

5062

AKK

From: Pat Butler
Sent: 01 October 2015 12:56
To: DPD
Cc: Customer Services
Subject: Response to Northwest Cullompton Extension 2nd stage consultation
Attachments: 20151001_124211.jpg; stage2response.docx





Re: Masterplanning: Cullompton Urban extension 29th September 2015

Please find comments, suggestions and questions re 2nd stage consultation.

Please note that the questions I ask are not rhetorical, I do request answers (to **Questions in bold**). Should you feel this is not within your remit, please advise to whom I should make representation and their contact details.

Responses:

Your introduction states that you have taken into account the views expressed and as a result the masterplan has evolved to its current form- what utter poppycock!

I found it laughable that, in looking at the responses, your: 'you said ...we did' section contains very selective questions, with even more selective answers: for example, Planning policy allocation: The fact that, of the published responses, only 44% wanted increased development, yet it has been decided to go with the increased development option- I feel that the figures & statements have been twisted to fit the result you want it to have- the wording and options within the online survey assisting with the statistical skewering.

In another example re: 'development should not result in the creation of new rat runs...' The answer you provide is that the link road will be finished in phase 1... This is an *AVOIDANCE statement* NOT AN ANSWER!!! You have omitted to acknowledge that the positioning of the link road will create more rat runs via Saxon way roundabout, Norman Drive and Head weir Rd (via a new mini roundabout??). The result will be that the established estates will be less safe, with more likelihood of accidents for drivers, cyclists, and pedestrians alike.

Why would planners believe that drivers would drive two sides of a triangle to get to the motorway when they can cut cut through Saxon way, Norman Drive or Head Weir Road to reach the motorway quicker?... To illustrate this point... when you drive home.. do you go via the longest route or the quickest/most convenient?... yep the latter, because that is HUMAN NATURE.- This plan does NOT accommodate how people think and do!!

Link Road:

I looked up the definition of a link road- it should link 2 major conurbations or major roads... This does neither. Taking traffic northbound through a town to reach a Southerly motorway junction is just not common sense.

As the transformation of a B road into Link road is highly likely to have a negative impact on both House prices and saleability, what compensation will be offered to the residents living adjacent to the site?

What process will be put into place to enable homeowners to find out more about this issue?

Point 1.1.3(conclusions) states that 'the access route must be suitable for future bus service provision'. By placing the link road on Willand Road the new development will be serviced only in part. By situating the new road around the top end of the development to the millennium way roundabout, it would make the bus service assessable to more residents and would provide a clear boundary for the final house building- so all residents would know the extent of any future building when they move in. It would keep heavy traffic on the outskirts of the town and those moving into the area would know exactly what the road layout would be from the outset. The lower part of the development would be serviced by current bus routes, with additional buses required for upper part, therefore boosting business and employment within the district/county.

In its current suggested position the link road only serves to move bottle necks and cause rat runs, pollution and stress to those living alongside the affected roads.

What is the speed and weight restriction of the Link Road going to be?

How will heavy traffic/HGVs be dealt with throughout the development?

How many lanes will the Link Road have?

Will it be a one way or two way Road?

What anti-noise and anti-pollution measures are being considered/put in place?

What measures are to be put into place to minimise the impact of the development and the new road on local residents adjacent to the site?

It seems that in minimising pollution in one part of the town (station road and town centre), another is being increased .. that isn't a resolution, its just moving the problem. A southern link to the motorway is by far the better option: This will naturally filter traffic and take cars away from both the town centre and the through route whilst improving Cullompton as a place to live in, travel to, spend time and money. With the retail development at the south end of town (Aldi & HomeBargain), a southern link to the motorway would be more beneficial on grounds of pollution and traffic easement for the whole of the town- not just the town centre.

The focus should in the first place be about economic development and stability, together with the introduction of a road system to take traffic where it needs to go at the southern end of town. If the planners get it right in the first place, there would be no need for 'flexibility for the future' (masterplan)

Without the right road structure in place, with consideration for the WHOLE of Cullompton, for now and future (ie motorway link/relief road at the southern end of town) wherever the developers build is likely to become a place of traffic chaos, resulting in more people staying away from the town which isn't the future any of us want for such a lovely piece of Devon.

Impact on established properties adjacent to the site

With the flooding of recent years, **What assurance will be given to ensure that we as householders do not end up footing bills for problems that are a result of the new development?** Looking at the layout of utilities, it seems that the estate running alongside the most northern part of Willand Road will bear the brunt of any sewerage problems as well as more noise pollution and increased traffic impact. These homeowners and indeed the residents of Cullompton deserve reassurance that adequate provision is made to disperse surface water from roads, sports fields and buildings to an ever saturated water table. **There should also be a contingency plan/financial fund should the provision not be robust enough In the event of sewerage, pipework, flooding or similar issues. Is this a consideration within the detail of the masterplan?**

Re: New local centre.

Often in the local paper there is a plea for support- both financially and for volunteers to keep the community venues open and running. It begs the question why there is an intention to put yet more facilities in the area instead of promoting the facilities that already exist within Cullompton? Should this go ahead, I fear this will be a divisive move. Without a local centre, the residents would use the town centre facilities which would help boost the town centre and help with the regeneration of Cullompton. Why has this aspect been overlooked? **How does a new separate centre amidst the development meet the criteria of what you state a masterplan to be.. 'a well-balanced community that is positively integrated with existing facilities in the town'?** (page 8- Masterplan outline).

There is a great danger of creating more premises that will, in the main, remain empty or under used because it ticked a box on the master plan...

The impact on people seems to have been left out of the equation, with planning being for planning sake (and government targets) rather than with the townspeople of Cullompton in mind. **Is there a strategy to ensure sustainable economic development so that Cullompton does not become a huge commuter town, with 'local' centres that fail because all cannot be sustained, and a divided community, of old and new communities.?**

Mrs P Butler

7, EX15 1XP



