



PLYMPTON ST MAURICE

1. INTRODUCTION

This report seeks delegated authority to implement amendments to The City of Plymouth (Moving & Speed Traffic Regulation Orders) (Consolidation) Order 2014 (as amended) in association with the Plympton St Maurice TRO.

2. TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS REQUIRED

2.1 The elements that need a Traffic Regulation Order are as follows:

To Add;

Schedule 1 - 20mph Zone

- Longbrook Street – From a point 10 metres north of the property boundary of number 21 and 22 St Elizabeth Close to its junction with Fore Street
- Fore Street – from its junction with Longbrook Street to its junction with Barbican Road
- George Lane – From its junction with Longcause to its junction with Fore Street and Longbrook street
- Church Road – From its junction with George Lane to its junction with Fore Street
- Barbican Road – From its junction with George Street to its junction with Underwood Road and Back Lane
- School Lane – From its junction with Barbican Road to its junction with Fore Street
- Castle Lane – From its junction with School Lane to its junction with Fore Street
- Castlehayes Gardens – for its entirety

Schedule 2 - 7.5T Weight Restriction (Except for Access)

- George Lane – from its junction with Ridgeway to its junction with Fore Street and Longbrook Street
- Longbrook Street – From its junction with Fore Street to its junction with Plympton Hill
- Plympton Hill – From its junction with Longbrook Street to its southern junction with Ridge Road
- Fore Street – from its junction with Longbrook Street to its junction with Barbican Road
- Longcause – from its junction with George Lane to its junction with St Maurice Road
- Church Road – From its junction with George Lane to its junction with Fore Street
- Barbican Road – From its junction with George Lane to its junction with Underwood Road and Back Lane
- School Lane – From its junction with Barbican Road to its junction with Fore Street
- Castle Lane – From its junction with School Lane to its junction with Fore Street
- Castlehayes Gardens – From its junction with Barbican Road for its entire length
- Back Lane – From its junction with Barbican Road to its junction with Vinery Lane
- Wolverwood Lane – From its junction with Longbrook Street (Bullers Hill) to its junction with St Stephens Road
- New Barn Hill – From its junction with Longbrook Street (Bullers Hill) to its junctions with Back Lane and Vinery Lane
- Ridge Road – From its southern junction with Plympton Hill to its junction with Merafield Road
- Drunken Bridge Hill – From its junction with Ridge Road to its junction with Underwood Road

- Underwood Road – From its junction with Barbican Rd and Back Lane to its junction with Merafield Road
- Merafield Road – From its junction with Underwood Road to its junction with Cot Hill

- Underlane – from its junction with Cot Hill to its junction with Underwood Road and Merafield Road
- Copse Road – from its junction with Drunken Bridge Hill to its junction with Kennel Hill
- Kennel Hill – from its junction with Underwood Road to its junction with Underwood Road
- Hill Close – from its junction with Copse Road for its entire length
- Copse Close – from its junction with Copse Road for its entire length
- Merafield Drive – from its junction with Kennel Hill and Copse Road for its entire length
- Almeria Court – from its junction with Merafield Drive for its entire length
- Kennel Hill Close – from its junction with Kennel Hill for its entire length
- Amados Drive – from its junction with Merafield Drive for its entire length
- Amados Rise – From its junction with Merafield Drive to its junction with Amados Drive
- Merafield Rise – From its junction with Merafield Road to its junction with Merafield Drive
- Woodland Drive – From its junction with Merafield Road for its entire length
- Elaine Close - From its junction with Merafield Road for its entire length
- Amados Close – From its junction with Woodland Drive for its entire length
- Dudley Road – From its junction with Cot Hill to its junction with Linketty Lane
- Linketty Lane – From its junction with Valley Road to its junction with Underlane
- Dark Street Lane – From its junction with Mudge Way to its junction with Underwood Road
- Priory Drive – From its junction with Dark Street Lane for its entire length
- Redvers Grove – From its junction with Dark Street Lane for its entire length
- Cottage Mews – From its junction with Redvers Grove for its entire length
- Sydney Close – From its junction with Dark Street Lane for its entire length
- Market Road – From its junction with Ridgeway to its junction with Underwood Road
- Auctioneers Close – From its junction with Market Road for its entire length
- Old Priory – From its junction with Market Road for its entire length
- Potters Way – From its junction with Market Road for its entire length
- Horseshoe Drive – From its junction with Market Road for its entire length
- Gatehouse Lane – From its junction with Market Road for its entire length
- Priory Mill– From its junction with Market Road for its entire length
- Longbrook Barton – From its junction with Priory Mill for its entire length
- Lavinia Drive – From its junction with Underwood Road for its entire length
- Brookingfield Close – From its junction with Underwood Road for its entire length
- Maidenwell Road – From its junction with Underwood Road to its junction with Linketty Lane, for its entire length.

REVOCATIONS

THE CITY OF PLYMOUTH (MOVING TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS) (CONSOLIDATION) ORDER 2014 to be varied in line with the provisions of this Order.

3. STATUTORY CONSULTATION

Proposals

The proposals for the Plympton St Maurice Traffic Orders were advertised on street, in The Herald and on the Plymouth City Council website on 27/02/2020. Ward Councillors and statutory consultees were consulted on 21/02/2020.

There have been 56 representations received relating to the Traffic Order proposals.

Consultation	Comments
<p>George Lane is fairly wide and straight from the junction with Longcause/Barbican Road up to the junction with the Ridgeway. As a result traffic tends to move up and down this section at speed. Increased speed also means increased noise, traffic accelerating up the hill in particular.</p> <p>As more houses have been completed at the Sherford development there has been a marked increase in the amount of traffic moving up and down George Lane, a lot of it at speed. During the development at Plympton House the number of vehicles parking on both sides of George Lane, contractor's vehicles in particular, increased. This resulted in restricting the flow of traffic up and down, and although this served to reduce traffic speed it made it particularly difficult for the busses to transit through and made access in and out of my drive quite hazardous when large vehicles were parked near the entrance obscuring my view. The work at Plympton House is nearing completion and the number of contractors vehicles parking on George Lane has reduced and this coupled with availability of parking within the Plympton House site has reduced the occasions of parking on both sides of George lane. This now means that the volume and speed of traffic has increased again.</p> <p>I would like to see the amount of traffic using George Lane reduced to pre-Sherford levels. A reduction in the volume of traffic would be more important to me than controlling its speed. The junction with the Ridgeway at the top and the restrictions at the bottom end George Lane serve to control speed as traffic has to slow to negotiate these hazards, the section where traffic and travel at speed is relatively short.</p>	<p>Commentary below covers all representations received.</p>
<p>I am a resident of Plympton St.Maurice a little over 3 yrs. In that short time, there had been a noticeable increase in traffic, including HGVs and speeding has occurred. With the development of Sherford happening nearby, I was pleased to know that a fund (S106 Fund) would be set up to tackle the increased traffic throughout the historic conversation area. Unfortunately, I have now learnt that this is being used to installed 20mph speed signs, along with 7.5T signs that will do little to tackle the issues at hand. Signs throughout St.Maurice will not reduce traffic and would be a poor use of the fund put aside. On several occasions I have had the pleasure of listening to road users verbally abuse one another as they</p>	

navigate the road. Another time I politely asked someone to slow down as they skidded to stop outside my house only to be verbally abused my myself! It's naive to think the installation of signs will have any impact on traffic, let alone speeding, people will speed regardless, especially if it isn't enforced. I believe a 20mph limit being put in place is the right decision along with other measures but not at the expense of the fund and St.Maurice. I believe it to be of high importance that the historic village on St.Maurice is preserved and that Plymouth City Council doesn't go along with this 'easy option'.

A few points I'd like to make :

- Crumbling Pavements from cars being forced to mount the roads.
- Health and safety of school children and pavement users.
- Disturbances when traffic standoffs.
- The damage to historic listed buildings (of which ours is one) and vehicles at the expense of residents.
- Noise pollution.
- Air pollution.
- Shaking buildings from large lorries.

Please consider different options for traffic management throughout Plympton St.Maurice.

