

KENTISBEARE PARISH COUNCIL

Chairman: Mrs Q Broom
Quenton House
Cullompton
Devon. EX15 2AA.
Email: queenie@kentisbeare.net

Clerk: Mrs M Shore-Quinain
12 Manor Close
Kentisbeare
Devon. EX15 2BG.
Email: info@kentisbeare.net

To: Tina Maryan
Area Planning Officer - Major Projects Cullompton Growth
Economy and Delivery Team
Mid Devon District Council
Phoenix House
Phoenix Lane
Tiverton
Devon. EX16 6PP.

6th March 2019

Via email

Dear Tina

CULM GARDEN VILLAGE CONSULTATION

Thank you for accepting the response from Kentisbeare Parish Council after the deadline date due to our March meeting falling just after this date. Please find below our comments in respect of the two documents:

Vision and Concept Document

Question 2: The map on page 9 of the Vision and Concept document shows issues and features that could influence the way that the Garden Village is masterplanned. Are there any other issues and features that are not shown?

Response: The Garden Village should take into account the sensitivities of, and rural nature of the villages in its vicinity. Kentisbeare Parish boundary should be clearly marked in all documents throughout the masterplanning process.

The existing junction 28 is not capable of dealing with the traffic arising from the Garden Village plans. The A373 has become significantly busier in the last couple of years. Also to date, no proper catchment based flood study has been undertaken, although it has been promised. It is not enough to describe issues like this as opportunities. Real infrastructure delivery on all three issues needs to take place before significant quantities of housing are built.

Question 3: The vision for the Garden Village will express the type of place that we want the Garden Village to be. Do you agree with the draft vision shown on page 12 of the Vision and Concept document? Is there anything that you would like to see prioritised or omitted?

Response: No - we feel that there has been no attempt to justify the size of the Garden Village and that the proposal is too big. A green buffer with Kentisbeare should be inside the Cullompton Parish boundary. In addition, we are concerned that affordable housing percentages must not be traded away, and we feel there is insufficient detail or acknowledgement that renewable energy technologies should be a crucial aspect of ALL housebuilding in the new scheme. As with the Local Plan, there is nowhere near enough detail on the flood risks this scheme will create, and there needs to be particular care and attention to the sizing, placement operation and maintenance of SuDs schemes to mitigate surface water run-off.

Question 4: The 9 key principles shown in the Vision and Concept document will guide the development of the Garden Village. Do you agree that these are the right principles? Please include any further comments that you have on the 9 key principles.

Response: We would like to see a good range of skill-based businesses and not just basic service jobs. We would also like to see good links to the surrounding areas – e.g. connecting paths and an upgrade to the A373. We would like the development to reflect local architecture.

Question 8: The Concept Plan shows a green landscape area to act as a buffer between the potential extent of the Garden Village and the village of Kentisbeare. Where do you consider the boundary of this landscape buffer area and the Garden Village should be located?

Response: The green buffer area between the Garden Village and Kentisbeare should be inside the existing Cullompton Parish boundary.

Question 9: What type of facilities would be acceptable within the green buffer, for example, sports pitches?

Response: If it is to be an effective buffer zone, it should disguise the scale of the building from the rural areas beyond. That might suggest the planting of new woods or similar, such as coppiced woodlands that would generate an income. We do not believe that sports pitches fulfil that function. Within the buffer zone, property owners should retain their existing rights in terms of development. We would encourage footpaths and cycle/bridleways through the buffer zone. Kentisbeare Parish Council would be looking to secure this area as designated Local Green Space in any Neighbourhood Plan.

Question 10: Do you have any other comments on this document?

Response: The Garden Village seems excessively large, as does the allocation of housing to east Cullompton in the Local Plan. This consultation should be asking for local residents' views as to whether they want a Garden Village at all, not presupposing their approval.

