

From: Ruth Sorenson <ruth.sorenson@hotmail.co.uk>
Sent: 02 March 2014 12:23
To: DPD
Subject: Local Plan Review



Dear Sir / Madam

Please find below our comments and objections to the local plan review:

Junction 27 both Commercial and Residential

1. Impact on the countryside and its setting in the landscape viewed from a substantial area.
2. Impact of commercial proposals on local facilities and a detriment to economic growth including the viability and vitality of Cullompton, Tiverton, Wellington and Taunton, North Devon and Torrington. i.e.
 - o direct competition to Atlantic Village which would appear to be currently struggling, Big Sheep Tourism attraction, necessary employment venues in an area where employment is challenged and wages are below the national average.
 - o direct competition with the independent cinemas of Tiverton Tivoli and Wellington's Wellesley which will likely see these facilities vanish.
 - o Direct competition to Banbury's which many mean loss of this established and major attraction to Tiverton Town Centre resulting in a further decline of the town as a shopping destination.
3. The size and nature of the commercial development would not represent what people coming to Devon come here for. Devon's attraction is its rural landscape, to place such built environment in the countryside will be a deterrent not an attraction.
4. The disruption caused by construction of the development over the next 10 years or more would also have detrimental impact on attracting tourists to Mid Devon which will impact on existing facilities and attractions county wide.
5. The increased congestion and traffic will have detrimental impact on the exiting amenity of local residents in the outlying villages, eg Burlescombe, Culmstock, Uffculme, Willand, Hemyock etc.
6. The corridor for concern will include junctions 26,27 and 28, impact on the A361 to Bolham roundabout and access on to it, existing and planned. Impacts along the A38 junctions: Broadpath, Burlescombe, Waterloo Cross. The A38 has experienced accidents which have been recorded as severe and fatal and the increase in traffic will only exacerbate the risks.
7. The provision of residential properties will need to provide adequate education with both primary and secondary which may conflict with existing school provision, catchments and transport.

The development will also need food shops, convenience shops and suitable public transport. Currently the loss of countryside to residential is in and unsuitable location under National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Such residential development will be dormitory for Exeter, Taunton, and Bristol. In the case of Exeter it will have significant impact on the substantial road network at junction 28 and is unlikely to be able to affect necessary change to the junction to enable development to proceed. Both junction 27 and 28 will each require 10's of millions to provide the necessary infrastructure on their own and need approval of the Highways Agency.

Villages / Countryside: Burlescombe

The map shows the loss of the settlement boundary for the village. The implications of such a proposal are

unclear and ambiguous.

The settlement boundary identifies where permitted development can take place and if the boundary loss results in tighter planning control of development in the rural landscape this will impact on existing residents permitted development rights and we would object.

Conversely if it is a relaxation of planning to allow for development I would also object given the sustainability of the community in terms of a food shop and lack of public transport. It is unlikely that any development would be of sufficient number which would be acceptable to the community that would provide for a viable business.

Yours faithfully

Mr and Mrs Sorenson
Burlescombe residents