A 20mph speed zone would be appreciated however how would this be achieved/policed? There are a number of speeding cars and motorbikes that come through Longbrook Street which are a nuisance, noise pollution and danger. How would the proposed speed zone prevent this. I am not in favour of sleeping policeman as it would not be in-keeping with the village and would create further noise. The 7.5T weight restriction (except for access) again would be appreciated. There is no requirement for these vehicles to be in the village. My concern is your omission in considering the volume of traffic that comes through the village and the future escalation as Sherford is completed. I note yourselves or your partners are currently surveying traffic volumes on George Lane and the corner of Longbrook street adjacent to the Pub which again I appreciate however I fear the data collected in the last three weeks will not be wholly representative due to the closure of the road (Plympton Hill) between Brixton, Elburton and Plymstock. I can assure you traffic volumes through the village are greatly reduced due to this road closure. The original plans for Sherford suggested five and a half thousand new homes. Two cars per home would equate to a further 11,000 vehicles which I appreciate would not all necessarily be coming through the village however a proportion will and the historical conservation area will be damaged. Your proposals are welcome however fall short of the agreement to resolve the volume of traffic currently coming through St Maurice as Sherford is developed and likely to come through as it is completed. The S106 money set aside to address this issue is not there to

<p>fund 20mph speed zones or 7.5T weight restrictions, this the council should fund. I encourage you to engage in conversation with the villagers to work out the best solution for the volumes of traffic and how the S106 money would be best used to protect the historical conservation area that is Plympton St Maurice.</p>	
<p>I wish to express my concerns about the increased volume of traffic in this conservation area as I have first hand experience of the damage to the area and the increased volume of traffic.</p> <p>My concerns - the increased volume of traffic - that S106 Fund needs to be solely used to stop the increase traffic through this conservation area</p>	
<p>I understand that as early as 2003 traffic problems were identifiably predicted as a risk to PSM Conservation Area and as a consequence a S106 agreement was created. I refer to the notices displayed in PSM regarding a proposal for a 20mph speed limit and new 7.5 tonne weight limit signage, while any form of traffic calming is welcome, unless it is constantly policed it will have little or no effect, and most certainly will not reduce the flow of HGV's LCV's, Cars and Motor Bikes through PSM, and unquestionably should not take funds from the above mentioned S106. What is needed is a physical barrier, or a one way system, signage alone will be largely ignored as it is at present. The flow of HGV's LCV's Cars and Motor Bikes through PSM is continually increasing (predominantly at Peak Times) and is having a damaging effect on the Property, Pavements, Street Fixtures, Residents Cars and Roads of the Conservation Area. Our roads are full of pot holes caused by the increase of traffic flow and lack of maintenance. (as a matter of interest what is the procedure for claiming compensation from PCC for damage to one's car due to hitting a pot hole). 17 years on PCC/ Highways have done nothing to alleviate the predicted volume of HGV and other Traffic invading the Conservation Area, now is the time for action.</p>	
<p>Please bear in mind when formulating your plans to consider making Fore St one way and Barbican Road one way. I suggest Fore St allowing traffic from West to East and Barbican Road from East to West.</p> <p>This together with the suggested signs and traffic calming would achieve the aims local people are looking for perhaps. One proviso being that the one way sign preventing traffic entering Barbican Rd at the western end be set back enough to allow ingress to the first left turn for ingress to the houses in that road.</p> <p>This change in arrangement would avoid the often dangerous habit of vehicles backing out of Barbican Rd on to the main road of Georges Lane.</p>	
<p>With two primary age children, I feel it is important to focus both on the speed of the traffic passing through, but also the volume. A 20mph limit would be welcome, as cars currently</p>	

<p>fly round the corner by the Brook Inn and it is only a matter of time that someone misses the turn appropriately putting pedestrians at risk. The pavements are busy regularly with school children walking to and from school. However, the importance of preserving the historic buildings in Plympton St Maurice must not be overlooked. The volume of traffic using the road is steadily increasing with more residents moving into Sherford, using our roads to access Plymouth rather than use Laira Bridge. I notice that traffic monitoring is in place at all entries into the village, but this will not reflect usual volume whilst the lanes are closed for resurfacing through to Brixton. The traffic has been noticeably less during this last week or two. At the time of Sherford planning, S106 money was set aside to protect our streets in St Maurice. A few 20mph signs is not an adequate use of this money and will not achieve what was agreed when Sherford building began.</p>	
<p>I am writing this to you regarding the proposed 20mph speed limit and 7.5 ton weight limit on Fore street and the surrounding area, I don't know who comes up with these great ideas but obviously they have no clue to what happens around the village and surrounding area's. To start the 20mph limit is an utter joke, to get up to that speed at the moment with all the traffic is a pipe dream. The speed limit is not the problem around here, it is the amount of traffic using Fore street as a cut through to Sherford, Valley Rd or one of the other developments around here. In the last 3 years it has become unbearable the amount of vehicle's congesting the roads, traffic jams and causing subsidence to pavements and people's property's by pulling up onto the pavements to let people past. The amount of damage caused to my car by people pulling up right behind it to let people past is another matter altogether. To say a 20mph limit will cure all this is a joke, it's the level of traffic using these roads, nothing to do with the speed limit, I don't know why they don't just block off the far end of Fore street by Dark Street lane and have it for residents only, that would stop most of the problems by just doing that, there's an idea. The 7.5 ton weight limit that's proposed, there already is one and know-one pays a blind bit of notice to it, there's a sign by the garage/church, it's been there for years, but 45ft Artic lorries are a constant sight trying to get to Valley Rd ind est or Newnham ind est, or even going to the development on George Lane. I've spoken to a few of these lorry drivers when they get stuck and they say the same thing, that the sat nav sent them this way. Great. The police usually get called out when they get jammed up down Fore St but have any of them received a ticket for ignoring the weight limit down here already, No. So to say that we're going to have this new weight limit here and there is daft, as it's unenforceable as nothing's been done about for years, just a sign at the top of Plympton Hill saying no Sherford Lorries this way. And just to say that 7.5 tons are ok, the supermarket delivery vans are the worse</p>	

<p>offenders, they just pull up onto the pavements to drop off there delivery's, the pavements by the top end of Fore street are shocking where they've started to subside due to them parking up for delivery's.</p> <p>We need some proper ideas on how to save our village not just some stupid 20mph signs and a weight limit signs that seem to be the cheapest option, a few years ago there was money put aside to deal with the Sherford problem for a project on Buller's/ Plympton Hill, never happend, where did the money/funding go or is it being spent on this project. We need a proper solution to the traffic level problem not just a few signs and unenforceable speed/weight limits that will make no change what so ever, thought up by somebody who has no idea what it's like to live around here with all the traffic. Why are PCC not listening to the residents of the village again.</p>	
<p>I am a resident of the Plympton St Maurice conservation area where I have lived since 1988. As this property is in the narrow stretch of George Lane by the church of St Maurice, I have been very aware over the years of the increasing problems with traffic in this area of the city. I support the proposals in the consultation paper for a new 20mph zone and for an extended Weight Limit. I suggest that the proposals could be improved by extending the current 30mph zone to the top of Plympton Hill and its junction with Ridge Road, perhaps near the site shown in the photo on page 5 of the consultation paper. This could mean that more traffic would comply with the 20mph limit at the foot of the hill. I hope that it will be possible to implement the proposals very soon as some improvements of this kind have been needed for a long while, going back to a time well before any of the development at Sherford. I know that some local residents are very unhappy with these proposals but I hope that there can be some constructive dialogue which leads to further improvements in the near future without delaying a start to relief from our problems now.</p>	
<p>As I'm sure you're aware, there have been attempts recently from local residents to contact the council in the hope of more suggestions on how to prevent exacerbation, eliminate or reduce traffic volume and speed. The issue seems to have worsened since the start of the Sherford development. If nothing at all is put in place then I am positive the roads, grade one and two listed buildings, historical paths and protected areas will suffer further detrimental damage. There seems to be no concrete plan in place regarding what to do to help keep the situation under control as of yet. The noise of some of the louder vehicles, particularly modified cars and large trucks, shake the very foundations of my house as they pass. The pot holes and cracks appearing have grown, seemingly overnight, to be huge and extremely damaging to vehicles unlucky enough to find themselves in one. There is constant damage to the pavements as people mount them to</p>	

allow passing cars and I have witnessed numerous vehicles drive into the bollards (and indeed my own car while I was sat in it!). Though, by no means, an expert of traffic calming myself, I have tried to contribute to the possible suggestions that I'm sure are flooding your inboxes:

- Introduction of a one way system- Though this may be tedious for residents to drive around, it would prevent traffic stand-off's and therefore stop cars mounting the pavements. It would also limit traffic using the road as a rat run as half the traffic would be unable to pass through and have to choose the main roads. This is a successful system they've used in many small towns which residents do adjust to over time.
- Reduce speed limit to 20mph- this may not be enough on it's own, it certainly won't contribute to the reduction in volume but it may help reduce the overall speeds of those who drive through, most driving well over the speed limit.
- Temporary speed camera- potential for this to be in place alongside the speed limit. I suggest temporary so that the village can revert back to it's historical aesthetic after a period of time.
- Better weight restriction signs- All too often, large lorries are directed down the road via SatNav etc and end up stuck, causing damage to buildings, the street and vehicles.

I believe, though costly in the first instance, implementation of the above suggestions could save the council money in the long run. There would be less repairs required to the road surface and pavements, the insurance companies would also benefit by vehicles remaining undamaged, any damage caused to houses could be reduced and therefore better value in acting now and any fines secured from drivers committing speeding offences would pay for the cost of the speed camera. We routinely see drivers passing through the narrow roads reaching speeds of 45 mph. I appreciate there must be many factors involved but the traffic is having a negative effect on us all, myself as a resident and the village.

