

## **Mid Devon Local Plan Review 2013 – 2033**

### **Policy SP 2**

Comments relating to the questions posed by the Inspector Nos. 12 to 16

Mrs Rosalind Thomas BSc (Hons), MSc

22, Turnpike, Sampford Peverell, Tiverton EX16 7BN

#### **12. If a site in Sampford Peverell is necessary to cater for additional housing need resulting from the Policy J27 allocation, is this site the best performing?**

I am open to change and understand the demand on providing more housing, however, feel that the allocation to this site in Higher Town has been rushed and is not at all suitable, or the best performing site for such a development in the village or surrounding area. In fact the consequences of a development on this site, is likely to be catastrophic for existing village residents of Sampford Peverell. (See comments below)

#### **13. Does the proposed allocation have sufficient regard to the historic environment?**

We have friends who own farms and are bound by strict rules to maintain existing hedgelines and boundaries. In a bid to maintain the historic rural environment and views that Devon boasts. They are encouraged to maximise on productive farmland, and yet here we have a hugely productive piece of farmland (see photos) in a difficult location, to prepare to build and develop being given the go ahead?



***Photo taken from our upstairs window. Shows how much higher the site would be to the existing properties on Turnpike, and the overbearing nature of the new development. Also how productive the existing farmland is. Along with the kind of traffic that regularly use the main road, making it unsafe for pedestrians.***



*This photo indicates how productive this relatively small piece of farmland is, with the large number of bales produced. Also an example of the size of lorries that use the main road deeming it unsafe, and busy enough as it stands, without an extra 60+ cars and the associated postal or deliveries to those houses through the village.*

There appears to be several flatter, less obvious areas of land immediately given over to the use of solar panels locally. There are even people lower down in the village who own flatter, less productive and more accessible land that have not been allowed to develop on their land? It isn't as if Higher Town is the last remaining option for development locally? So why have these other sites not been considered?

It doesn't make sense.

#### **14. Does the proposed allocation have sufficient regard to the character and appearance of the area?**

We bought our property in 2015, and had to completely renovate it. Removing and replacing the roof and modernising it throughout. We wanted to remove a flat roof and replace it with a pitched two storey development which was initially turned down by the Planning department for its overbearing nature and impact on the current appearance and size of the property in its location close to the canal.

In the end this went to a full Council meeting and thankfully the Planning Departments decision was overturned by the Councillors, to allow us to sensitively finish what we started. This process was a huge stress and expense for us as a young family, looking to invest in a family home. Yet, here we have the same Planning Department agreeing to 60+ homes on the highest site in the village. This site will be overbearing to the existing properties on Turnpike (see photos), and will be an eyesore for those keen to enjoy the rural views from the canal.

It feels unfair, and inconsistent for the Council to have been so against our relatively small extension, and seemingly not concerned about this huge development?

It would certainly not be in keeping with the appearance of the area. The development would be seen for miles around, and would be an eyesore. Along with the associated light pollution.

#### **15. Is the proposed allocation properly accessible, for pedestrians in particular?**

With regard to access this site is at the wrong end of the village re: work traffic to and from the M5 early in the morning and at the end of the day. In addition to the Sampford Peverell primary school traffic, there is likely to be an accident waiting to happen. I have walked the main road with my 3 young children with no pavement on many

occasions and in all weathers, and have had several close encounters, with cars/vans/lorries speeding through the village. That is without an extra 60 + cars using the road. It is not safe for pedestrians as it stands and this has already been recognised by the Planning department several years ago, and yet nothing has changed.

In fact the road is considered so dangerous that my son who catches the bus to Uffculme High school gets picked up at Battens Crossroads right at the top of the village, because the bus company do not want to be responsible for him walking down the road (without a pavement) and crossing over the bridge (on a blind corner) to be picked up outside the Globe, along with other students in the village. This is proof enough of how dangerous the road is considered to be.

If new houses and a play area were to be built on the Higher town site. It is likely that my children would have friends living in that estate, and they would like to visit them, or a play area. If that is the case. How could you reassure me that my children could safely access their friends homes and/or the play area safely from their home at number 22 Turnpike? What safe route would they take? Or what would you provide/build to reassure me that this journey could be done safely?

#### **16. Is the tie to Policy J27 strong enough?**

If the J27 plans are to provide work for local people then I do struggle to understand why so many extra homes are needed to be built for employees. Surely this wouldn't be helping the already existing unemployment rate locally, by encouraging new employees to move into the area?

However, if this is necessary then I think the impact of such a development in the local area needs to take into consideration the effect of these extra homes and people in the surrounding towns and villages, and the impact that this will have.

#### **Conclusion**

I just feel that this site is not the best site, or the most logical for the health and safety of the Sampford Peverell village as it stands.

I am also disappointed that the Council seemed to 'sneak' this site into the allocation without really considering its impact on those who it concerned the most. I have had to remain actively interested in each stage of this process. At no point have any members of the Council visited those on Turnpike or written letters to us as residents, which I find disappointing.

Mrs R Thomas

14/08/2017