

Customer Feedback

Design Survey

Collect Responses

Analyze Results

View Summary

Default Report

Browse Responses

Filter Responses

Displaying 6 of 9 respondents

Crosstab Responses

Download Responses

Share Responses

Response Type:  
Normal Response

Collector:  
Web Link  
(Web Link)

Custom Value:  
empty

IP Address:  
90.208.76.60

Response Started:  
Sunday, January 26, 2014 3:35:53 PM

Response Modified:  
Sunday, January 26, 2014 3:39:36 PM

1. Employment development will be in the northwest of the site, north of Blundell's Road. The rest of the site (excluding large areas of open space) will be developed for housing, with a new primary school and neighbourhood centre located in the centre of the site adjoining Blundell's Road. Do you believe these uses are being proposed in the right places?

Yes

In general yes but please see 'other comments' below

2. The draft masterplan proposes around 1500 new homes, which is slightly below the adopted policy target. Housing density will vary across the site. Section 5.1 of the draft masterplan describes the different character areas across the site and the existing and proposed density of development. Do you agree with the design approach set out?

Yes

In general yes but please see 'other comments' below

3. The Council must ensure that infrastructure is provided in a timely fashion alongside the development, without making the development unviable. Pages 96-97 of the draft masterplan set out the trigger points for when infrastructure is expected to be delivered. Do you agree with the trigger points suggested in the draft masterplan for the following key areas?

Access and transport

Education

Community infrastructure

Open space, recreation, play and green infrastructure

In general yes but please see 'other comments' below

4. Do you have any other comments about the draft masterplan?

Comments on Consultation for Eastern Urban Extension In general, I am not happy that such a sizeable area of Tiverton, a locality close to where I live, has been designated for such a large-scale development. However, if it does happen, I am pleased that the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) contains so many sensible and precautionary constraints on any untrammelled permanent change. The Post Hill locality and the land surrounding it must not be destroyed by rampant commercialism and turned into a densely packed housing estate with no community facilities. The people of Mid Devon have only this chance to influence their own future and not to have it blighted for ever by unwanted and excessive change. Having stated this, I do have some specific comments on certain proposals in the SPD and these are set out below. 1. Sports & Recreation area to east of Giebelands Road in Phase 1c (between the old railway line and the Grand Western Canal) Pages 60 and 69 of the SPD give a summary of the vision for the 'Parkland' area. The parkland wraps around the southern edges of the new neighbourhood. The landscape would have the feel of a country park and would be a defining feature of the development. The parkland would provide a landscape resource comprising: wetland areas; woodland areas; areas of pasture, retained veteran trees; new tree planting; landscaped areas of varying character; attenuation ponds and other SUDS features; allotments and orchards; formal and informal play areas - including a NEAP, LEAPS and LAPS; new sports pitches; enhanced biodiversity; improved access to the canal and cycle path; and an enhanced network of hedgerows. However, I feel that the inclusion of 'new sports pitches' on this site would be severely detrimental to the vision for the area and be completely out of step with the rest of the vision above for the following reasons: • Page 41 of the SPD sets out a view for the new primary school that it "should be directly related to new areas of public open space for both recreational and learning benefits. It should have suitable areas for sports pitches." If one were to state this by altering the order of the sentences it can be argued that consequently most sports pitches should be located close to the school, not at the far end of the site, at the bottom of the slope and over the old railway line. • Is there any perceived need for further sports pitches in Tiverton given the existing provision at Exe Valley Leisure Centre and other schools in Tiverton? Is there any study that suggests that extra residential development automatically generates needs for new sports pitches? Informal play areas will need to be provided but given the change in how people spend their leisure time will there be a need for formal sports pitches? Is the inclusion of 'new sports pitches' just an automatic assumption? • There is an explicit assumption on page 67 of the SPD "that there is no opportunity for shared facilities between the school and the community" but this must be reconsidered in the light of current economic constrained circumstances and both public and private financial policies. • There is a possible alternative in that Blundell's School possesses many excellent sport pitches and indoor facilities, which currently can be hired by the public. Is there some way that these facilities could be shared with the new community? Perhaps this could encourage interactive relations between the new community and Blundell's? • If the new sports pitches are situated south of the old railway line and beyond the end of Giebelands Road there will definitely be an effect on Giebelands Road residents. People who wish to use these facilities who live in other areas of Tiverton (and Mid-Devon?) may prefer not to drive through the new EUE development, park on the northern side of the railway line (if a car park is provided) and then walk over along the line to access the sports ground. In this case they would park at the end of Giebelands road (or in one of the roads off Giebelands such as Follet Road or Westcott road) thus creating hindrances to residents and also the bus service that operates there and turns at the end of the road. Most of the road width along Giebelands and the streets off it are too narrow to accommodate parked vehicles and two traffic streams. This extra traffic would also create further problems at the tight turn into Giebelands from Tidcombe Lane which has very restricted sightlines and narrow road width and also suffers from inconsiderate parking at the present moment. The scenario described above would transform a difficult into a dangerous lurching manoeuvre. • I also note from page 17 of the SPD that several considerations which arose out of the initial consultations have a bearing on the location of the sports pitches which I believe have not been addressed by the current proposals i.e. • Consider if the southern green infrastructure area is the