We have resided in Plympton St Maurice for 23 years. We have played a very active part within the local community in support of the conservation and preservation of this medieval village. Personally I organise local events held to raise monies to support/protect our environment and buildings and to promote awareness to the wider community about the need to ensure that the delicate history of Plympton St. Maurice continues. The current proposal is not in our opinion going to resolve the "real issues" which are going to suffocate and ruin this beautiful ancient village. Whilst it must be recognised that "Speed & Weight" of vehicles has an extremely detrimental effect on both roads and buildings the "REAL ISSUE" is the sheer volume of traffic using Plympton St Maurice as a "Rat Run" particularly since the development of "Sherford". We have been promised that the "Sherford Section 106 agreement" monies would be used to develop "traffic control" mechanisms at the main entry points to

<p>Plympton St Maurice. These control measures would “essentially” reduce the “VOLUME” of traffic together with the prevention of vehicles “over 7.5T” through the narrow medieval roads of our village. The current proposal of installing 20mph speed restriction signs along our roads quite simply...WILL NOT WORK and will “NOT” reduce the “Volume” of traffic. The proposal of repositioning and enhancing the current “7.5T” limit signs will, in my opinion, have “No Effect” as they have been ignored for years and the issues of “intercontinental” transporters will continue irrespective of signage. I feel that since the development of “Sherford” on the perimeter of our historic village PCC have ignored our cries to “Stop” our village being used as a “Rat Run”. I also believe that PCC are purposely ignoring the real issues now crippling our village since the development of Sherford and that is the increased “VOLUME” of traffic</p>	
<p>From Sherford's earliest inception until its acceptance by the Secretary of State I represented Plympton St. Maurice in meetings with Developers and other interested parties. Traffic was only one of many issues that were the subject of discussion. Plymouth's statement that the Conservation Area of Plympton St. Maurice should be protected from increased traffic was a principle that all accepted. The intention was that S106 money would restrict traffic on Plympton Hill to buses and emergency vehicles by means of rising bollards. I can accept that this is a solution that is now impractical, but the risk of irreparable damage to the Conservation Area remains. Plympton St. Maurice, the oldest part of Plymouth, essentially a Norman Plantation borough, lies on desire lines between major employment areas and what will be Sherford's central core. Though alternative routes will exist, many would choose to rat run through streets not suited to modern traffic, damaging buildings, and destroying its unique character. There are solutions which would offer a sensitive deterrence to traffic especially at peak hours, for example extending the pavement to the Primary School, or, at least, providing a protected pathway with the road reduced to single carriageway sections. It is essential that decisions made now continue to uphold past planning principles, safeguarding a precious urban landscape with unique historical associations.</p>	
<p>A lorry recently nearly collided with buildings in Plympton St Maurice as it forced its bulk through a turn in the road that was built for a horse and cart. I hear the ringing of reverse lights daily, as I attempt to work. I see that the speed limit is due to be reduced to 20 mph, which will reduce traffic noise when Fore St is not congested, but will do nothing to reduce the traffic volume, which is the other part of the problem. I understand that the signage is likely to be funded out of the S106 for the Sherford scheme, reducing the funds available to deliver against the promise to mitigate any increased traffic caused by the Sherford scheme. You have reneged on this</p>	

<p>promise. I thank you for reducing the speeding HGVs, but we need to reduce the volume of traffic and the HGVs entering roads that are too small. Our infrastructure can't take it. Our houses are Grade 2 listed, so we are not allowed to install UPVC windows to reduce the endless shuddering as cars sit, engines idling, in traffic jams outside our houses during the rush hour.</p>	
<p>I believe the council are failing to address the problem of traffic correctly or effectively. One of the major problems we have in the conservation area is the ever increasing volume of traffic with all the associated problems this brings, damage to buildings, roads and pavements, noise and air pollution to mention a few. This situation will only get worse as surrounding housing developments grow. There are regular traffic standoffs right outside my single glazed grade II listed home - one of the narrowest parts of the street where pavements are regularly mounted so two cars can pass in opposite directions, lots of revving, shouting, etc. The amount of traffic since I moved in in 2015 has grown to an already ridiculous level for such an historically important area which is supposed to be protected as a conservation area. If the council are interested in finding a solution and protecting what they have previously pledged to protect then please do not proceed solely with the 20mph signs and 7.5T restriction solution already proposed. Whilst these are important they are inadequate and therefore unacceptable as a solution. Please consult with us fully so you can understand all the damage that is being done to our homes and environment due to the volume of traffic before it is too late. Many residents are already thousands of pounds out of pocket as a direct result of too much pressure on our infrastructure. Pavements are breaking up which in turn impacts on drainage. I wrote previously to Amey when they were responsible for pavement repairs but only received an insulting letter including a diagram of how water defied gravity and jumped over the broken pavement into the road in order to drain away, they did not bother to hide their lack of interest. Another important point to make is that my understanding is the S106 money was put in place to address the volume of traffic through the conservation area and not to put up speed signs, surely this should come from another highways budget? I am no city planner but even I can see that with a few cost effective measures the whole problem can be solved. If this is a consultation period then please do just that. Consult. Listen to our problems and work with us to find mutually agreeable solutions then be proud about how, in the mayflower 400 year, you are preserving important historical areas all over Plymouth.</p>	
<p>I can say that there is recent increase in traffic from the closed road into Sherford. It's had an impact on traffic through St Maurice. In addition the amount of HGV's having to perform complex manoeuvres in order to exit the village</p>	

<p>is dangerous. My property has been within inches of a HGV Strike many times. This is without mentioning the speed of most vehicles hurtling through this historic village. At times our windows shake with the vibrations. The 20mph and 7.5t weight limit will not alleviate the issue of excess and oversize, over speed traffic through what is largely a village of Grade I and II listed properties. Please can other proposals be formed which address the volume of traffic as well as the size and speed?</p>	
<p>The sheer volume of traffic using the Conservation Area is not being addressed in this proposal and its essential that appropriate measures be put in place to protect and conserve this unique village. The 20mph limit, together with the 7.5T weight restriction is a very useful start, but it is noted that although Longcause is in the Conservation Area the 20mph speed limit has not been included. This is a residential road incorporating some important buildings: Grade I Listed House Grade II Listed boundary wall running along Longcause Private lane leading to Grade II listed building Longcause community special school Cars park both sides of the road in term time, together with double decker buses travelling every 20 minutes in both directions. Residents are put at risk when attempting to leave their drives. I feel strongly the the 20mph is a necessary requirement for Longcause and I look forward to hearing that this will be included to complete the whole of the Conservation Area.</p>	
<p>I am dismayed to note that the 20mph does not include Longcause. This road is within the Conservation Area and includes roads and lanes leading to Grade I and II listed buildings and a Grade II listed boundary wall. Also a school. There is parking along both sides of the road. The traffic is very heavy with cars and buses and is often used as a race track. Surely this is an oversight on the part of planning. I feel that this should be address urgently.</p>	
<p>I would like to raise four points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. General Traffic Traffic travelling from the A38 and St Elizabeth Hotel creates a shortcut for individuals driving cars, vans and lorries attempting to avoid the area between Mudge way and the traffic lights at the bottom of Cot Hill. 2. HGV Heavy goods vehicles coming off of the A38 and from the Sherford development using Fore street as route, only to find themselves getting only as far as the guildhall and having to reverse back into Long Brook Street as the road is too narrow casing traffic chaos. This has also been witnessed with Lorries towing 	

<p>trailers making it a danger to both pedestrians and parked vehicles.</p> <p>3. Speed Vans, cars and taxis ignore the speed limit when using this route oblivious to the dangers of the narrow street.</p> <p>4. Danger to the conservation area It goes without saying that there are many listed building within Fore Street. This conversation area is in danger with the continued vibrations affecting the buildings and more so, the ancient pillars associated with the guildhall and a private dwelling that runs further along the street. <i>The building on the junction between Fore Street and George Lane has been struck many times over the years.</i></p>	
<p>I have been a resident of St Maurice since 2006. The traffic within the conservation area has steadily increased, most recently and noticeably with the development of Sherford. I have experienced / observed the following negative issues due to this:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The breakdown of drainage pipe outside my house, leading to thousands of pounds to replace (on Longbrook Street the drainage pipes are close under the surface and have been severely affected by traffic weight and volume). The damage to pipes on Bullers Hill is repeated and causes issues with water drainage and flooding - Traffic noise at all times of day, including late at night. Cars coming through at speed late at night cause windows in my house to vibrate - Increased difficulty crossing the road. I have walked my son to nursery, pre-school and school at least 3 times per week over the last 5 years. The amount of traffic and speed has made this notably more hazardous. This concerns me as a parent. We have many school children (primary and secondary) who walk through St Maurice village on their way home - Inappropriate vehicles that are too long / too wide making their way through the village, getting stuck and causing damage to historic cobblestone - Damage to building walls along George Lane narrows and Fore Street - Queueing / idling traffic in a narrow street with bedroom windows each side (these queues lasting up to 15 minutes at times whilst traffic becomes entirely blocked trying to pass narrow sections of the street) <p>We had been assured that money was set aside as Sherford began being developed to ensure the conservation area would not be impacted by increased traffic. Sadly, we were put off many times and then told the money no longer added up to the permanent solution originally proposed (some kind</p>	

