

Hayley Keary
Participant No 6354

Policy SP2

Issue 12.

I do not believe a site in Sampford Peverell is necessary to cater for additional housing needs resulting from the policy J27 allocation. There is no reason for such a site to be in Sampford Peverell in the first place - the other site policy TIV16 is six miles from J27 so obviously the distance from J27 is not considered a specific issue. The village school is not capable of holding the additional children from 60 new houses, the capacity shown on Devon County Council's report on line shows capacity for 119 children and we currently have 117 currently on roll. I can tell you this as a member of staff at the school, now, (and for the past 22 years), there are no spare classrooms and nowhere to build additional classrooms.

More importantly SP2 is most definitely not the best performing site, even if it is considered the site should be in Sampford Peverell.

SP2 is on the west side of the village, is directly attached to the Conservation Area and next to a Grade 2 listed house which is attached to historic houses. This west side of the village is the oldest part of the village and has historic heritage aligned to older appearance and character which clearly warrants preservation. SP2 is also within clear view of the Grand Western Canal conservation area, something MDDC have completely ignored in their evidence base. A large modern housing development would be completely out of character in this historic part of the village. This poorly proposed development would slice Higher Town in two : on one side, a modern sixty house development divorced by its modernity , elevated above the 48 historic cottages which make up Higher Town. I am aware of other sites in the village which were not considered in depth as the inclusion of SP2 in the local plan was made in a rushed manner , lacking properly considered evidence.

SP2 would without doubt lead to a massive increase in traffic. The new house owners (60 houses possibly equaling over 100 cars) would need to drive through the village to access any amenities eg, school, shop,pubs, J27, A361, M5, Parkway station etc. Higher Town already has an immense amount of traffic and could not safely cope with this additional traffic. Other sites in the village to the East side would not have this problem. A development on SP2 would have a massive impact on the oldest part of the village and would pose a great safety risk.

In the SHLAA 2013 constraints to delivery were: 'there may be no safe points of access'...'the topography of the site may make access unachievable'...' Turnpike is a dangerous road for pedestrians'. The fact that Turnpike is a dangerous road for pedestrians is included in all MDDC's paperwork including the SA 2015, which is used for evidence to support MDDC's 2017 submission. No evidence is given as to why it is no longer dangerous. Nothing has changed on the road itself. MDDC offer no evidence as to the impact on Higher Town.

According to MDDC this site was chosen as it had more support than other sites in 2014, where the two land owners wrote to say they supported the site and the Parish Council wrote saying they may support 25 houses or less. There were three letters of objection. This is not strong evidence to support the site. I believe there were more than 100 letters of objection, including the Parish Council, in 2017. Thus public opinion, which seemed important to MDDC in 2014 , should be given the same credence now.

In conclusion, a development on SP2 is not clearly justified, was proposed without necessary evidence, contradicts previous advice, poses a considerable and undeniable safety risk, lacks clear evidence, and will have a massive and detrimental impact on the village. If, and only if, Sampford Peverell has to cater for the additional housing needs from J27, this is clearly not the best performing site. MDDC have not

given due attention to other sites which perform better both inside and outside of the village and I believe this is due to the rushed nature of SP2's inclusion in the Local Plan.

Issue 13.

The proposed allocation does not have sufficient regard to the historic environment. My direct involvement with SP2 lies in the fact that the land at the North-East corner of the site is merely two foot away and approximately six foot above my historic property in which I have lived all my life, 42 years. My own property which is of historic interest is attached to a Grade 2 listed house. The vote as to whether or not SP2 should be included in the local plan was taken without any reference to these properties, thus councillors voted without full knowledge of the historic environment. There was no reference to the Grand Western Canal either. Please see included photo, the view of SP2 from the canal. References to these two historic environments were not included until after the vote was taken. This is a shocking lack of professional conduct.

Issue 14.

The proposed allocation does not have sufficient regard to the character and appearance of the area. The SHLAA 2013 states 'Development would have significant visual impact'...and 'would require substantial hedgerow and earth removal.' The West side of Sampford Peverell is the oldest part of the village, the majority of which is in the Conservation Area. SP2 is adjacent to the Higher Town Conservation Area and is only 50 or so metres from the Conservation Area which includes the Grand Western Canal.

Recently one of your own Government inspectors turned down the building of two story houses next to SP2 on a site very close to my garden and my neighbours garden (the garden of the listed house) on the grounds of : 'the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with Policy DM2 of the Local Plan and Policy COR2 of the Mid Devon Core Strategy which aim to promote good design and protect local distinctiveness'.

The proximity of this development to our gardens and houses and the proximity to the proposed site at SP2 is equidistant and therefore the policy DM2 and COR2 must be considered for SP2.

We are grateful that MDDC have decided to include a GI area nearest to the historic houses, but this also clearly shows the inappropriate choice of SP2 as MDDC clearly see the necessity to protect the character and appearance of the environment in which SP2 is sited.

Issue 15.

There is a severe problem with the accessibility if the allocation was to go ahead. As above, the SHLAA 2013 states Turnpike is a dangerous road and no evidence has as yet been put forward as to why they believe it is no longer dangerous. There are no continuous footpaths on Turnpike or indeed in Higher Town. Wheelchair users are unable to safely use Turnpike and Higher Town.

MDDC now seem to be intimating that pedestrian access could be gained through Higher Town, but there are no continuous footpaths here either and furthermore the road is too narrow to create any, particularly at the SP2 end. Again there is no evidence as to how this could be safely and practically achieved. If footpaths were to be attempted, I believe they would need to be 2metres wide, this would be impossible in some parts, particularly at the SP2 end where three historic properties , including part of my property and directly on the road line and immovable. Major works would alter the character and appearance of this Conservation Area, important historic setting and in a hugely detrimental way.

Issue 16.

The tie to J27 is unequivocally strong enough: MDDC have repeated again and again that the ONLY reason SP2 is included in the Local Plan is because of the additional housing need arising from J27 proposal.

In the cabinet meeting (21st November) I asked , 'What has changed in land topography since 2013 when you decided not to include SP2 in the LP?' Jenny Clifford, head of regeneration and planning replied, 'Of course nothing has changed in the land, only MDDC's need relating to J27 and the LP'

The tie of J27 to SP2 therefore clear and strong : the only reason SP2 is included is because of the need for additional housing arising from Policy J27, we have had that confirmed at all MDDC meetings time and time again.

I ask the inspector that even if J27 is rejected from the LP that the SP2 site is protected from development due to the unsuitability, on so many levels , of development of this site.

I respectfully ask that the inspector considers coming to my property to view the impact this proposed development would have on our 16th century historic cottages . I invited MDDC to the property and they accepted the invitation and said how useful that had been. It was after this visit MDDC decided the GI area needed to be extended.

Hayley and Elaine Keary