

5, Drakes Meadow,
Cheriton Fitzpaine,
Nr. Crediton, Devon,
EX17 4HU

Tel:

19th March 2014

Local Plan Review,
Forward Planning,
Phoenix House,
Phoenix Lane,
Tiverton, Devon
EX16 6PP



Dear Sir,

I attach my responses to the Local Plan Review Consultation, and ask that my views are taken into account, and that I am kept informed of the revised LPR due out in the autumn.

Many thanks for your kind attention in this matter,

Yours faithfully,

David Plumridge

e-mail = [unclear]

REASONS FOR NO LARGE-SCALE DEVELOPMENT AT CHERITON FITZPAINE:

ACCESS ROADS

1.1 Both access roads to the village, one at 1 and a half miles long, the other at 2 and a half miles long are little more than winding single-track roads with passing places, and already struggling to deal with existing traffic levels.

1.2 There are no safe access points on to the current roads for access roads from new housing developments. The two roads surrounding the Glebe fields proposal are single lanes with passing places, and totally inadequate to deal with increased traffic from a housing development.

1.3 Currently helicopters are regularly used to ferry casualties to hospital because of inadequate roads. Any further development would exacerbate existing difficulties and create additional risk to patients' safety.

1.4 Due to the lack of employment in the local area, the new working inhabitants would need to commute with consequent increase in traffic at significant times. This would be in direct contradiction of your stated aims in the LPR (p.16, Overall Strategy, "development will be managed to reduce the need to travel by car, increasing the potential of public transport, cycling and walking" (And also at p.20, Policy S2 "e"; and LP3 p.16 DM6 1.21)

1.5 There is only very limited public transport in the village. Two buses, per day to Crediton; one bus per day to Exeter; one bus per week to Tiverton, all at inconvenient times for commuters. This does not comply with your "High quality public transport services" (as at LP3 p.18, DM6 1.27).

1.6 The main village street has no pedestrian pavements, nor any width for any, and an increase of a third on the current traffic levels would greatly increase the risk to pedestrians of injury or death by road accident, which risk would have to be accepted by whichever planning authority granted permission for large-scale development. (See below under Amenity Loss)

SERVICES SUPPLY

2.1 Electricity supply is maxed out, with the village suffering regular power outages on current demand. (No pun intended!!)

- 2.2 There is no gas in the village, and so any new houses would need to have fuel delivered (oil or liquid gas) with further loadings on traffic.
- 2.3 Water supply is maxed out, with pressure falling considerably in summer months.
- 2.4 Sewage waste is currently on a pumped system that has no capacity for increased demand.
- 2.5 There is no mobile phone signal in the village.
- 2.6 The Glebe fields proposal currently carries power lines diagonally across the site. These would have to be completely re-routed, or buried.
- 2.7 The steep slope of the Glebe field would create further pressure on water run-off drainage, increasing an existing risk of local flooding. The lower end of the Glebe field currently stands in the flood plain.
- 2.8 The local school, recently newly-built, has a pupil level of 94, (having risen from 78 last year) out of a maximum of 115 places. Any large-scale development would rapidly take the school into over-capacity thereby effectively wasting the investment made in that building.
- 2.9 An increase of a third on the village size would create unsustainable pressure on the doctor's surgery.

AMENITY LOSS

- 3.1 The Glebe fields are currently used for productive agricultural use, (sheep and bullock grazing in the spring and autumn; hay-making in the summer) which would be lost.
- 3.2 Glebe fields currently contains two large holm oaks (approx.. 80 years old) on which there is a statutory preservation order. To build on this site would totally distort the settlement limit of the village. It would be better to **designate this area as a local green space.**
- 3.3 Glebe fields are currently also used on a daily basis by dozens of local villagers walking their dogs, and as a safe childrens play area. To eliminate this would cause local dog-owners to have to use narrow lanes without pavements, with consequent threat to safety. It is a well-used local quiet place.

3.4 The field next to Glebe field is currently used by the whole village for its annual bonfire and firework display. This would be lost, on safety grounds owing to the launch site for the fireworks being so close to the boundary with Glebe field.

3.5 Access to the school and the excellent children's play area to the rear of the Almshouse Cottages would be increasingly endangered by an increase in road traffic as there are no pedestrian pavements, nor any width for any to be built.

CONCLUSIONS:

Whilst a valid case could be made for appropriate (ie. No more than 15) in-fill housing along existing housing lines (much along the lines of the two excellent cottages erected by the Martin brothers to the rear of the Ring of Bells pub), as in the north-west corner of the Landboat Farm site between the main road and the access track, which would provide affordable sustainable housing to allow young families to remain in the village, **the large-scale developments outlined in the Local Plan Review would be totally inappropriate for the reasons given above, and would put public safety at risk, both for pedestrians and car drivers on the inadequate road infrastructure.** Concerns about the Barnshill Close site are the proximity to the school, which would create safety issues for children at school-time with four road junctions within yards of the school entrance, and the elevation of the site, which is considerably higher than Barnshill close itself. The site called Land adjacent to new primary school would need to have an open-space buffer zone between any development and the school.

I fully support the view put forward by the CPRE (Campaign to Protect Rural England) in their letter of 16th August 2013 where in their third paragraph they state "Housing: - p.16 to p.19. CPRE supports Option 1 to retain the current strategy with the major developments being in Tiverton, Cullompton and Crediton with Bampton as a large village. The other two Options are considered not to be sustainable as they would, by dispersing development, cause more travelling thereby increasing the carbon footprint along roads and lanes which are inadequate for the extra traffic caused by such development. By containing development in concentrated areas, the need for travel is more contained and the countryside which is an important economic asset for Mid Devon due to tourism as well as for local people retains its special qualities and tranquillity." And in the same letter,

para 13 they state "Villages (COR 17): p.41/42. CPRE supports Option 1, to continue with current strategy. As already stated in its comments for "Housing" p.1, if a more permissive approach is taken in villages this would be unsustainable as there would be more traffic on the road and also a greater loss of productive farm land if villages were to expand beyond their existing limitations. **There would also be a demand for services such as improved roads, schools, electricity and water provision if Option 2 came forward."**

I am encouraged to read in the Local Plan Review, 3.113 that "Consultation responses are sought on the **principle of allocating sites in and around villages and the Council will carefully consider local infrastructure capacity and impacts to the character of rural settlements."**

This view is endorsed by Devon County Council in their letter of 15th August 2013, para 3, where they state: "Mid Devon is largely rural in nature, and because of this, development should be focussed at the main towns within the district. This is because these provide the greatest number of community services and greatest opportunity for providing employment (or attracting new employment). This urban concentration development strategy ensures that distances between homes, services and jobs are shorter, which reduces reliance on the private car and ensures that those without a car can access services and employment. Another benefit of this is that a concentration of development into larger sites creates economies of scale facilitating infrastructure investment. It is therefore considered that the new Local Plan should continue with the urban concentration strategy of the last Local Plan."