<p>of bollard restricting access between St Maurice and Sherford).</p> <p>We have been frustrated by little action to reduce traffic levels, whilst all the while watching the impact it is having. I was disheartened to see a traffic management plan focusing on using signs to reduce speed and restrict heavy vehicles. We welcome action to reduce speed but alongside, not in place of, dealing with the main issue of traffic volume. I am entirely opposed to the S106 money, intended to prevent traffic increase, being used instead on speed / weight signs. I believe this would be an inappropriate and improper use of this money. Thus far, we have been offered nothing to help reduce the traffic volume, which this historic village cannot sustain.</p>	
<p>I wanted to share my concern about the impact of Sherford on Plympton St. Maurice, my neighbours and me and my disappointment that our voices do not seem to be heard. I understand and have no doubt that the reasons for needing to build new houses is important however there will always be intended and unintended consequences to these sorts of decisions. I'm sure the impact on surrounding countryside and our village must have been part of the discussions although probably from someone unconnected to our village and the impact it will have for people now and in the future. My family have lived in St Maurice for three generations and many of the features of St Maurice that have seen on Time Team reflect the importance not just to us but too many people. St Maurice has served our local community for hundreds of years and yet some poorly thought through decisions will have significant consequences. There are more practical routes in which the traffic from Sherford could be diverted onto roads that are modern, built for and more used to the heavy flow of traffic. It would be helpful to understand what consideration was given to the roots of the traffic and the rationale for suggesting that limiting the speed of cars to 20miles an hour is going to somehow mitigate the impact of the excessive traffic going through an area that is not built to take it. I am aware that the impact of the traffic is already damaging the area. I would also be interested to understand the financial implications that have been considered in terms of the long-term impact and financial cost balanced against ensuring that there were appropriate traffic considerations when it was decided that the houses would be built here. I'm sure many people will make a lot of money out of building those houses which I would hope does not outweigh the financial impact and physical damage that such a project creates for others. I am again hugely disappointed that the impact of our countryside can never be restored and I hear nothing about how you will attempt to remedy this. I hope you listen with interest to the feedback from myself and my neighbours and demonstrate you understand the level of concern that we have by making decisions that are better for everyone.</p>	

<p>Can I also suggest you seriously look at making a one way sign for the village entry sited just past the entrance for Barbican Road, making it a west to east approach through the village as this would improve traffic flow, with the no-entry sign sited directly at the east end of Fore Street. When positioning the 20mph sign can I suggest the sign is sited halfway in Dark Street Lane, this will prevent vehicles approaching at speed as this is a dangerous area not only for pedestrians but also traffic entering the other way.</p>	
<p>The main reason or logic for the introduction of a 20 MPH speed limit for Fore Street seems to just enable a sense of 'place' with a local motif (the 20MPH zone doesn't appear to be connected with the HGV traffic). However, the location of the start of this zone very far south on George Lane doesn't actually correspond with the conservation area which is the main defining characteristic of this area. If you are trying to create a sense of place, you would need to start this zone further north on George Lane, north of the west gate of the Grade I listed Plympton House Estate.</p> <p>Whilst I never once saw a speeding car on Fore Street (the narrow road and parked cars prevent this), I constantly see speeding cars and motorbikes on George Lane. Hence, I think you are implementing this speed limit in the wrong place. This would be another argument for starting the 20 MPH speed limit further north on George Lane. Without this extension of the 20MPH zone, I would strongly oppose it being implemented. Finally with regards to the funding of this scheme. The impact of commuter traffic from Sherford on the village of Plympton St Maurice is likely to increase substantially in years to come as more houses are completed. We need to ensure that the S106 funds that were set aside to counter this problem are ONLY used for this problem. The scheme you are talking about implementing is completely unrelated, so I would strongly oppose using the S106 funds in this way. I would also ask that you put together an action plan for addressing commuter traffic from Sherford using Plympton St Maurice as a rat run.</p>	
<p><u>Twenty Mile Per Hour Speed Limits.</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The speed limit restrictions which are proposed over a wide area of Plympton do not include Longcause between George Lane and the mini roundabout going into St Maurice estate. There is a school for children with special needs on this road. This road should be included. 2. Speed limit restrictions have a long history of being ineffective in controlling the speed of many vehicles. There are studies to support this. One of the major factors is how they are enforced. Have the Police been consulted about these proposals? Do they have the resources and manpower to adequately enforce them? If not, the signs alone will be useless over time. 	

3. Speed limits will not address the major issue of increased traffic flow through the Conservation Area that forms the majority of the proposed speed restriction area.
4. Have other forms of speed restriction measures been considered? Average speed camera systems have a far greater success than signs alone and have been used successfully in many areas in Plymouth.

7.5 Weight Limit

1. The Conservation Area desperately needs the weight restriction of goods vehicles to be enforced. There are numerous recorded incidents of heavy goods lorries trying to navigate along Fore Street. The disruption to general traffic, the safety of pedestrians, damage to parked vehicles and the continued physical degradation of the infrastructure and listed buildings is of great concern.
2. There is a 7.5 restriction sign in place at the top of Buller's/Plympton Hill. This does not stop heavy goods vehicles entering the conservation area. Only yesterday I had to assist an articulated lorry negotiate turning from the end of Fore Street into Dark Street Lane. The driver confirmed that he had delivered to Sherford building site and was directed to take the route through Fore Street to get back to the A38. Your department have been sent photographic evidence of the ongoing issue of large lorries causing problems in Fore Street.
3. How will the proposed introduction of weight restriction signs alleviate the problem? Again, have the Police been consulted as to how they can enforce these restrictions?
4. Have modified road layouts been considered to prevent heavy lorries entering restricted areas?

Conservation Area and S106

1. The Conservation Area within Plympton St. Maurice is an important asset to Plymouth and falls under the protection of Plymouth City Council as described in their Plympton St. Maurice Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan.
2. One of the statements within this policy says that the traffic volumes that pass through the area should be controlled. In particular, that the development of Sherford should not increase the volume of traffic.
3. To ensure that this was the case a S106 was approved and formed part of the planning consent for the Sherford development to continue. The S106 stated a sum £25,000 be put aside by the developers so that a set of rising bollards could be installed on Buller's Hill to prevent the increased traffic volumes entering the conservation area. There was a volume of traffic figure agreed that would trigger the drawdown of the S106

<p>money to install the proposed traffic management measures. This traffic level has been triggered and the S106 should now be used for its intended purpose.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. It is crucial to understand that the S106 was specifically put in place to reduce to volume of traffic through the conservation area. 5. <u>The measures proposed in the above referenced notice do not address this issue and the S106 provision should not be used to finance speed reduction and weight limit restrictions.</u> <p><u>Summary</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Whereas the introduction of speed limits and weight restrictions seems desirable they will not achieve the intended objectives without proper enforcement. 2. The proposal will not control the volume of traffic through the conservation area. 3. The S106 should be ring-fenced and used for the purpose it was intended for. 4. Plymouth City Council should adhere to their own policy and protect the conservation area with regard to the increased traffic generated by the Sherford development. 	
<p>Although I support the introduction of a 20 mph in part of the conservation and the 7.5 tonne weight limit that spreads well beyond the conservation area I object strongly to the use of the Sherford S106 monies to offset the cost of introduction; the S106 was established to protect the conservation area from the impact of an increased volume of traffic arising from the creation of the Sherford new town. The new town development was authorised with a range of caveats, one of which was protecting the Plympton St Maurice conservation area from increased traffic volumes; Plymouth City Council has already agreed that the volume of traffic had triggered the requirement to act. The proposal does not address the intent of the S106.</p> <p>Despite repeated attempts to engage constructively with the Highways team there has been no attempt to address the key issue of traffic volume and considerable activity to obfuscate the problems arising from the road alterations that have already occurred on the roads connected to Buller's Hill such as the widened link road to Deep Lane.</p> <p>By all means introduce the Plympton 7.5T limit and the 20mph zone that covers part of the conservation area but don't take the money set aside to protect the conservation area from the core problem that you are not addressing, the volume of traffic especially at peak hours.</p>	
<p>Although I and my family are in agreement that the proposed weight restriction to 7.5 tonnes and speed limited of 20mph are of benefit they do not we feel address the main issue which is the volume of traffic using Plympton St Maurice as a rat run for access to and from Brixton and Sherford.</p>	

