

6790/S13
6790/DEVSTRA

6790/S27/mod
6790/SP2/mod

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

8th February 2017

Dear Sirs

HK Rep 3

We make a representation on behalf of our client, Mr G Cottrell and family, Mr T Burns, Mrs Carol Pearce and Mrs Wendy Upham and families, 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 several separate representations that will be submitted by Harcourt Kerr on related and different policies on behalf of various clients. We attempt not to re-iterate points where made elsewhere.

Rural Areas –Policy S13

We welcome a breakthrough in the very strict policy that restricts development in anything but a very limited way in villages across this most rural of districts. By allocation of 786 units to villages there is a recognition that the village communities have their own requirements for growth albeit limited. So anything that takes away from this Policy would be inconsistent with an aim of the plan. Indeed windfalls do occur but not on the scale required by the communities.

So it is with some confusion that we note there are NO allowances or assumptions for rural provision towards the end of the plan. According to Chart 1 the overall housing trajectory in rural area all but halts by 2021 and there is an increasing reliance on well over half the delivery coming from a single location of Cullompton. And the remainder from Tiverton. This is counter to all the evidence of completions in recent years in the district and is unrealistic to think that for a ten year period from 2023 to 2033 there will be no pressure from other centres.

Indeed the NPPF focuses on locations that are accessible to economic growth potential, reduces travel needs and maximises the scope for the fullest use of public transport walking and cycling. Some villages (as well as the towns) achieve this in an exemplary fashion and none better than Sampford Peverell or other villages close to J27 (where there is a policy for employment/economic growth, a railway station, a bus service, and other services).

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

Policy J27

We have no objection in principle to the allocation of new commercial activity at Junction 27. It has long been recognised as the best, if not the only, location to provide a suitable and viable place for business and worthwhile contribution to the local economy. Previous Inspectors have said so and the arguments today perhaps are stronger than ever as efficiency of location on communications and sustainability creep higher up the agenda. Swallow Court, a successful business location at the Junction 27 is a good example of what can happen to promote employment opportunity.

In that the policy has deeper ramifications into the wider plan we understand and support the need for housing within close and suitable distance of the employment hub.

Policy SP2

We support this policy conditionally. Whilst the site in terms of position to the village and topography has the best qualities of any site in Sampford Peverell we would argue the more efficient use of this land would be to raise the numbers to closer to 120 dwellings.

This would not only allow for Green Infrastructure and drainage but take the density to more normal levels of 30 dph against the suggestion of 15 dph in the current policy.

Under paragraph 3.186 (in Table 22 on page 130) the site is clearly represented at 3.6 net ha which at 30dph is 108 dwellings.

Such extra number of about 50 dwellings would contribute to the rural areas and assist in balancing the bias from the three major settlements to the villages by less than 0.001%.

Larger sites at the towns are also known to deliver less than anticipated. Examples of this abound in the plan itself such as TUE Table 12 (on page 64) where the estimate from 1520 houses is reduced to 1250 following topographical and environmental constraints not anticipated by the original projections. In table 13 Farleigh Meadows (Tiverton) delivers 255 units against the original planning permission of 303 (under construction).

Cummings Nursery in Cullompton Policy CU16 (on page 109) has moved from 120 units to 100 (under construction). Other examples exist and it should be noted that these alterations are now made to reflect the reality on the ground (post consent/ surveys) and so any figures without a full consent or evidence are tentative based on a broad brush calculation.

The Policy as written is unduly prescriptive in relation to two items

The reliance on

- the "commencement of the J27 allocation" and
- the "completion of an improved access to the A361"

These are heavy handed and will almost certainly prevent the allocation coming forward for many years. Once again the authority attempt to place the delivery of a relatively small site dependant on major development or infrastructure. Whilst a nice aspiration to have sites contingent on other sites it works against the very direction of growth and the NPPF golden thread required of plan

making. Such policy wording as *No development until the completion of improved access works to the A361* is wide ranging, unspecific and ambiguous. It allows for indecision which halts activity.

These policies are also inconsistent with other policies on similar sized sites in villages who will use the A361 and junction 27.

We suggest therefore three things

1 we have done enough initial work on SP 2 to say no more than 110 units are deliverable without altering the basis of the policy- this addition of 50 to the number here is likely to be so insignificant compared with the discrepancy that drops out of the larger sites in the plan (as examples above).

The site has to be considered as a whole to make it viable and provide the green infrastructure for which we applaud. So to make it smaller to accommodate a particular number is possible but not desirable or good planning practice.

And

2 the following words struck out ~~to come forward following the commencement of development of the M5 Junction 27 allocation~~

3 remove item b) ~~No development until the completion of improved access works to the A361~~

All other policies remain the same (and this extra provision is not at the expense of green infrastructure)

Conclusion

This Policy SP2 runs parallel to the Vison (page 9) which expounds Strong village communities, green infrastructure for personal amenity space, use of public transport etc.

The policy as drafted is restrictive and inconsistent to the other similar housing policies in villages of Bampton Chawleigh , Cheriton Fitzpaine, Culmstock, Halberton the Tiverton Parkway Hotel Sampford Peverell (SP1 in the same village) , Uffculme and Willand all of which do not carry such a policy requirement. There is no logic in this site being burdened with extra time and cost constraints hence our request.

We would be grateful to be kept informed on matters as the Review goes forward.

