

Sandra Hutchings

Ack

From: Eddie Dennis
Sent: 20 March 2014 20:18
To: DPD
Subject: Fw: Local Plan Review 2025

Eddie Dennis
 2 Damson Close
 Willand EX15 2QB

19th March 2014

To Local Plan Review
 Forward Planning
 MDDC
 Phoenix House
 Phoenix Lane
 Tiverton EX16 6PP



Dear Sir / Madam,

Jct 27 / Willand Consultation

While it is only right and proper that these types of consultation should be open and attract as much interest and feed back as possible, given the overall planning system as exists, I do have real deep seated concerns that the exercise and the eventual Inspectors recommendations will in effect be cleverly undone by the Government supported developers use of the loosely structured Developer Lead Planning Guidance Systems. I am not being negative, indeed I have it on file, namely that in effect while the proposals will have the Inspectorates nod of approval, in the long term there are no guarantees as to the final outcome. This is not pie in the sky over reaction, my comments are based on some 15 years of Private Housing development for Willand, all rubber stamped as a bulk outline plan in the then 1970s Willand Cullompton Plan. Then Application upon application seeking revised or amendment to that approved were a common feature, with absolutely no additional improved services provision or infrastructure enhancement.

That leads into my first question, given the earlier extensive house build why is it now being proposed to add a further 3350 in the area adjacent to Willand? We are told there is a severe Housing need, where is the proof, apparently there are in excess of 14million empty homes across the EU. Local and wider Housing need statistics from organisations such as Shelter show figures that strongly contradict this myth from within Government. So who wants the houses, and if so and the proposal gets the nod, where is it envisaged that the sustainable Industrial and Employment opportunities will emerge from, It wont be at Jct 27 that's for sure? One thing Willand does have is Industrial Sites, at the last count Four, with an additional two just outside the Village boundary both of which have emerged via ,the dare I say, the dubious use of the Farm Diversification guidance and both have a distinct advantage over the normal Industrial sites, the converted farm sites only require a 50% Business rate contribution. This has resulted in the said bona fide business sites which are served by a purpose built new roundabout now operating at a greatly reduced capacity, with little or no real new Business interest coming forward. With that problem upper most I have to ask, why does this Development Plan even include a further white elephant Industrial complex at Jct 27? That the agents do not or indeed cannot give constructive answers to simple questions speak volumes. Junction 27 of the M5 is "The Gateway to Devon," I am also reminded that to my knowledge three earlier attempts to develop the site have been refused or dismissed by the Planning Inspectorate and on the last occasion, by the then Secretary of State. therefore it must remain the "Gateway". I have heard the arguments from the various agents that Devon has

to change, I agree, it is how that change is projected and managed that is the issue. The level of change and how it is structured has to be heart of what is best for this all important community of Devon. Proper locally thought as well as carefully constructed proposals are the key.. Given the proposed timescale along with my age, the changes under consideration will not impact on me. However as a responsible caring individual I must look to the future and secure a level of change that will secure and safeguard a decent sustainable well designed vision for future generations, not one that supports the dumping 3500 homes adjacent to a motorway and a main railway line, that whole ill thought out concept must never ever be a consideration. Refusal is the only possible option .

I have to seriously question the Jct 27 / Willand presentation format, I have lived in the village of Willand since 1980, during that time Junction 27 has never been, indeed is still not situated within the Village boundary / settlement area? It does not nor ever has adjoin Willand, indeed it has both the villages of Burlescombe and Halberton sited between Willand and the said Junction.

As a geographically small but highly populated village, note not a Town, as mentioned earlier it has be subject to more than your normal level of growth, especially compared with the majority of much larger villages and indeed towns. I am reminded that Bradninch and Brampton are both Towns, but they have escaped the level of build thrust upon this village. Again as already mentioned, as the result of earlier Local Plan decisions we have an abundance of Industrial / Employment sites, which in the main stand idle. The one exception being the Two Sisters meat processing unit, who in the main bus their work force in from as far a field as Bridgwater. The effect of the very limited local employment has to be seen to be believed, during working week Monday to Friday and Saturday there is a morning mass exodus of people by car and bus which is reversed in the evening, result a very quiet village between the said times. It should also be noted that contained in the then Devon Structure Plan of 1995/6 was a proposal for some 3000 new dwellings, fortunately the presiding Inspector having visited the village, stated publicly that Willand had been over developed and it lacked infrastructure support. I am also reminded that in addition, the then MDDC in its review of future development agreed a policy that approved a policy that new housing should only be concentrated where there was existing adequate infrastructure and service provision sufficient to meet the new build. Development in villages should be kept to a level that would not damage or harm the existing service provision. .

Looking at the proposed sites which if agreed would I assume result in a revised Parish Boundary. That the bulk of the proposed new build will take place within Halberton but immediately adjacent to Willands Village boundary. So does this extensive long term plan include in its concept the provision that would activate a properly structure Government lead Boundaries Commission review?