<p>Plympton St Maurice is a conservation area and Plymouth City Council have undertaken to preserve the character and historical importance of this area in the Conversation Area management plan. There are 16 listed buildings within the area which are at risk from the volume of traffic as well as speed and weight. Even those properties that are not listed are of importance to the area and all are being destroyed or damaged by the sheer volume of passing traffic not just HGVs and those travelling at speed. The S106 agreement for Sherford set aside a sum of money for reducing the amount of traffic passing through Plympton St Maurice, this must not be used for speed limits and weight restrictions. I note from my neighbours that the Civic Association has tried on many occasions to obtain information about Plymouth City Council data from various traffic data gathering and to discuss proposals to reduce traffic volume but have been met with no action by Plymouth City Council and indeed to get information that Plymouth City Council has acknowledged they have had to resort to freedom of information requests. This is hardly in the spirit of the conservation area management document of a collaborative approach to managing the conservation area. Please confirm that the S106 money is not being used for this traffic order and that the S106 money is still available for traffic calming measures. Please also confirm that Plymouth City Council propose to honour their promise to implement traffic reduction measures in this area and will adopt a collaborative approach with the Civic Association to preserve this historically important and interesting area of Plymouth.</p>	
<p>I am writing in response to the above proposal of speed and weight restriction in Plympton St Maurice and surrounding roads. Whilst I am in favour of anything that will help ease the pressure of traffic in the area I do not think that these proposals alone will be the answer. The increase in traffic over the last few years and the increased parking in George Lane and Longcause is a big concern. Plympton St Maurice cannot sustain the amount of traffic which flows through the narrow streets, most of which is through traffic from the A38 including lorries and delivery vehicles. As a conservation area it is vital that the integrity and safety of the village is preserved. Weight reduction would help (if this was adhered to) but the increase in traffic also includes vehicles from Brixton/Yealmpton, with taxis, vans etc using the village as a rat run. It's the volume of traffic that needs restriction, Section 106 was intended to deal with this as part of the Sherford development. Our concern is that if the proposal above goes ahead the money intended to restrict traffic will be used for this proposal which will not address the main issue which is the flow of traffic.</p>	
<p>I wish to object to the proposed 20mph limit and 7.5 tonne weight restriction around Plympton St Maurice. As a council you should have a duty of care. PSM is a conservation area of</p>	

<p>historic significance and a treasure to the city. It is being ruined by the increase in traffic caused by the Sherford Development. You will be aware that some of the properties in Fore Street are over 450 years old and these are being damaged by the increase in vehicular movement. If something is not done to preserve them I can see a future court case arising for reparation and repair. Please reconsider the above proposal and again consult with the residents regarding alternative arrangements.</p>	
<p>I have just found out you are making a 20 MPH speed limit through the conservation area in St Maurice and I can't believe that Longcause is not part of it. Longcause is a car park during the day and a race track after 4 PM weekdays and a speed way at weekends. And this will get worse after we have a 20 MPH speed limit at both ends of this road.</p>	
<p>I applaud the proposal for a 20 mph zone and consider this should have been in place many years ago given the nature of the narrow roads and pavements, nearby schools and increasing traffic. I submit that the speed limit be reinforced by vehicle triggered speed panels (with smiley face for under limit and grimace for over) I have seen these deployed to great effect elsewhere and I believe they were solar panel powered. I also fully agree with the 7.5 tonne limit as heavy vehicles are inconsistent with the width of roads and are causing damage. For both initiatives obviously signage is required in accord with highways regulations. Where possible this should be on the road surface rather than on street furniture. Having given this support I do believe that the traffic volume through St Maurice has increased now to a level that calls for calming - particularly the George lane to Bullers hill route. This was recognised in the planning approval for the Sherford development. The documented rising bollards at bullers hill was clearly never seriously seen as a solution to protect the conservation area from rising traffic flow. Now is the time to consider calming solutions rather than slowing the existing traffic. Whilst understanding that PCC is entitled to use section 106 monies for any roads purpose it is right and proper that it should be directed towards calming and discouraging rather than solely speed and weight limits which do not fully address the issue.</p>	
<p>I am writing in support of the 20mph proposal. George Lane is becoming a race track, I have witnessed an accident already and I've only lived here for 12 months.</p>	
<p>There is a significant problem with the volume of traffic that passes through. This is particularly acute along the route between the junction of George Lane at the Ridgeway and Plympton Hill, with traffic heading towards either the A38 or to Brixton (and beyond). The recent closure of the road towards Brixton and subsequent drop in traffic levels has proved beyond all reasonable doubt that St Maurice is used as a rat-run. Another notable problem - one which is perhaps more immediately obvious to the more casual observer - is</p>	

the continuing (mis)use of our narrow streets by large vehicles, which clearly flout the signage in place on the approach to the village. Sometimes this results in gridlock, while on other occasions vehicles have been known to inflict actual impact damage to properties on their way in and out. Evidence for this can be seen in the long gashes in the churchyard wall in George Lane among other things. I shall not soon forget the sound and shock of an articulated lorry colliding with the corner of my neighbour's house a few years ago. The environmental impact of traffic takes many forms. At busy times I find that the atmosphere is clogged with fumes and the air quality seems at least as bad as anything I experienced while living in central London. Indeed I believe Plymouth rated poorly in a recent survey of the air quality of towns and cities in Britain. The fact that a railway station does not exist in Plympton I believe speaks volumes, but perhaps that is a separate argument. Along with vehicle emissions there is the noise and visual pollution which only adds to the existing roar of the nearby A38 (can anything be done about this I wonder?). Safety is a concern as the pavement provision is patchy for historical reasons. Not only is the volume of traffic a concern, but I believe that drivers using the area as a rat-run take noticeably less care than do residents as they tear around corners and along narrow points in the roads. What pavements do exist are in varying states of repair. Some are fine but others are nothing short of shambolic. Particularly worthy of note is the pavement running the length of George Lane from the junction with Longcause, continuing down Longbrook Street to its conclusion near the Brook Inn. In my own case there is no pavement at all in front of the house and crossing the road with small children is an unpleasant experience. There were plans mooted to adapt the pavements at the bottom of George Lane where it meets Longbrook Street and Fore Street. I can confirm that these improvements are necessary as it is not a safe place to cross the road on foot. A conservation area should be given greater protection than St Maurice currently receives. Plymouth as a whole has lost enough of its heritage to enemy action, poor planning, and inadequate protection of property. It would be to Plymouth's shame if St Maurice is allowed to be spoiled by the inconsiderate demands of 21st century. The place has grown over hundreds of years but the vast majority of its builders could not have foreseen and planned for the ravages of our excessive use of the motor car. What has been built so long ago and cared for for so long should not be treated with a casual disregard. Please listen to those who live in it and cherish it and place our concerns above those of the motorist who does not give it a second thought. If the road network elsewhere is inadequate then any improvements to it have my support. I believe what exists currently is just about good enough to take the traffic that uses St Maurice as a rat-run. Any attention paid to the area is of course to be

<p>welcomed, but I do not believe that all of the concerns of residents are adequately addressed by the proposals currently in place. All of the issues raised here will only be exacerbated once Sherford has grown beyond its current size. Please place this email on record to be taken into consideration during the consultation.</p>	
<p>A much welcomed move and one long overdue. I would like to propose Dark Street Lane itself be included in the 20mph zone, the speed of the majority who use it exceeds the current limit. I regularly witness near collisions and larger cars driving as if its a one way street - driving in the middle and then having to break heavily at the bend by the bridge. Traffic calming measures/speed reduction would help along with clear lines at the Mudge Way end. Dark Street Lane is getting increasingly worse and ask you include it in this proposed order.</p>	
<p>I am a resident in Plympton St Maurice and have lived here for some 7 months. We are deeply opposed to the proposed consultation of a 20mph speed limit and 7.5T weight Limit. While we agree that these measures are needed, it is not the most pressing of issues. The sheer volume of traffic that passes through the Village, particularly at peak times in the morning and evening, it is clearly evident that our village is being used as a "rat run". We do not want the S106 money used on the current proposals and would request further consultation to solve the problem of excessive traffic using the routes. It is causing long term damage to our roads and pavements, with pot holes coming more evident and cracks appearing on pavements. Signs alone will not cure the problem. In the year of Mayflower 400- it is even more relevant that we preserve areas of historic beauty and not ruin by increased traffic. Plympton St Maurice has played an important part in Plymouth's history and as such, just like the mayflower we must preserve for future generations.</p>	
<p>I am writing with regards to the traffic proposal for Plympton St Maurice. I live in Longbrook Street and have done for a number of years and have noticed a significant increase in the number of vehicles since the Sherford development got underway. I welcome any traffic calming measures however I am concerned that what you are now proposing does simply not go far enough and we will not see any benefit. Putting up signs to tell drivers that there is a 7.5ton restriction will not stop them coming through the area. Lorries larger than 7.5ton will continue to come down into Longbrook Street if we are only relying on the drivers taking notice of a couple of signs posted at the top of Bullers Hill before Vinery Lane. There is already a sign there but drivers don't pay any attention to it, particularly as their sat navs bring them through St Maurice as a 'shortest route'. Articulated lorries often come down Longbrook Street to the junction of George Lane where they then have to try to turn around- this is when damage to buildings and cars occurs. The</p>	