best place for formal sports pitches. • Emphasise green links from the neighbourhood centre to the parkland area around the Grand Western Canal. • Ensure easy access to allotments and play areas from all housing. 2. Traffic No-one doubts that the proposal will generate extra traffic, particularly along Blundell's Road as it is a major east-west artery for traffic in the district and beyond. This is recognised particularly in the SPD that states, at page 85, that a 'number of environmental enhancement and traffic calming measures are suggested. It is proposed that 20mph shared surface zones are introduced at Blundell's School and at the village green at the centre of the neighbourhood'. I have concerns about these, despite my recognition that something like these are necessary at these points. • Firstly, the ability to ensure that the speed restrictions are adhered to at all times. Roadside engineering (for example speed humps, shared surfaces) can make drivers realise that other road users are likely to be about and extra care should be taken. However, in my own experience driving through Halberton it is only a minority of drivers who adhere to the lower speed limits and I would suggest that strict enforcement is applied at these spots in some way, for example road crossing patrols or even speed cameras. In particular I am concerned about the situation at Blundell's School. At times of class changeovers many of the school's students cross the road currently using the pedestrian controlled lights. However the flow in the number of students is not uniform and children tend to arrive in groups. The SPD illustrates the School site with examples of 'informal crossings'. I think that some drivers could get annoyed and stressed (and possibly aggressive?) if forced to wait for several dispersed groups of students to cross the road under these circumstances. Maybe a better solution would be to retain the present crossing system. • Secondly I have concerns about the use of 'shared surfaces' along Blundell's road. These could give pedestrians a false sense of security and given a high level of traffic along the road this could be fatal. Also 'shared surfaces' do not give people with impaired vision a sense of where the pavement ends and the road starts. An unobservant or distracted driver could not realise that they are in such a shared area and I believe that the existence of such an area should be forcibly brought to the attention of all drivers in some way. 3 Wildlife There is an aspect of the local wildlife in the wider area that has been overlooked in the SPD. It does not mention the effect of the EUE proposals on the particular wildlife that inhabits the old railway line and the adjoining land. I am thinking here not only of owls, deer, buzzards and badgers but particularly of the frogs that appear in the streams and ditches that flow along the path from Pool Anthony bridge to Tidcombe Lane bridge. This site is not within the EUE but adjoins it and could well be affected by flood prevention proposals. The frogs appear every February and March, breed and lay clusters of spawn and then disappear until the following year. Presumably the adult frogs disperse to land next to the railway line which could be affected by drainage proposals. 4 Infrastructure Requirements Green Infrastructure Section 6.4 (page 97) of the SPD referring to implementation phase 1.3 says 'Provision of green infrastructure to the west of Pool Anthony Bridge with necessary management / funding arrangements'. This area looks to me to be outside the western boundary of the EUE. Can any light be thrown on this statement or clarification given as to which bridge or direction is being identified here? Sewers I am very concerned that the additional housing and employment will provide more strain on the sewerage systems in Tiverton. I hear tales that the local water treatment plant will not be able to deal with any increase at all in effluent, never mind the level associated with that this development will create. Can South West Water give any assurance that the company can cope with such a boost, particularly not having to store effluent in temporary storage before transferring it by lorry to a treatment plant? How long would it take for South West Water to provide any necessary upgrade which would have to be completed before houses start to be occupied?

1. Are you

c) A member of the public

1. Members of the public only - do you live...

b) Elsewhere in Tiverton

2. NOTE: RESPONSES CANNOT BE REGISTERED WITHOUT A NAME AND ADDRESS Name

Eric Procter

3. NOTE: RESPONSES CANNOT BE REGISTERED WITHOUT A NAME AND ADDRESS

House No - 10

Address 1 - Glebelands Road

Town - Tiverton

Postcode - EX16 4EB

