

[REDACTED]

From: Local Plan Review
Subject: FW: Letter of response from Kentisbeare Parish Council
Attachments: 2017 Kentisbeare Parish Council Re Local Plan Consultation 13-02-2017.pdf

From: Kentisbeare Parish Council [REDACTED]
Sent: 13 February 2017 20:31
To: Local Plan Review
Cc: Poie-Yee Li
Subject: Letter of response from Kentisbeare Parish Council

Dear Sirs

Please find attached a response to the Local Plan Review Proposed Submission consultation (incorporating proposed modifications).

The letter has been copied to the Principal Forward Planning Officer.

Could you kindly acknowledge receipt asap.

With many thanks,

[REDACTED]

Melanie Shore-Quinain
Clerk for Kentisbeare Parish Council
Tel: [REDACTED]

76/S2
76/CW7-CU12
76/CU1-CU6
76/CU11
76/CU20
76/SFRA
76/J27
76/GV

KENTISBEARE PARISH COUNCIL
Clerk: Mrs Melanie Shore-Quinain
12 Manor Close Kentisbeare Cullompton Devon EX15 2BG
Tel: [REDACTED] Email: [REDACTED]

Local Plan Review Consultation
Forward Planning
Mid Devon District Council
Phoenix House
Phoenix Lane
Tiverton
EX16 6PP

13 February 2017

Via email to: [REDACTED]
cc - Principal Forward Planning Officer

Dear Sirs

RE: LOCAL PLAN REVIEW PROPOSED SUBMISSION (INCORPORATING PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS)

Policy S2 Amount and Distribution of Development - Local Plan Review Extension, with particular reference to Proposed Development East of Cullompton

Kentisbeare Parish Council would like to request that the Planning Inspector ensures that the infrastructure (for the East of Cullompton development) is put in place **before** the building of any property starts. Our Parish Council (and many of our parishioners) have major concerns that the infrastructure cannot cope with MDDC's plans to build some 1,750 new houses to the East of Cullompton.

If the Planning Inspector cannot agree/arrange same, then Kentisbeare Parish Council wishes to strongly object to the proposed plans.

Infrastructure problems

There is already strong evidence clearly demonstrating that the current road network provisions are not suitable for the "current" stock of housing/population. We believe that development should be suspended until MDDC and Devon County Council clearly confirm the "terms" for major highway infrastructure improvements - and also that the terms to start road improvements have been formally put in place.

Cullompton Town Council has been negligent in placing the desire to build new houses before the interests of the many thousands of people who live in the surrounding communities.

The western Distributor Road through the proposed North West Development, linking Willand Road with Swallow Way is not fit for purpose through the Kingfisher Reach section, and we cannot support any future development at Cullompton because MDDC's previously "agreed proposals" have not been forthcoming.

The Local Plan proposal document refers to the North West Cullompton Phasing (Tiverton Road) stating that 500 new houses can be inhabited before a through route is put in place and public open spaces are started. The figure was originally 300 houses, and we are disappointed that MDDC has decided to increase to 500 houses without proper preparation for infrastructure or highways.

Policy CU8 East Cullompton Transport Provision

There is no mention of the town centre relief road being delivered before any development takes place to the East of Cullompton. We have been promised a new relief road over many years so in our opinion the town centre relief road through the CCA fields is vital immediately (subject to flooding arguments being overcome).

The suggested route through the CCA fields is subject to a report from the Environment Agency approving or suggesting an alternative; we had been told that there had been a report/consultation some two/three years ago. Now it seems unclear if and when this will happen or whether they are merely reluctant to produce their findings. We cannot support any future development at Cullompton because MDDC's previously "agreed proposals" have not been forthcoming. This inability to confirm a new relief road puts an incredibly negative light on the ability of MDDC to plan for such a large scheme.

Current Traffic Problems

We have been told on many occasions (dating back to the early 1970s) that the infrastructure "will come as a result of development" – time and time again, this has **not** happened. We are fobbed off by platitudes that "the next development will bring improvement" – we cannot continue on this path as it is unsustainable and it is likely to devastate the lives of many thousands of local residents.

There are serious concerns with reference to the volume of traffic that any development will create. Currently roads leading up to the existing motorway junction and onwards into the town centre from the east of Cullompton suffer from extreme congestion at many times of the day. Recently, we have experienced traffic queuing on the M5 motorway (queuing along the slow lane) waiting to exit at junction 28.

We would urge you to visit the Motorway Junction 28 around 8.00am or around 5pm on a working day and see for yourself. Every morning there is turmoil from Culm Lea to the junction at King's Mill road – this cannot be sustained without some serious, upfront infrastructure improvement.

There is a major problem with vehicles exiting King's Mill onto the A373 because there are always cars backed-up preventing them from joining the main A373 road. This is having an immensely negative effect on local businesses which are losing revenue as a result of their vehicles taking far too long to exit and to join the main road; not to mention the immense strain on everyone's patience which has the potential to cause accidents. One of Cullompton's largest employers (Gregory's Distribution) was recently quoted in the newspaper regarding the "amount of money" they lose due to their lorries taking ages to join the traffic from King's Mill to the A373. Many commercial lorry/drivers are merely leaving in the other direction which means they drive through rural villages to get onto the main road network.