<p>addition of 20mph signs are also not likely to stop cars speeding through Longbrook Street and Fore Street. Cars regularly drive at 30mph and above, and signs in isolation will not be enough to stop that. Signs are part of the answer, however without significant traffic calming measures, stopping cars and lorries from using the road as a rat run from the South Hams will not happen and the situation will continue to get worse. I was under the impression that Section 106 monies were promised to improve the traffic situation in the area as part of the Sherford Development but as yet we have not benefited from that in any way. Please can you advise what else is in the plan for St Maurice's traffic solution.</p>	
<p>Whilst I admire the proposal to introduce 20 mph and 7.5 tonne restrictions to the Conservation area of Plympton St Maurice, although I have my doubts of the effectiveness of either of them as, in my experience, they are generally ignored by the traffic and are difficult to police. Please confirm that the S106 money for Sherford will not be used to finance the above proposal.</p> <p>However, the above will not do anything to restrict the excessive traffic volumes that are being experienced through the Plympton St Maurice Conservation area. Assurances were made several years ago in the Sherford Planning process that measures would be taken to minimize the through traffic, especially needed during the peak hours. There are many examples of damage and deterioration of properties in the village caused by the high volumes. The 3 traffic count machines that have been installed in the village are surely going to give inaccurate figures due to the closure of the road at the top of Bullers / Plympton Hill going towards Brixton. thus causing traffic to find alternative routes. In addition are the figures being counted in hourly or daily basis or as a total figure for the whole period?</p>	
<p>I have for many years been on our local group in connection with traffic issues within St Maurice; and have had several meetings with councillors, highways representatives in that time. For all these discussions, the overriding emphasis has been on looking at ways of reducing traffic coming from Sherford into the village. There is a fund within the Sherford Plan for Section 106 money to help enable some form of restriction. We have provided proposals and had confirmation, previously, that the amount of traffic has increased to be able to trigger this S106 requirement. With all this; I am dumfounded as why this proposal has been put forward, when it clearly will have no effect on restricting traffic. Whilst I appreciate the slight benefit of 20mph and welcome the 7.5T limit; this is not what we need. And everyone is very aware of this.</p> <p>Furthermore, it has been said that there is a proposal to utilise the S106 money for this works. Which I believe, your</p>	

<p>proposal does not meet the requirements of that section. With this in mind I strongly object to this work going ahead, without both further consultation with local groups and with a better defined proposal for restricting traffic.</p>	
<p>I live at a junction of two roads in PstM. I am near a school for pupils with moderate learning difficulties, and on the bus route for the 21/21A bus. Neither of these factors cause any traffic problem in comparison to the volume of traffic that we have seen using a rat-run through the village since the instigation of the building works at Sherford. The road between houses and the ancient Church opposite is narrow, and on a hill. Cars cannot pass: it is single carriageway. I have lost count of the number of occasions that huge lorries have thundered past within inches of windows. Last summer a car travelling too fast out of Barbican lane spun out of control, hit a parked car, and crashed into the front face of a house. In my opinion, a 20mph zone will do nothing to exacerbate the problems of high volume traffic in a conservation area. The very nature of this historical village means that it was not designed to host huge vehicles driven badly. We are not being hypocritical about this: we probably all have cars (some large cars no doubt!) but we live here, and need access to our homes. We do not drive HGV vehicles down other people's roads at speed for a short cut. There are alternative , safer routes. There are two schools on PstM, one of which is approached by a lane with no pavements. Alternative routes must be used, especially at rush hour/school run times. The more obvious solution would be access-only areas in the Fore St/Longbrook-George Lane link with the crossroads of Longcause and Barbican Lane, thus avoiding the narrowest streets where houses on Fore St have no garage/drive and so park on the road, with even the possibility of a one-way system. Personally I would favour blocked off roads: there is no need to drive through the village itself unless you live there!</p>	
<p>Whilst I welcome these developments, I do not think that a speed limit or weight restriction will solve the issues we are currently experiencing. The other issue that seriously needs attention is the volume of traffic which has been incrementally increasing since the development of Sherford. I have been increasingly concerned at the speed and volume of traffic and the number of lorries and other large vehicles that have been coming through the village. The whole of the surface of the road on Fore Street is showing significant damage and obviously being in a conservation area, there is a real worry about the damage to some historically important properties locally. Pavements are becoming damaged where vehicles are mounting them to get through narrow areas. Is there a plan to actively enforce the speed limit and weight restriction? Having signs everywhere in the village is unlikely to have the desired impact as if there is no enforceable deterrent, I am not sure what difference this will make. I am</p>	

<p>also aware that there has been S106 funding set aside from the Sherford development and understand this is intended to be used to prevent an increase in traffic in the area. I trust that this money is not going to be used for the measures that you are currently proposing as I feel we need a definite proposal to address the volume of traffic in the area.</p>	
<p>A wide, raised band of cobbles at each end of Fore St, similar to those marking pedestrian zones, might deter non-access traffic. They would also slow traffic down. Cobbles would be more in keeping with a conservation area than a proliferation of signs, although some signs would make the message clear. This is an important issue if this precious historic area is to be preserved.</p>	
<p>I agree that these measure will be beneficial to Plympton St Maurice if properly enforced and I support the implementation.</p> <p>I do not agree that these measures will help in any way to reduce traffic volume through the village. This issue still needs to be addressed.</p> <p>S106 monies from the Sherford development were allocated to address traffic volume through the conservation area and therefore should not be used to implement the proposed speed and weight restrictions.</p>	
<p>We appreciate efforts to slow down the speed of traffic through this area – and to limit the number of large lorries attempting to pass down the street (and often failing because of their size). If this is to be more than a token gesture, it is important to know how the proposed restrictions will be enforced. If there is no enforcement – speed cameras and speed humps on Buller Hill before the entrance to the school, for example – these moves will be futile. The restrictions currently proposed do not, however, speak to the other pressing traffic issues which are a danger to us and our properties: - most notably, the volume of traffic (and especially service vans) and the impact that the current levels of flow are having on the medieval foundations of this conservation area. These issues have to be addressed. They will be even more pressing once Sherford is fully occupied. It might be a sensible option to grasp the nettle and introduce a one-way traffic flow in Fore Street; in Underlane, and (downwards) in the narrows to the east of St Maurice church.</p>	
<p>1 A 20mph limit should be imposed AND ENFORCED in Longcause. A weight restriction would be of little benefit as the only LARGE vehicles currently using the road are Buses and delivery lorries</p> <p>2 Double yellow lines should be painted in road from outside of No 30 to junction with Saint Maurice Rd, this restriction should be applied on BOTH sides of road, the Northern side should be extended to Junction with George Lane.</p>	

<p>3 Parking on pavement should be prohibited, there is a current danger to pedestrians and traffic when this practice happens (usually in school time)</p>	
<p>There has been a notable increase in VOLUME of traffic, most notably at peak hours during the morning and evening. This increase has also included large HGVs alongside usual traffic. These types of vehicles are completely unsuitable to be travelling along our historic streets and have cause extensive disturbance and damage to property and vehicles, many of which are listed or noted as sites of historical interest. This increase can only be due to the development of the Sherford site. The S106 funding was put in place to safeguard our historic conservation area against the types of damage we are now regularly suffering from. The S106 funding was put aside to be used for traffic CALMING and not the traffic MANAGEMENT 'solution' that the council has offered. I would like to make three main points. The first being that when the Sherford development plans were being made, the developers were keen to suggest that all in the local community would benefit from this. I strongly believe that it would be impossible to find anyone within the conservation area of Plympton St.Maurice who believes that the supposed advantages that we should be receiving from the development at present outweigh the devastating impact that traffic is having on our community. As previously stated, the rat run traffic that now comes through the area as a shortcut to Sherford and Brixham at peak hours comes through at huge volumes that our roads simply cannot handle. A 20mph speed limit will do NOTHING to counter this. I am in agreement that a 20mph limit is the right choice alongside a traffic CALMING measure as agreed. My second point being that many buildings within this area our listed, our home being one. As you should be aware, many of our properties lead directly onto the pavement, there is evidence to suggest that historic buildings are suffering from vibration damage due to the volume of traffic. Many buildings within this area our listed, our home being one. The council cannot mislead the public by misusing the S106 funding and ignoring its duty of care to our historic buildings. Additionally, this year the council have advertised many events celebrating Mayflower 400. It is inherently wrong to use our City's history to generate publicity and revenue while allowing a conservation area within the council's care to become damaged beyond repair due to the council's persistent neglect. The third issue I would like to raise, and perhaps the most important is that our everyday lives are now being negatively impacted, and have for quite some time by this problem. There are many vulnerable people within our community, Fore Street in St Maurice is home to many elderly residents as well as lots of very young children. Too often cars mount the pavement to pass each other not only causing damage to historic paving tiles but also endangering our community. Our house is next to the part of the road</p>	

where traffic often bottlenecks, often the rows that erupt from road users abusing one another disrupt our family meal times and can be heard above the television or music. This is simply unacceptable. My partner has also suffered abuse when asking road users to slow down when driving down Fore Street. There have been well documented videos and photographs of HGVs trying to enter the area and causing huge traffic jams, often taking upwards of 30 minutes to clear. This would be alleviated somewhat by the introduction of traffic calming but not at all but the proposed 20mph speed limit. Recently a heated debate occurred outside our home between two drivers, during this time many residents left their homes to help organise the chaos caused by backed up traffic. I believe it to be of high importance that the historic village on St.Maurice is preserved and that Plymouth City Council doesn't go along with this 'easy option'. A few points I'd like to make :

- Crumbling Pavements from cars being forced to mount the roads.
- Health and safety of school children and pavement users.
- Disturbances when traffic standoffs.
- The damage to historic listed buildings (of which ours is one) and vehicles at the expense of residents.
- Noise pollution.
- Air pollution.
- Shaking buildings from large lorries.

