

Sandra Hutchings

✓  
Ack 15.5.13

**From:** Pat Stagg  
**Sent:** 09 May 2013 20:26  
**To:** DPD  
**Subject:** Tiverton Eastern Urban Extension.



135/3747

Tiverton Eastern Urban Extension.

As a Tivertonian of over 60 years standing, I have seen many changes during my time. I have recently viewed the plans for the above proposal and I have two major concerns, one being surface water and the other being sewerage.

Having stood in some of the towns public houses with flood water up to my knees, I am wondering where the surface water from this development will go. There is a huge area to be covered by concrete, tarmac and residential/industrial roofing and with climate change becoming more apparent, the volumes of water are only likely to increase. We cannot put extra water into the canal as we know a delicate balance is needed to maintain levels of water and I have no knowledge of any local streams in that area capable of coping with the expected volumes of surface water. I suspect it will follow the old railway line, causing problems at Horsdon and thereafter into the river Lowman where the town already has problems caused by the river at Lowman Green and St. Andrews Street.

For many years our sewerage system has been unable to cope, so much so that in times of high rainfall pumping lorries have to be used to transport the excess to the treatment centre at Holwell. Additionally, we are led to believe that the pipe is already full to capacity and there is evidence that huge volumes are already being transported to the works for the treatment. All treated sewerage is, at present, removed by huge tractors and trailers. The lane at Collipriest has already fallen into disrepair and further sewerage traffic from this development would only make the problem worse. Provision in the planning should be made for either a new access to the treatment works or for South West Water to take over the ownership of the lane, bringing it up to a standard capable of taking the volume of traffic and also the weight of the heavier vehicles. The lane was originally built for horse and cart and as it is a public footpath safety must be paramount.

Finally, having investigated the utility services report, I consider section 2.4, 2.5 and 2.6 should be thoroughly investigated as I do not agree with their findings.

I hope you take these comments on board.

Yours Sincerely

Paul Stagg