Taking the Quick's Farm proposal, in relation to the existing Parish Boundary it does make some sense, if properly thought out it could see the boundary being tidied up and strengthened. That said there must also be some prior formal written agreement, namely that before any housing development is commenced, that a serious review of the existing road network and an extension of the 30 mph speed restriction be agreed and implemented . The said agreement should also set out the addition of a new foot path along with an extension to the current street lighting, in keeping with the re- sighted Speed Limit warning signage.

The exception site on the B3181 was according to the Core strategy, split into two. The smaller area for some seven Affordable properties at any time, while the larger site with a proposed 32 Affordable homes would only be commissioned as and when there was an identifiable need?.

In my opinion the Meadow Park proposal has not been considered in detail, it is pie in the sky, and with its proximity to the Motorway is in its present form not a sustainable option, due to a very recent decision by the Local Plan Inspectorate who threw out the previous Lloyd Maunder site, it being to close to the motorway. That must now equally apply to the Meadow Park site. I am also aware of the ongoing noise impact on certain areas within the earlier Meadow Park development Two wrongs do not make right, likewise Planning is about the rights of people and occupants and their right to have a reasons quality of life.

Looking at both the Dean Hill and Lloyd Maunder proposals, as these are both outside the village settlement area will these be deemed Exception sites?

That the Lloyd Maunder site was deleted in the DM3 Inspectorate decisions speaks volumes, I strongly support that sound decision. As for Dean Hill Road suggestion, what can I say. Here we have a isolated area situated with a Motorway on its one side, as if that is not bad ,it also has the added problem of the main Penzance to Paddington Railway line on the other. In addition the Dean Hill Road Junction with the B3181 is situated where the ability to see adequately B3181 traffic from Cullompton is situated at the top of a hill where the approach and the layout of the railway bridge is seriously restricted. One other possibility relates to the Inspectorates decision on the Lloyd Maunder site. If that were get the go ahead, the impact on the narrow lanes from that site onto Dean Hill Road coupled with the added aforementioned dangerous almost blind B3181 junction would need to be addressed and overcome. For the reasons as set I out the only possible decision is for me to object to these fool hardy ill thought out options.

With an additional 344 new homes, given the failure of the 1970s Local Plan to make proper provision to revise and update the infrastructure in the 1985 / 2001 development programme we now find our Primary and pre Schools are both at saturation point. While the two units have seen extensions since the the completion of the housing programme, that was achieved via the work of this local community, not by your greedy developers. So if the Jct 27 concept was given approval, before any new house build is even considered let alone undertaken, be it within or in the immediate area or adjacent and is likely to impact on Willand already over stretched services, there will have to be in place an agreement ,one that is paramount and legally binding , so that it cannot to be overturned or dismantled later, the agreement will secure the construction of new schooling adequate to meet the immediate and long term schooling and educational needs, BEFORE I repeat before any new house building development is agreed. Such an agreement must include senior education requirements. While I object to the 3000 house development I am aware that it is important to look to the future and at the wider issues in order to safeguard this community should this ill thought out Jct 27 option ever become a reality.

Back in the 1970 / 80s and even into the 2004 timescale Willand was continual reminded that its shopping and other support facilities were based at Cullompton. Given the extensive on going new build in the Town, add the 3500 new homes as envisaged just how will these projections effectively address or make good what should be an adequate service provision? We have been promised shops, these became houses We were in line for a new medical unit, it became houses. Given that would be developers are not obliged or indeed required to contribute to any earlier shortfall in a development. Mindful that as a result of short sightedness on the part of the then MDDC there has only been limited improvement to our over stretched services. In the absence of any real service improvements or upgrade to address the previous Planning errors I have only one option open to me, to object to the overall proposal.

No mention is made on how the would be developer is going to address and manage the B3181 road which although a "B" road serves as a back up to the Motorway in various emergencies. No wording on how the new development will address its impact on this all important highway. It has for example a weight restriction in place through the Village. I also note that no mention is made in relation to proposed new relief roads provision to serve the Willand side of Cullompton,

Developers know how to manage the system they know how to manipulate and work the planning system. The use of the "outline" is a classic. Then there is the detailed application which initially complies with all of the Inspectors requirements, then once approved, the developers using the revised or amendment application process slowly demolish the originally approved concept, the one we all contributed too and slowly do there own thing. That is the Planning System as in place so I am bound to ask, how can we stop such blatant abuse of the Planning System and secure a plan that is our we the local peoples desires and design?

Finally the Jct 27 concept includes a 35% affordable housing requirement. From real experience no safeguards exist that will secure that figure, not my words, but from a Planning Officer. Again what this Consultation is about is to achieve a development whose design is in line with what the local community would want to see. However like the rest of this extensive proposal, with no meaningful planning safety factors being introduced, those that would give the Local Planning Authority the controls over the would be developers LPA actually in a position to control the developers, there is only one proper option on the table, to without reservation lodge my strongest possible objections and oppose the Jct 27 / Willand proposals.

Yours faithfully

Eddie Dennis



This email is free from viruses and malware because avast! Antivirus protection is active.



This email is free from viruses and malware because avast! Antivirus protection is active.



This email is free from viruses and malware because avast! Antivirus protection is active.



This email is free from viruses and malware because avast! Antivirus protection is active.