

From: Goff Welchman
Sent: 29 May 2013 12:25
To: DPD
Subject: FW: Eastern Urban Extension



Sirs,

66/870

I now have a further comment to make, regarding my point 1/ below.
On consideration, I believe it is wrong to hold your discussion with Natural England (English Nature) totally behind closed doors.

I can understand that you cannot have a large number of members of the public in attendance. The risk of disruption is obvious.
However, I feel that a small, pre-designated group should be invited to witness the proceedings.
A condition of that attendance could be that no interruptions would be allowed.
But a time-limited question and answer session could be included at the end of the meeting.

If the Council has nothing to hide, I see no reason to refuse such a request.

If such discussions are only held in closed session, that would tend to confirm my following suspicion.
This is, that the development is motivated purely for Council financial reasons, rather than the overall benefit for Tiverton.

- These reasons could be as follows:-
- 1/. The Council is mainly interested in the government grant accompanying each square metre developed.
 - 2/. The increased revenue in Council Tax and Business Rates is also a primary target.
 - 3/. Increased local residency will result in salary increases for senior Council staff.

Please include this comment and request in your list of considerations.

Yours faithfully,

Goff Welchman.

-----Original Message-----

From: Goff Welchman
Sent: 24 May 2013 18:12
To: 'planningconsultations@middevon.gov.uk'
Subject: FW: Eastern Urban Extension

Sirs,

Now that I have had the opportunity to discuss the plan options with your staff at the exhibition today, I have further comments.

1/. I understand that you will be holding meetings with English Nature and the DOE, to discuss Tidcombe Fen.

These meetings will however not be public.

Please advise if the content and results of these meetings will be published in time for the final public consultation.

2/. Your staff confirmed that 5 gypsy pitches are included in the plan.

Whether a government requirement or not, I consider such an inclusion totally inappropriate for the area concerned.

I object to this in the strongest possible terms.

3/. Your staff confirmed that the designated green areas will contain recreational or sports facilities. They stated that access to these may be needed through Glebelands Road or Follett Road. Both would be ridiculous.

If the new housing estate requires such facilities, it is nonsense for those residents to travel down Post Hill, into Tidcombe Lane, and along Glebelands Road, in a huge circle.

Glebelands Road is a narrow and quiet residential road, where parking needs to be allowed. Constant traffic would be a disaster.

Again, I object to this idea in the strongest possible terms.

4/. I've already made my objection below, regarding increased traffic resulting from the proposed development.

Your colleagues informed me that a new Link Road junction would not be built in the early stages.

If the development were to go ahead without a firm, binding commitment, fund allocation and timescale for such a junction, then we would face the risk of a later local or central government cancelling the junction.

We would then face the permanent traffic nightmare I've indicated below.

Please add all these comments to my original objections below.

Yours faithfully,
Goff Welchman.

-----Original Message-----

From: Goff Welchman

Sent: 24 May 2013 08:06

To: planningconsultations@middevon.gov.uk

Subject: Eastern Urban Extension

> Sirs,

>

> I consider the Eastern Urban Extension to be a totally inappropriate development, for the following main reasons.

>

> 1/. We already have a large area of new estates relative to the size

> and

infrastructure of the original town. We need no more. Our facilities cannot support such growth.

>

> 2/. In today's society, most homes have two, or even 3 cars. The

> volume

of traffic pouring either into Tiverton down Post Hill, or out to the M5 through Halberton, would be utterly unacceptable.

>

> 3/. Our rare Tidcombe Fen habitat could not be satisfactorily

> protected

from such surroundings. Just leaving a small space between it and the proposed estate would not be sufficient.

Drains, sewers and utilities provision would totally alter the natural water supply and drainage of the SSSI, and drive away its resident wildlife.

>

> This plan needs a total re-think.

>

> Yours faithfully,

> Goff Welchman

> 28 Glebelands Road