/2A – South Devon Chamber of Trade & Commerce

This page has been left blank intentionally