

ROGER WYATT
TULLIMAAR
HEMYOCK ROAD
CULMSTOCK
DEVON EX15 3JB
TE:



E-mail: rc

20 March 2014

Local Plan Review Consultation
Forward Planning
Mid Devon District Council
Phoenix House
Tiverton
EX16 6PP

Dear Sirs,

MDDC LOCAL PLAN REVIEW 2014-2033 - CULMSTOCK

Proposal for Planning Development of Culmstock Glebe and Rackfields

I write to register a strong objection to the above named proposal. Up to now Culmstock has retained its character of an attractive village without extensive block development such as has occurred in other villages. The in-filling type of development that has occurred in Culmstock over the years has not detracted from the "Street Scene" so regarded by planners and residents alike. There remain several areas where this type of development could continue, in particular on the Prescott Road and in Silver Street. Surely, even in these times of expansion, this gem of a village in the Culm Valley should be allowed to retain its character for the benefit of present and future residents of Devon.

The following points are also relevant to my objections :-

1. **Flooding** The fields act as a reservoir for water running down from Hackpen Hill, which is then released slowly through land drains, one of which runs through my own property? Building over these fields will cause immediate release of water through new drainage causing more flooding problems in the River Culm.
2. **Traffic** Presumably access to the site would be on to the Uffculme Road at its junction with the lane to Hackpen Cross, a narrow road with blind corner leading in to the village.
3. **Traffic** The additional traffic from the development would cause problems on the narrow roads, particularly over the one way bridge in the centre of the village which is the main route in and out for all residents south of the River Culm.
4. **Pedestrians** New development will mean many more pedestrians, including children going to the school north of the bridge. There are few footpaths and consequent dangers from the increased traffic.

5. **Social Consequences** The current in-fill development allows an easy integration of new residents; the proposed block development would make this integration more difficult creating an “us”, the established residents, and “them” the newcomers, attitude
6. **Environmental** The proposed development is outside the existing settlement area and encroaches onto farmland and valuable open space around the village. Also the land is rising towards Hackpen Hill, and a block development of housing on this rising land would have a detrimental visual impact on the neighbourhood as a whole.

Accordingly I urge you to reject this proposal.

Yours faithfully,

Roger J Wyatt