

**Planning Consultation (DPD)**

---

<b>From:</b>	[REDACTED]	MM23
<b>Sent:</b>	17 February 2020 16:14	MM24
<b>To:</b>	Planning Consultation (DPD)	MM33
<b>Subject:</b>	Local Plan Review, Proposed Main Modifications	MM01
<b>Follow Up Flag:</b>	Follow up	
<b>Flag Status:</b>	Flagged	
<b>Categories:</b>	Rep	

Dear Sir/Madam, I regret that I could not see how to select the criteria in the tick boxes of your online questionnaire so have reverted to email.

MM09, S11

The removal of reference to J28 of the M5 is of serious concern as it is key to any development.

MM17, Para 3.70, page 89.

This is ill thought out and incorrect The Cullompton Relief Road will not mitigate Peak Traffic improvement at J28, but it will certainly improve the High Street congestion and air quality.

MM22/23 , CU6

Phasing seems to have changed from 'No occupancy prior to completion of the Relief Road' to 'Not more than 600 should be occupied prior to the completion'. This would have a devastating effect on the town and its environment. The Inspectors letter stated deliver 600, the proposed wording defines this in a different way, indeed it allows the construction of many more houses but not their occupation. The actual congestion caused by construction itself seems to be ignored throughout any forecast.

MM24/CU7

The inspector wrote that development East of Cullompton of up to 500 houses can follow the completion of the Relief road. Quote '**Beyond that first 500 units, the allocation to the east of Cullompton will require a strategic intervention to facilitate further development, which may take the form of a new J28a on the M5.** As the relief road has no traffic impact on East of Cullompton this decision should be reconsidered and, at the very least be allowed to be built but not occupied until a strategic intervention has been completed. Equally no development whatsoever should take place before that Intervention. This also covers MM27/7 and MM31/2

MM33/CU20

The flood risk is a major concern and so far no major study has been completed, nor am I aware of one that will include areas affected such as Kentisbeare, and all the way to J27 that such a major development will impact upon. The Culm is served by many rivers such as the Ken and these areas seem to be ignored.

Given the massive Infrastructure requirements both the Relief road for Cullompton and Strategic Intervention at J28 ( or alt access to the M5), flood risk assessments, planning etc needs I believe that the Local Plan cannot achieve its amended housing table (MM01 Overall Provision..) in the short or long term. It is therefore not positively prepared, justified, effective of consistent with National Policy. Unless the relevant infrastructure can be delivered in a very short time period and in advance of housing the plan is unsound and should be rejected.

Yours sincerely

John Dominy  
Lower Pound  
Kentisbeare

