

Ack
Request**Sandra Hutchings**

From: SUSAN MEADS ·
Sent: 22 March 2014 17:21
To: DPD
Subject: Local plan consultation on housing development in Cheriton Fitzpaine

Dear Sirs - I would like to make my personal comments on this consultation, as follows :-

1. The development boundary of the village, drawn in March 1974 by the old Crediton Rural District Council and old-style Devon County Council in the month when both ceased to operate, enclosed at that time about seventy dwellings. It now surrounds some 220 dwellings; the area is virtually fully developed. The village has over that period assimilated some additional 150 dwellings and their inhabitants, very happily and, I think, successfully, in addition to a significant amount of further housing development within the large agricultural parish..
2. There has recently been alarm at the prospect of the additional development of a further 142 houses; a confusion of the consultation documents that the forward planning section has worked very hard to explain and clarify. We are all grateful to them for their assistance.
3. There is an error in the descriptions of all four sites as regards bus services; there is now only one weekly bus service from and to Crediton to Tiverton (on Tuesdays) with an additional Fare Car service on Fridays. However, there are two 'loop' services from, and returning to, Crediton on six days a week, and another service from the village to Exeter on Mondays to Fridays, also with a return service. The common factor in all of them is that they bring passengers back to the village in the early afternoon; they are shoppers' buses and of very little use to commuters.
4. Of the four possible areas for housing development, the one between Barnshill and the new school is the most obviously desirable, being already surrounded on three sides by development. It is generally understood that it is owned by a developer who would wish to build more large, 'executive-style' houses on it; this is very unfortunate since the newly built housing already mentioned contains quite a high proportion of such dwellings already; the plan's specification for this area suggests that more such houses would fit in best with the surrounding area. That is particularly unfortunate in view of the aspirations of many young people who, having grown up in the village, would hope to make their lives here, in the light of the low wage rates payable in the area, and of the high costs of commuting. It would be far better if the developer, or another, could be persuaded to construct a group of low-cost dwellings on this site, including as high a proportion of social housing as can be negotiated, to give opportunities for younger people to rent or purchase within the village envelope, and found new families to build up the village community - and also to support the existing facilities.
5. The area to the eastern side of the new school has been a possibility for housing development for many years. It would be a continuation of the existing elongated shape of the village, and could be provided, for the most part, with footpaths for the use of those living there to travel into the village to use the other facilities there, and would also link the village with the group of assorted properties around White Cross. Here, there would be space for a mixed development of housing sizes, including both affordable housing and, if desired, more of the larger houses that builders love - or at any rate, seem to prefer to build.



6. The site on Landboat farm has similar merits, but is really too large to develop in its entirety at this stage for the coherent development of the village; it would be more sensible to include only part of it in forward planning at this stage, and reserve the possibility of developing the remainder for some future time and plan, and when the roads serving the village have been improved.

7. The Glebe land site is wholly unsuitable for housing development. Not only does it slope more steeply than the other sites, but the north edge is within the flood plain (and there is always the possibility that more development will produce more run-off water and increase the size of this) and road access is difficult, while it contains some splendid trees, one of which, at least, is protected. The field has been suggested regularly as a possible development site in the last forty years, doubtless because the Church Commissioners hope to make some money from it - which would not come back into the village or be used to improve facilities. A glance at the plan of the village attached to the draft plan clearly shows that this is a protruberance from the developed area which is totally out of keeping with the overall shape of the existing, and the remainder of the suggested, development. It should also be noted that this is almost the only area of land where development has ever taken place on the south side of the stream (excluding the remote local authority development at the top of the hill - Wordland Cross).

However, because this field forms an important part of the green outlook of much of the village, and is also a place where people can walk off the roads with their dogs, and children can play, if possible I would hope to see it designated as a site of special value to the village, a mini-green belt. If a formal designation of this kind can be achieved, it would doubtless be easier to reach an agreement to reconcile the needs of the users already mentioned with those of the farmer who rents it from the Church Commissioners, and must try to cultivate it for agricultural purposes.

Susan Meads