

1090/RURAL
1090/DEVSTRA/mod
1090/S6/mod

1090/S2/mod
1090/S4
1090/DM14
1090/DM15

From: Local Plan Review
Subject: FW: Local Plan review
Attachments: MDDC rep SP HK3 14.02.17.pdf; MDDC rep HK2 14.02.17.pdf; MDDC rep Blacmr and Wootn HK1b 14.02.17.pdf; MDDC rep Disney HK1a 14.02.17.pdf

From: Philip Kerr [REDACTED]
Sent: 13 February 2017 19:51
To: Local Plan Review
Subject: Local Plan review

Good afternoon

please can you kindly acknowledge safe receipt of the attached FOUR representations Thank you.

Philip Kerr FRICS
Harcourt Kerr
Chartered Surveyors



Kingston House, Blackbrook Park Avenue, TAUNTON TA1 2PX

Tel: [REDACTED]
Mobile: [REDACTED]
Fax: [REDACTED]
E-mail: [REDACTED]

VISIT <http://harcourt-kerr.com/why-develop/> AND SEE our philosophy

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

10th February 2017

Dear Sirs

Rep HK 2

We make a representation in our own right as we represent a number of clients who have property interests in Mid Devon District. We set out the following in response to the *Local Plan Review Proposed Submission Consultation* (January 2017).

This letter is one of several representations that will be submitted by Harcourt Kerr on related and different policies.

Rural Areas

We have argued that to say under Paragraph 3.189 that “only two sites are considered suitable for allocation for commercial development” (and that is within the rural area of 352 square miles) seems frankly lacking imagination and the reality. In a town focussed plan there still needs to be a rural basis for employment and the plan recognises this: however does so by allocating ONLY two sites of in locations that are only of any use to a small section of the employment generating community.

We have made representation elsewhere to suggest an alternative approach.

Commercial Quantum

There is ambiguity in the plan as to how much development is to be taking place in the various locations and below we set out where occurrences bring about confusion (though we accept does not =change the overall thrust of the plan)

Policy s6 page 42 – 147,000 sqm

Policy S6 page 43 – Table at 2.47 - 159,725 sqm

Table 9 page 28 – 159,370 sqm

Policy S2 page 32 – 147,000 plus (page 33) 42,550 sqm

There is a discrepancy whichever way it is observed – though the intention seems to be to deliver 147,000 sq m. and we accept such anomalies will not affect the overall plan direction.

HK Consultancy Ltd trading as

Harcourt Kerr, Kingston House, Blackbrook Business Park, TAUNTON TA1 2PX

www.harcourt-kerr.com

Registered in England no 7577971 Stafford House Taunton TA1 2PX • Regulated by the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors

Chartered Surveyors | Property Development Advice | Occupier Consultancy

Overall provision

Chart 1 and Chart 2 (pages 24 and 29)

We are not sure about the soundness or the use of these charts and it may be of little relevance within the overall context of this Local Plan review. However the trajectories do seem to be founded on very little empirical or historic data and does not properly portray where the actuality will lie even by the most basic assumptions. For example

- The 2013/14 colour banding does not seem to accord with the proportions set out in table 9 which states the actual numbers 'since 2013'
- The rural take up is ambitious compared with the recent history at Willand on the adjoining site which took about twice as long to work out (10 years instead of 5 years)
- J27 has to be extremely ambitious to work out 78 acres of land in five years – unprecedented in this area let alone more affluent and commercially viable centres across the UK.
- To assume housing will ONLY be delivered in Cullompton and Tiverton after 2015 seems unlikely
- To assume no economic development will take place in Tiverton or Rural areas after 2024, or rather all development will gravitate to one centre (Cullompton) also irrational or at least almost impossible to implement.

It appears the plan is being asked to fit the preference of the rather than work with a sober analysis of what is most likely to be the case. Albeit we accept that the plan tries to influence where development should take place. However, the trajectories are simply not realistic by any measure of normal estimating.

Table 9 Page 28

We do not recognise where the figure of 19,699 sqm of commitments in Cullompton is derived from our visits around the town. We have been unable to elicit an answer from the evidence base. Planning permissions may exist but remain unimplemented so this may be misleading if used as a figure to support future projections.

Contingency sites

We support the idea of contingency sites. In a plan that is supposed to drive economic activity we note the contingency idea only relates to Housing.

Whilst we appreciate there is an obligation to make sure there is a five year land housing supply and this may be a driver for the policy housing.

However this should not preclude the idea being used for employment sites with a plan so dependent on large allocations coming forward and almost invariably the employment land delivery lags behind. This is the case since about the year 2000 where it can be shown that of the main centres has seen low take up of new employment land (e.g. Crediton has delivered retail on employment land – Tiverton has produced none)

We think this remains a defect in the plan and has an effect on soundness.

We do however support the contingency sites in the housing allocations.

Policy DM 14 and DM16

The general approach is far too prescriptive on allowable uses and the flexibility to react to changes. Whilst the 'high street is under threat' as shopping habit change so should the policies be allowed to make easily understood moves by those who wish to be there. And diversity of use gives vibrancy and a much wider timespan in which there is activity in the street. As under 4.44 "the town centre is the heart of a market towns community" and under 4.45 "retail markets change quickly... planning policies are flexible"

But the policy doesn't allow this. By restricting the uses to certain A use-classes and not allowing anything from education to offices to residential the policy does not chime with the references. A dismissive line in 4.46 " "while other uses such as takeaways and professional services may be m located elsewhere in the town centre." exemplifies the policy whilst elsewhere the sentiment could be read differently.

As a 'Mary Portas' exemplar (Tiverton received funding), based on a much more relaxed attitude to get vibrancy and activity to the "heart of the town" places such as Tiverton, Crediton and Cullompton could be improved greatly – and they simply don't have the luxury of being able to be so well defined as "protected frontages" and 'retail only' zones.

The policies defined are much more akin to larger urban areas where the retailing might be protected in small amounts; but in Devon market towns this policy deters innovation, pulls back growth and deadens the "heart of the community"- the very reverse of the policy intention. We support higher quality of meaningful uses and less volume and not mono-use.

In a time when the trend is for big format space retailing (and the internet shopping) the town centres are most vulnerable and should be havens for any small or large business intermingled with community and emerging trends and restore the buildings to some of their former uses- such as houses - and by so doing deal with the Vision the plan attempts to set out.

We believe this is a serious flaw in the plan and important as there is so much emphasis on many other polices in a town focussed plan.

We would be pleased to be kept informed as matters proceed with the review.