We have been told that there are "considerations" for a new junction on the M5 about a mile south of Junction 28 – again we demand that these plans are fully presented with an official "start date" for building **before** any more house building starts.

What have we done?

On 25th January 2017, we held a Parish meeting in Kentisbeare which was attended by around 160 residents. It was unambiguous that the majority who attended felt that the proposed East of Cullompton development is oversized, and that Cullompton clearly does not have sufficient infrastructure to cope with the current development let alone 1,750 new houses.

As a Parish Council, we are sympathetic to some expansion and some future development but we consider that the following matters should be addressed in the first instance before any new building starts:-

- Improvements to the existing M5 Junction 28
- A larger and more efficient motorway junction is required - perhaps a new junction (a J28b)
- A new relief road to bypass Cullompton Town centre
- Pedestrian footbridge over the M5 and over the railway line
- Newly established cycle paths

Secondly, we ask that the following infrastructure is confirmed BEFORE any proposed house building commences:

- Details of proposed schools
- Details of retail shop and facilities
- A recycling centre in Cullompton
- Sports facilities that are not on a flood plain
- Sports pitches for rugby, cricket and football on soil types suitable for these activities
- Details of health care provision, which will be necessary
- Existing health care facilities are already working at full capacity
- Safe pedestrian and cycle access across the M5
- All emergency services moved closer to the motorway junction before any proposed house building starts

Cullompton Policy S11 – Regarding Flooding – which cannot be ignored

We consider that the references to flooding issues are not robust enough and that the methodology is flawed. Kentisbeare Parish Council has major concerns with regard to possible flooding and how the proposed development East of Cullompton impacts the catchment. We understand that a new Environment Agency Report (expected in 2016) is intended for submission with the MDDC Local Plan, but this has not yet been received or made public. Parish Councils and the public will not have had time to review same before the deadline for submission – again, this is completely unacceptable that they have not given more time to promote the findings.

Whilst we have not seen the new report, the current Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) uses generalised data from 2008 for all modelling purposes and there is little regard to the Devon County Council report on the flooding in November 2012.

Apparently, the SFRA has no mention of a "Catchment Based Assessment" despite DEFRA, the Environment Agency and South West Water all adopting CaBA.

There is no detail on how the proposed development East of Cullompton (and its overall scale) will impact on the catchment with regard to the main and non-main rivers and streams; therefore, there is not sufficient information on how the proposed development could either increase or decrease the likely future need for flood relief schemes in Kentisbeare or surrounding villages.

Furthermore, Kentisbeare Parish Council feel that there is a complete disregard for the impact of any further development (housing or infrastructure) in the Functional Floodplain around Junction 28 and no consideration as to how the proposed development impacts existing critical infrastructure which sits in the Functional floodplain – especially the Sewage Pumping Station at Stoneyford and the Sewage Treatment Works at Cullompton. In addition, the proposed new railway station and the relief road through the CCA fields are both 100% in the functional floodplain and there is no mention of compensatory floodplain being "created" (to provide land which is allowed to flood during major events).

We understand that this location has been proposed by Mid Devon District Council; however, as we do not fully support this proposal, we wish to make a representation to the Planning Inspector to suspend the application for Mid Devon District Council's (MDDC) proposed east Cullompton development.

Junction 27 Development - Flooding

There is no mention of how any proposed development brought forward as a result of the land allocation changes proposed around Junction 27 will be mitigated with respect to flooding (which again serves to point towards the complete lack of a CaBA approach to the flooding issue).

Culm Garden Village Proposal

Kentisbeare Parish Council has neither been approached nor consulted on the proposed Garden Village development from MDDC. Kentisbeare Parish Council wishes it to be noted that it has major concerns following the recent approval of Garden Village Status on the land to the East of Cullompton. The area identified in the Local Plan to 2033, is proposed as the "first phase" with the potential for a second phase to be included in the next Local Plan to 2040 – the potential area identified in the Garden Village bid encroaching into Kentisbeare Parish, and almost up to the village boundary without prior consultation with Kentisbeare Parish Council. Again, we have received no consultation on this issue which will have a major impact on our Parishioners.

Conclusion

Kentisbeare Parish Council would like to request that the Planning Inspector ensures that the infrastructure (to the East of Cullompton) is put in place **before** the building of any property starts.

If the Planning Inspector cannot arrange same, then Kentisbeare Parish Council wishes to object to the proposed plans.

Yours faithfully

Mrs Melanie Shore-Quinain (Clerk) and Mr Jonathan Wadsworth (Chairman)
Kentisbeare Parish Council

Cc (via email to: [REDACTED]) Poie-Yee Li, Principal Forward Planning Officer