

To:  
Local Plan Review  
Forward Planning  
MDDC  
Phoenix House  
Tiverton  
EX16 6PP

From: MM-Other  
Mr Robert Bond  
13 Pullet  
Sampford Peverell  
Tiverton  
Devon  
EX16 7TA  
27<sup>th</sup> January 2020

## Response to revised MDDC Local Plan with particular reference to policy SP2

I welcome the move by MDDC to put forward a Local plan but to me, and to many others, there remains one particular “fly in the ointment”. I refer of course to the proposed inclusion for development of the land at Turnpike/Higher Town Sampford Peverell known as SP2.

As a resident of Sampford Peverell who has lived in the village and has walked pedestrian routes for more than forty years, I have always been against development at this site for a number of reasons that I have made clear on numerous previous occasions. Since this area of land was initially selected, some things remain the same but also some things have changed and there is now new evidence that selection of this area of land was flawed at the outset. So, what has changed?

- Since the initial publication of the Local plan there have been a number of speculative planning applications lodged for the site
- Following comprehensive site visits by members of the MDDC planning committee, these applications have been rejected
- The application, 17/01359/MOUT having been overwhelmingly rejected, is currently the subject of an appeal by the applicant which will be heard at an Inquiry
- MDDC have offered strong evidence as to why the development should not go ahead, much of which relates to the pedestrian access to the centre of the village from the site
- Devon Highways concede that the best that can be done to improve crossing Turnpike near the canal bridge is to provide a crossing point which, in their words, is ‘substandard’.
- The eastern end of the village is now connected to Tiverton Parkway station by a safe, illuminated footway that encourages people to walk to their trains
- MDDC are now well within their target for meeting the 5-year housing supply and deleting SP2 from the Local Plan would not compromise this.

I would urge the inspector to consider all the evidence in connection with the appeal as it puts MDDC in a curious position, on the one hand fiercely opposing development at the site while on the other hand proposing that the site should be included in the Local Plan for development. However, MDDC has agreed that if the appeal is rejected and that if the evidence does not favour the principle of development, it will review further the inclusion of SP2 in the Local Plan.

Personally, I would favour removal of SP2 from the Local Plan, at this stage, but if it is to be left in, pending the outcome of the appeal, I would suggest that the Settlement Limit, shown on the map, should be moved to the edge of the Residential Area to protect the listed buildings in the Conservation Area adjacent to the site and to ensure the retention of the Green Infrastructure Area for posterity.

I am not against development in this village per se, but SP2 is the wrong location for housing. If a location on the eastern side of the village had been chosen initially it would have invited far less opposition. At a time when climate change, carbon footprints and sustainability are much higher profile items, development should be in places to encourage pedestrians not to offer them dangerous routes.