East Cullompton – Masterplan SPD. Stage 1: Issues, Opportunities and Concepts document

Question 1: The map on page 24 of the Masterplan SPD document shows issues and features that could influence the way that the east of Cullompton development is masterplanned. Are there any other issues and features that are not shown?

Response: Plans for east Cullompton continue to ignore all issues to do with the A373 to Honiton. This road needs addressing too. There is also no mention of the flooding issues in the area. There should be no large scale development until this has been studied thoroughly, and recommendations from a full catchment based study implemented. There is no mention of sustainable drainage systems.

Question 2: Two power lines cross the east of Cullompton development area as shown on the map on page 21 of the Masterplan SPD. These could form wide, green corridors as part of a green network running through the development. Do you agree or disagree with this approach?

Response: Agree. Further comments – the undergrounding of power lines should take place where it is economically feasible to do so.

Question 3: The map on page 28 of the Masterplan SPD shows a potential transport, walking and cycling network to serve the east of Cullompton development, with potential to expand this into the wider Garden Village and improve connections into Cullompton. Do you agree or disagree with this strategy?

Response: Further comments - the transport network depicts the hoped for reopening of Cullompton railway station, which appears unlikely from comments elsewhere. Infrastructure needs prior delivery. MDDC continue to ignore the resultant transport problems which will be created to the east, notably the inadequate condition of the A373 to Honiton.

Question 4: The network of green corridors and open spaces, rivers and water features shown on the map on page 27 could provide opportunities to provide sports, health and leisure uses. What types of uses do you consider important to promote healthy living and why? Examples could be formal sports, outdoor play areas, cycle ways, fitness trails, allotments, water activities.

Response: The map on page 27 shows a “potential formal green infrastructure node” to the east of Dead Lane, representing the relocation of Cullompton Rugby Club. This is not connected to the development of the Garden Village and should be part of a separate process.

Question 5: The emerging Local Plan policy requires a shopping and community centre and an area of 2ha is required to provide this. This could include a range of shops and services e.g. local shops, cafes, pub, community building, leisure/sports centre and health care provision. The map on page 36 of the Masterplan SPD shows one potential location for a local centre. Looking at the map on page 36, where do you think that the local centre should be located and what key uses do you think that it should include?

Response: Community buildings should be multimodal, particularly churches with reference to acts of worship.

Question 6: What types and tenures of housing do you think are needed within the allocation? Are there any other types and tenures of homes that you would like to see?

Response: Agree to all of those listed at question 6. We would like to see a good proportion of homes available for local people, together with high quality housing association homes. Priority should be given to local people on the waiting list with reference to social housing.

Question 7: What type of employment opportunities do you think should be included within the allocation?

Response: Offices should be of a high quality design. There are already adequate industrial units within this area, and there should be no further requirement, as it is really important to try and attract high skilled and high salaried jobs, rather than see these jobs being created in Exeter and Taunton. Consideration should be given to flexible co-working spaces (of high quality) to attract high growth and scale-up businesses in the digital economy, new disruptive technologies like artificial intelligence and 3D printing and materials engineering

Question 9: Is the focus on SMART and sustainable development the right approach to development? Examples of this could be high energy efficient homes and business units, low carbon and energy plus construction, climate change adaption through the natural environment, driverless cars and digital connectivity.

Response: Yes.

Question 11: Overall, do you think that the identified opportunities for the first phase of the Garden Village shown in the Masterplan SPD document are the right ones to help to start and deliver the Garden Village?

Response: No. It is far too big and relies on a considerably overinflated Objective Housing Need, and an ignoring of the regular emergence of windfall sites around Mid Devon.

Question 12: (i) Do you agree with the potential scope and content of the Masterplan SPD shown on page 37. (ii) Do you have any further comments on the Masterplan SPD document?

Response: (i) No. (ii) The proposal is too big. We are greatly concerned that the GESP allocations may override/overtake the Garden Village Plan.

Yours sincerely,

Mrs M Shore-Quinain,
Clerk for Kentisbeare Parish Council