

CIL

CIL

ID NO: 70
REP NO: 27
ACK: 6.12.11
SUMMARISED:

Sandra Hutchings

From: Liz Pickering
Sent: 05 December 2011 14:12
To: DPD
Subject: FW: HEMYOCK PARISH COUNCIL RESPONSE TO MDDC PLANNING CONSULTATIONS
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Green

*Liz Pickering
Principal Forward Planning Officer
Mid Devon District Council
Tel: 01884 234 398*

From: Sally Gabriel
Sent: 05 December 2011 13:32
To: Liz Pickering
Cc: Peter Williams
Subject: FW: HEMYOCK PARISH COUNCIL RESPONSE TO MDDC PLANNING CONSULTATIONS

Please see responses to consultation from Hemyock Parish Council
Please confirm receipt

Thanks
Sally

Sally Gabriel
Member Services Officer
Mid Devon District Council
01884 234229
sgabriel@middevon.gov.uk

From: Stephen Major
Sent: 05 December 2011 13:32

Subject: HEMYOCK PARISH COUNCIL RESPONSE TO MDDC PLANNING CONSULTATIONS

Dear Sally

HEMYOCK PARISH COUNCIL RESPONSE TO MDDC PLANNING CONSULTATIONS

Please find attached the views and questions of the Hemyock Parish Council formed at their specially convened meeting to discuss the following draft planning documents, please can you forward them to the relevant person in the planning Department:

1) Draft Supplementary Planning Document Strategy to 2026 and Delivery Plan Section 3

P6 Is the map as existing or proposed.

P7 1.4 Were Sustrans consulted? If not they should be included as a significant input.

06/12/2011

P8 Please confirm how Hemyock was placed at number 26 out of 28 in the priority catchment area list.

Strategic Nature Areas

Culm Valley trail is omitted (potential along the line of the former GWR rail track).

P10 GI/4 Are the local examples such as Ashculme Turbery, Lickham Common and Hemyock Common as well as others in the upper Culm Valley not worthy of mention, or inclusion in maps?

P12 Recommend increase of provision to 1 scheme per year, this would still only produce 15 allotments in the plan period, and the likelihood is that other communities will require new or expanded allotments in the future.

P22 If a local project in more rural areas, will a significant proportion of the contribution be retained locally?

P25 We assume that the Tennis Court sub-total cost should read £420,000 rather than £420. This affects overall sub-total for POS - sports to meet existing demand.

Final page: Concern at lack of target outcomes for a number of policies.

2) Community Infrastructure Levy Preliminary Draft charging Schedule

P1 We consider that bullet points 4 and 5 contradict each other:

Beneficial to local communities as a meaningful proportion of the charge will be passed to them to secure local infrastructure

Spent anywhere in the District rather than being restricted to the area close to a development, and....

Concern that the downgrading in planning and development terms of past Local Centres such as Hemyock are now less likely to have significant developments, and therefore few opportunities to benefit from significant CIL contributions.

P2 It was felt that the Air Quality element should be funded from relevant local development CIL only, and not a District wide liability.

P5 Noted that the figures are significantly higher than those proposed in Plymouth, therefore will challenges relating to scheme viability be common, or will schemes not be brought forward in MDDC but relocate to neighbouring Districts? Loss of potential employment concerns!

P6 We understand that current Government consultation on CIL may allow Social Housing to be included in CILs.

P6 We endorse the full relief for Social Housing developments.

3) Meeting Housing Needs

MHN1 We recommend that where there is a recent local Housing Needs Survey that the survey mix takes precedence over the MHN document.

Generally the document was well received

Recommend in future addition of glossary of key terms and acronyms in documents.

Yours faithfully

Stephen Major

On behalf of Hemyock Parish Council1 Higher Mead
Hemyock
CULLOMPTON
Devon EX15 3QJ