Traffic volume is killing our village. I fully support this as traffic volume has increased to an excessive volume, causing extension road damage and potholes. There is a massive pothole in front of my drive, which does not do any good to my cars suspension and shock absorbers when reversing onto my drive, it punctured my neighbours tyre. We have seen increasing traffic volume from people who take a short cut through our village, especially big lorries and vehicles working at Sherford. One of the lorries hit my driveway pillar, causing damage to this heavy structure, which I had to put right. The lorry just left it in a highly dangerous state, where it could have toppled over and fallen on somebody, potentially causing serious injury or death. Speeding traffic and heavy HGV's and the shear volume of traffic must be stopped, they have no regard to the residents and people living in St Maurice. Permanent long term damage is being caused and nothing seems to be done about it. It has been suggested many times that Fore Street should be one way traffic and access only to people who live there or who are visiting. This is a historical conservation area, that deserves an element of respect and it is the opinion of many people living in St Maurice, that not enough is being done by Plymouth City Council to stop this, and are failing to engage effectively to the problem.

<p>I wish to be added to those who are affected by the volume of traffic in St Maurice and the injury it is causing to the place. I have been in St Maurice since the 1950s. Now when I walk down the street (I do not own a car) I hear windows rattling as inconsiderate drivers rush by. Crossing the street is difficult as there are parked cars and moving vehicles rushing past them. The parked cars do not appear to slow the traffic which is a worry. Very often drivers have to go backwards as they cannot pass one another – this makes crossing doubly difficult. Even though there are posts along part of the pavement this does not stop many vehicles mounting the pavement where they can in order to let an oncoming vehicle continue on its way. Frequently I am hindered by this. Do I need to mention what it is like when oversized vehicles try to push through what is an ancient narrow street?</p>	
<p>I am writing to voice my concerns that the proposed plan of 20mph speed limit and 7.5tonne weight restriction is not enough to tackle the increasing volume of traffic that is travelling through Plympton St Maurice on a daily basis. It is the sheer volume of traffic that is causing damage to our roads, historic cobblestone pavements and even buildings. This volume of traffic is only going to increase with the proposed expansion of the Sherford site. Further and more drastic steps must be taken to protect our historic village.</p>	
<p>The amount of traffic and the type of traffic entering the village is seriously affecting the area, the properties and public realm. The Conservation Area document needs to be adhered to by PCC and something needs to be done to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lessen the volume of traffic 2. Stop HGV's 3. Stop vehicles parking on candy tiles and causing further damage to these historic pavings 4. Prevent the noise from excess traffic and HGV vehicles entering the area due to protected species. Traffic noise has a detrimental affect on bats. There are several bat colonies in Plympton St Maurice including Back Lane. The Natural Infrastructure team have records on a PCC subscription database for Plympton St Maurice on a bat mapping system that shows Pipistrelles and other breeds. In addition, there are far too many cars trying to park in the area, far too many delivery vehicles causing weight on precious protected candy tile sidewalks and pathways, and HGVs causing potential subsidence and damage to listed and buildings of historical importance due to their weight and inappropriate size which means they get stuck in the village and are risking buildings and the safety of pedestrians and public inside their own homes. In order to stop damage to buildings and in order to preserve this area of special importance, I propose that PCC; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - places speed bumps within fore street and longbrook street - erects no waiting bollards or no parking bollards on the edge is the road by certain pathways to stop vehicles and 	

<p>waiting vehicles damaging the pathways and the buildings on fore street and longbrook street</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - has speed signage - not taken from s106 budget - warning signage on George Lane and speed bumps - not taken from s106 budget <p>I also want to raise that any speed restriction signage should not be funded from the s106 funding as that is funding for extra measures not minimum measures that should be in st Maurice anyway.</p> <p>The area of Leigham is not of special historic importance yet that area has speed humps, signage and mini roundabouts and also the area of Thornbury. Both of those areas have primary schools close by. Plympton St Maurice has a primary school and a school for children with disabilities and there is no signage to prevent speeding, nothing to stop HGVs and nothing to prevent excessive parking or parking on protected pathways - all a risk to pedestrians at all times and children going to and from school.</p> <p>Plympton St Maurice needs the minimum signage and restriction measures to be paid for by the PCC Highways department just as it has done for other areas in the city as a general traffic speed deterrent along with warnings to protect pedestrians.</p> <p>Then, the s106 funding should be used for special measures like repairing candy tiles and preserving the village plus stopping Sherford Traffic.</p> <p>At the moment, PCC is neglecting Plympton St Maurice by not having the minimum measures in place especially for an area where there is a school.</p>	
<p>I have lived in Plympton St Maurice for over twenty years. The volume of traffic has steadily increased since 1999, it now is regularly unacceptable especially during the rush hours. My house is on the corner and I have to endure loud arguments between drivers and ridiculous strings of cars who are on the pavement to let others pass. This is not only destroying the tiles, it means pedestrians are forced to stop and get out of the way, for the elderly amongst us it's both frightening and unsafe. I've seen horses and their riders being forced to do the same thing. The speed of some cars is utterly horrific, blink and you miss them. I've seen speed devices being used but that is not an accurate measure as drivers see them and adjust accordingly. It has gotten so bad that the noise and continued lack of respect for our village has forced me into selling which is very upsetting as I love the community and it's passionate desire to keep it going.</p>	
<p>We are very concerned about the increased volume of traffic passing our house during the 'rush hour' times in the mornings and evenings. The road has always been a 'rat run' for traffic passing from Brixton area and beyond to Plympton and beyond but since the development at Sherford the volume of traffic has increased significantly. Concerns were raised by the St Maurice conservation area when the</p>	

<p>Sherford plans were first initiated, that the volume of traffic would increase but we were assured that this would be monitored and measures taken to address this if a problem was identified.</p> <p>Please refer to Plympton St Maurice Conservation Area appraisal and management plan (PCC 2008). It was agreed by PCC that the new Sherford Community should not adversely impact upon the conservation area and if the trip level of traffic was reached traffic flow would be restricted. S106 funding was set aside to fund any restrictions that were deemed necessary and rising bollards would be implemented. In 2017 PCC agreed that the trip level had been exceeded and we residents were relieved that the problem would be addressed. This has not happened and the volume of traffic using the 'rat run' continues to be a major concern. The roads and houses cannot cope with this volume of traffic and it is causing permanent damage to properties in the conservation area. We have now been informed by PCC that they are going to use the S106 funding to implement 20MPH speed restrictions and more signage to deter HGV traffic. Although these measures would be very welcome to the area they will not impact in any way on the volume of traffic, merely slow it down (if imposed) so the S106 funding should not be used in this way. We feel very angry that our concerns have not been addressed as we were promised and instead PCC are using the funds for inappropriate means. I hope that this matter will be addressed soonest and PCC will do as they agreed and ensure that the Sherford new community does not adversely impact upon the conservation area as we were promised.</p>	
<p>I agree with the 20mph limit and the 7.5 t but I disagree with the S106 money for the usage of signs for the village. I feel that this money should be used for the reduction of traffic in the village.</p>	
<p>We would like to register concerns that we have regarding the proposed traffic management within Plympton St Maurice. The current proposal is to place signage within the area to alert drivers to reduced speed and weight limits. Whilst this will have a very limited impact, it falls short of addressing the main issue, that being the sheer volume of traffic now coming through the conservation area. Our understanding is that the S106 money was put in place to assist in the reduction in volume of traffic through Plympton St Maurice, not to enable the council to use that money to promote speed and weight reduction. This is something I believe should be funded separately from another source. Having moved to Plympton St Maurice 20 years ago, we have noticed a substantial increase in the volume and weight of traffic using the area. When the Sherford development was initially proposed, local residents were informed that the increase in traffic through the area was projected to be nineteen, 19, traffic movements per day. This clearly was an</p>	

