



**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Main Mods Live Survey (Web Link)  
**Started:** Wednesday, January 22, 2020 12:24:53 PM  
**Last Modified:** Wednesday, January 22, 2020 12:33:09 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:08:15  
**IP Address:** [REDACTED]

Page 3: Part A

**Q1 Personal Details**

Title	Mr.
First Name	(Ronald) Ashley
Last Name	Wilce
Address Line 1	THE RETREAT, GRAVEL WALK
Address Line 2	GRAVEL WALK
Address Line 4	THE RETREAT
Post Code	EX15 1DA
Telephone	[REDACTED]
E-mail Address	[REDACTED]

**Q2 Agent Details (if applicable)**

Respondent skipped this question

Page 4: Part B

**Q3 Name or Organisation**

(Ronald) Ashley Wilce

**Q4** To which Main Modification consultation document does this representation relate? Please tick one box only (please complete a separate survey for each document you are commenting on)

**Schedule of Proposed Main Modifications**

**Q5** Please indicate the schedule reference (e.g. MM01) in the above document and the Policy number (e.g. DM1) to which your representation relates (please complete a separate survey for each schedule reference you are commenting on):

Reference Code	MM35 MM36
Policy	CU21

**Q6** The Local Plan Review 2013 – 2033 is required to be assessed against the tests set out in paragraph 182 of the 2012 version of the National Planning Policy Framework to establish whether it is 'sound' and complies with legal requirements. Please refer to the guidance notes above for further information on the tests of 'soundness'. Do you consider the Local Plan Review to be:

	Response
Legally compliant	<b>No</b>
Positively Prepared	
Justified	
Effective	
Consistent with national policy	<b>No</b>

Page 5: Part B (continued)

## Q7 Please provide your comments below

Proposed Main Modification to CU21

Site CU21, Colebrook, Cullompton is no longer considered to be a contingency site and can be brought forward. It is planned for 100 dwellings, but an application is in the system for 105. Currently, this site cannot be brought forward until the Town Centre Relief Road is provided, offering an alternative route. [MM35] & [MM36]

The proposed change (to remove the condition referred to) will leave us with a significant increase in traffic going through the Cullompton Town Centre, already an Air Quality Management Area.

Poor air quality reduces life expectancy in the UK by an average of seven to eight months, with equivalent health costs estimated to be up to £20 billion a year. Improvements between 1990 and 2001 have helped avoid an estimated 4,200 premature deaths a year, and 3,500 hospital admissions a year.

Mid Devon District Council has identified air quality as a local public health priority and has committed itself to reducing the exposure of people in Mid Devon to poor air quality in order to improve health.

The Local Plan Review says that it 'continues to support improvements to local air quality levels and prevents significant harm to air quality with consideration for Air Quality Management Areas' – but the proposal to remove the bar on developments in Cullompton until such time as the Town Centre Relief Road is built will do nothing to prevent further significant harm to air quality in Cullompton, in the short to medium term; and even long-term is expected to reduce traffic levels by less than 30-40%. The Local Plan adopted in July 2006 is (currently) the principal planning policy document for Mid Devon. Brief summaries of the relevant policies are:

- To permit development provided that the operation of the site, including any additional road traffic arising will not be detrimental to health or the wider environment through pollution
- To permit development where the health of the occupants or users of the proposed development will not be harmed by pollution arising from another existing or committed use;

Further demonstrating the air quality problems in Cullompton, MDDC has submitted an application form to Historic England under the High Streets Heritage Action Zones and we are advised that we have been awarded funding. In that application in answer to Question 3.1 a comprehensive response is given:

"One of the key issues is the impact of heavy traffic on the main thoroughfare. The B3181 runs through the town centre creating excessive through traffic, particularly in the mornings and evenings – noise and exhaust fumes detract from the general setting of the town; associated air quality problems. It is also perceived as unsafe for pedestrians as people find the narrow pavements, constant exhaust fumes and physical presence of heavy vehicle intimidating."

And so, we have air quality problems, sections of narrow pavement, and we are using the problems in the main street to apply for money and yet we are now being advised to make a Main Modification to an area of the plan which will further aggravate the problem. Is this sensible or doing anything for our credibility?

- Guidance is issued by the Secretary of State under section 88(1) of the Environment Act 1995, and local authorities must have regard to it when carrying out their local air quality management duties. It goes on to say:

Local Planning Authorities should not be afraid to take the lead where there is a legitimate case to be made for measures to protect air quality and comply with objectives derived from EU directives and importantly, the legal imperative to protect air quality should not be displaced with political imperatives

- The National Planning Policy Framework (2012) notes that planning policies should sustain compliance with and contribute towards EU limit values or national objectives for pollutants taking into account the presence of Air Quality Management Areas
- The Planning Policy says that the LPA can require mitigation measures to remove 'over-riding' impacts. If the impact is still 'over-riding' – as permitting the development before the TCCR is built would be - there should be a strong presumption for a recommendation for refusal on air quality grounds. In my view, this should be interpreted as not allowing the development until such time as the TCRR is built.

It is important to note that the recommendation made to remove the relief road condition has been made by officers without recourse to

## Consultation on Draft Main Modifications to the Local Plan Review 2013 - 2033

It is important to note that the recommendation made to remove the relief road condition has been made by officers, without recourse to Ward Members. It has not been made by the Planning Inspector whose only recommendation was that 'contingency sites should be brought forward for development. He did not refer to specifically to CU21 - but he did refer specifically to other sites. As can be seen by the inclusion of and/or the Inspector does not give an ultimatum, but options:

1. Bringing forward other allocated sites that are currently restricted in terms of timing with no good reason, the Policy SP2 site for example; and/or
2. Bringing forward the contingency sites; and/or
3. Extending existing allocations to accommodate more dwellings (the Policy WI1 site for example) or increasing densities to allow for more dwellings on allocated sites that are less constrained; and/or
4. Allocating a new, large site not constrained by the link road (or motorway junctions) that can come on stream quickly and bolster supply in the early years of the Plan while infrastructure is provided elsewhere.

The Council should be taking the option given by the Inspector which causes the least harm to its residents and on that basis, the plan needs stay as originally written, to show that this site should not come forward until the Town Centre Relief Road is open, to save further problems in the town centre. The alternative is akin to deliberately infect people with a fatal disease, on the basis that it will ultimately be better for everyone, owing to over-population of the planet.

---