<p>gross under representation. I notice that there is a traffic survey underway within Plympton St Maurice, we would however like to highlight that any numbers given will be artificially decrease as the road from Brixton is currently closed and has been for several weeks. Therefore this will not show the true scale of the problem.</p>	
<p>Traffic volume has increased significantly in the three years that I've been living here. its becoming a daily hazard pulling off my driveway due to the volume and speed of the traffic. Also due to the volume of vehicles large numbers are mounting the pavement and my driveway to allow other vehicles to pass. This has led to my wall being damaged due to a delivery van hitting it and could potentially lead to mine and my wife's cars being damaged. This is also dangerous to pedestrians especially those with young children. Reducing the speed limit with just signs is unenforceable. Vehicles will still continue to speed past and occasionally damage other vehicles. My daughters car and a number of visitors have both been the victims of speeding vehicles causing damage and then not stopping.</p> <p>Large goods vehicles continually find themselves becoming stuck due to the narrow roads and either sit there and wait for people to move there parking vehicles or try and attempt to reverse out. I believe signs alone are not going to change the issues we're currently having in the village and a comprehensive solution that will deter vehicles from using the village as a rat run is needed.</p>	
<p>PSM have been actively seeking a solution with your department to address the problem of ever increasing levels of traffic through PSM for a number of years, so far without any success. Despite being sold Sherford on the strength that our village would be fully protected from any increase in traffic brought about by the new town development, PCC and The Sherford Delivery Team have failed to acknowledge the scale of our problem or agree any solution that provides us with similar protection to the principals of the Sherford s106 agreement. We were misled over the practicalities of a rising bollard which is no longer perceived by the authorities as a workable solution. The curtailment of through traffic that a bollard would have brought about is our baseline expectation for a traffic solution and any scheme must therefore result in the same or similar levels of protection for us. I bring your attention to the obligations of the s106. Page 8 of the signed document from 12th November 2013 details the title 'All Reasonable Endeavours' para D (i) states</p> <p><i>'the Planning Permissions would not have been granted unless the planning obligations contained in this Deed had been entered into';</i></p> <p>Sheford only progressed after years of planning negotiations due to the protective nature of the s106. It is therefore against all principles of the agreement that you should abandon our village in respect of a traffic management</p>	

initiative. The proposed 20mph/7.5t traffic calming scheme does nothing to address our rat run problem. Furthermore, we are receiving mixed messages from the Highways department that contradict our councillor's comments in respect of funding for this proposed scheme. Can you assure us that funding for the 20mph/7.5t scheme will **NOT** come from our dedicated £25,000 s106 funds, designed for a Bullers [Plympton] Hill traffic solution?

In essence I support the proposed scheme **ONLY** if it is separately funded and our s106 funds remain ring fenced for a future and separate traffic management solution. I further implore both PCC and The Sherford Delivery Team to seek a swift set of solutions over and above this scheme that protects our village very soon, as previously promised.

I've recently been in dialogue with the Delivery Team and I don't share his sentiment that completion of Main Street and realignment of Brixton Road junction are our solutions to dissuading Sherford Traffic and beyond accessing our village for short cut route to the heart Plympton. The team isn't currently offering any immediate further dialogue with our Traffic Team and infrastructure is being implemented that will undoubtedly worsen our rat run problem. I envisage Main Street only compounding our problem as it offers a swifter route from Elburton, Plymstock and beyond to the top of Bullers [Plympton] Hill than the much more complex recent Sherford Road arrangement ever did.

A secondary Sherford associated problem arises from the widening of the link road between Deep Lane junction and Brixton Road which has now presented swifter access to Plympton for many commuters. This is contributing significantly to the traffic uplift. As a village we cannot accept continued denial of our traffic problems and we must have swift, constructive dialogue on the matter between St Maurice representatives and relevant Highway authorities to resolve this worsening issue.

Construction of a new town cannot continue to spoil such a significant historical village on its periphery. We are being severely let down by authorities and elected members and the village is gathering momentum to highlight its case and present it publicly.

Traffic volume has increased significantly in the three years that I've been living here. I live in one of the narrowest parts of Fore street and its becoming a daily hazard pulling off my driveway due to the volume and speed of the traffic. Also due to the volume of vehicles large numbers are mounting the pavement and my driveway to allow other vehicles to pass. This has led to my wall being damaged due to a delivery van hitting it and could potentially lead to mine and my wife's cars being damaged. This is also dangerous to pedestrians especially those with young children.

Reducing the speed limit with just signs is unenforceable. Vehicles will still continue to speed past and occasionally

<p>damage other vehicles. My daughters car and a number of visitors have both been the victims of speeding vehicles causing damage and then not stopping.</p> <p>Large goods vehicles continually find themselves becoming stuck due to the narrow roads and either sit there and wait for people to move there parking vehicles or try and attempt to reverse out. I believe signs alone are not going to change the issues we're currently having in the village and a comprehensive solution that will deter vehicles from using the village as a rat run is needed.</p>	
<p>I agree that the use of signage for both the 20mph and weight limit would be useful. The speed of some of the cars coming down Buller's hill is very dangerous as they come around the corner into Longbrook street. Sadly without any kind of enforcement I am not sure much will change as people are already going faster than the current 30mph in this area. I would also like to suggest that double yellow lines are extended in George Lane from the junction with Longcause on the side nearest St Peter's house to allow the buses a clearer journey down George Lane. We do have a fundamental issue with inadequate parking in the conservation area that means that residents sometimes park in inappropriate places. Could you consider some residents parking in the old allotments that are in Barbican Road or in the now closed Caravan Storage land between the Brook Inn and St Peter's close?</p>	
<p>I wish to strongly object to all of the proposed signage in our Conservation area, even though some might consider reducing the speed important. Had there been accidents or increased prosecutions for speeding through a 30 mile an hour limit the Devon and Cornwall police would have introduced average speed cameras. These cameras as data illustrates are the best deterrent and less intrusive than signs. However no such information is forthcoming. Large and heavy lorries are much more of a problem because of the narrow streets. A chicane at each end of Plympton St Maurice and Underwood road would be enough to stop this damaging dilemma. There are already weight restriction notices which are ignored so the only action is to make it impossible for the lorries to pass - hence the chicane.</p>	
<p>I would like to raise four points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. General Traffic-Traffic travelling from the A38 and St Elizabeth Hotel creates a shortcut for individuals driving cars, vans and lorries attempting to avoid the area between Mudge way and the traffic lights at the bottom of Cot Hill. 2. HGV-Heavy goods vehicles coming off of the A38 and from the Sherford development using Fore street as route, only to find themselves getting only as far as the guildhall and having to reverse back into Long Brook Street as the road is too narrow causing traffic chaos. This has also been witnessed with Lorries towing trailers making it a danger to both pedestrians and parked vehicles. 	

3. Speed-Vans, cars and taxis ignore the speed limit when using this route oblivious to the dangers of the narrow street.

4. Danger to the conservation area-It goes without saying that there are many listed building within Fore Street. This conversation area is in danger with the continued vibrations affecting the buildings and more so, the ancient pillars associated with the guildhall and a private dwelling that runs further along the street.

The building on the junction between Fore Street and George Lane has been struck many times over the years.

Commentary on Consultation Responses

The roads in Plympton St Maurice covered by these proposals are all public rights of way. Traffic surveys undertaken from 2016 do not show that total vehicle volumes or volumes of HGV's have increased over this time. It is also known that the Sherford Consortium do take action when HGV's associated with the development but to date there are very few verified instances of this occurring. However, it is also known that HGV's do attempt to travel through Plympton St Maurice and many of the consultation responses refer to instances where this has occurred. The measures proposed are intended to both inform drivers to take a more appropriate route and to enable Police Enforcement to take place if required. It is not possible to add additional measures to the scheme at this point and many such as One Way systems, Rising Bollards, Automatic Number Plate Recognition and Average Speed Camera Systems have been ruled out as either unaffordable, impracticable or unsustainable. The limits of the proposed 20mph Zone have been chosen with care and are largely reliant on physical space to place the required signage.

Whilst the proposal to introduce a 20mph Zone and expand the 7.5T Environmental Weight Restriction is not in itself controversial the initially proposed use of a £25,000, S.106 contribution from the Sherford Consortium to fund the scheme has raised significant objection along with concerns over the impact of intrusive signing in the conservation area. It has always been intended that signing should be kept to a minimum consistent with enforceability and it is now intended that the proposal should be funded from a successful Emergency Active Travel Plan funding bid. The S.106 funding can be utilised in ways that complement the objectives of the proposals to be developed in partnership with the community after the effects of the scheme have been evaluated.

4. RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the scheme is implemented as advertised

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

The lawful implications and consequences of the proposal have been considered and taken into account in the preparation of this report.

When considering whether to make a traffic order it is the Council's responsibility to ensure that all relevant legislation is complied with. This includes Section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended) that sets out that it is the duty of a local authority, so far as practicable subject to certain matters, to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway. It is considered that the proposals comply with Section 122 of the Act as they practically secure the safe and expeditious movement of traffic in and around Plymouth and provide for suitable and adequate associated parking facilities.