

PLANNING COMMITTEE AGENDA - 12th February 2020

Applications of a non-delegated nature

UPDATES

THE PLANS LIST	
1	19/02034/LBC - Listed Building consent for internal alterations to create an en-suite shower room - The Old Carriage House St Andrew Street North Tiverton.
2	<p>19/00928/MFUL - Erection of buildings incorporating employment (B1/B2/B8) with associated infrastructure - Land at NGR 305390 112177 (Hitchcocks Business Park) Uffculme Devon.</p> <p>MDDC - Growth, Economy and Delivery (GED) – 3 February 2020. The Growth, Economy and Delivery (GED) team strongly supports this planning application. The award winning business park has delivered a significant proportion of the District's economic growth (delivery of employment space, job creation and business investment) over the past 5 years, and is looking to build upon this success. The proposed units will enable local businesses to grow, and will help to meet the demand for business space which is currently outstripping the supply of commercial and industrial units across Mid Devon and the surrounding areas (most of our business sites and commercial land owners have waiting lists of interested businesses). The site's occupants provide employment for over 600 people, with jobs at a variety of salary levels, including higher level technical and specialist roles. It is unfortunate that the owner has chosen to withdraw the larger scheme they originally put forward and is instead going for a smaller project. The larger, masterplanned scheme would have delivered far greater benefits to the local area (greater pedestrianisation between Willand and Uffculme, park and community facilities etc), and there is a real risk of these benefits being lost through a potential return to a piecemeal approach to developing Hitchcocks. However, we recognise the reasons behind the decision, and will continue to support the business park and its further development.</p> <p>HALBERTON PARISH COUNCIL 15th January 2020 - No objections. The Council supports the scaled down application and the provision of much needed local employment.</p> <p>Response from Environment Agency 07.02.2020</p> <p>Thank you for re-consulting us on this application.</p> <p>Environment Agency position Following review of the Foul Drainage Statement (AWP, dated 23rd December 2019), we confirm that we have no objection to the proposed development. The reason for this position and advice is provided below.</p> <p>Reason – We have reviewed the further information provided within the Foul Drainage Statement and consider this to adequately demonstrate that the proposed foul drainage arrangement is acceptable. The proposal complies with our requirements and with the General Binding Rules.</p> <p>Additional condition to be added after Condition 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The floorspace hereby approved under drawing reference 180209 Unit F3 01 01 C shall not be amalgamated and/or let to provide an individual unit of more than 288 sq m.• The buildings hereby approved under drawing reference 180209 Unit F1 01 01 F shall not be amalgamated or let to provide an individual unit of more than 216

sqm.

- The buildings hereby approved under drawing reference 180209 Unit F 01 01 H shall not be amalgamated or let to provide an individual unit of more than 216 sq m. and there shall be no more than three units beyond 144 sq m in total.

Reason: To ensure that the size of the units remains appropriate for starter and grow on space

From an objector :

Re: Scientific report on behalf of the applicant on air quality and proposed additional HGV and car movements (60 lorries and 700 cars):

- **Cars, of the employees (approx. 700), in all probability will all turn up to and exit the site at roughly the same time;** and anyone familiar with the locality cannot possibly consider that the impact of such a significant increase in vehicular movement and accompanying pollution (air quality) could be anything other than significant; **especially as additional to the existing and currently expanding new developments of residential properties in close proximity on two sides of the site's perimeter and only metres away.**
- **The residential developments themselves are a source of additional vehicular movement and pollution** to the existing residential developments (**both the established developments and those still under construction**). No consideration at all has been given to the fact that **the full effects of the latter properties are yet to have been established as not yet built/completed!** Already, residential vehicles and 'white' goods vehicles are congested up and down Bridwell Lane; a lane which cannot accommodate the passing of two cars even, in places, let alone commercial vehicles with local car drivers having to repeatedly reverse a significant distance back along a narrow and bendy road with road users displaying varying degrees of 'courtesy' and 'care' (often both absent) i.e. not very safe.
- **Much of the commercial traffic (although not all) will probably arrive via the M5 and travel along the upper road to Uffculme B....', which is already becoming increasingly congested; especially at the Old Well / Waterloo Cross roundabout and the access road from it to the M5 roundabout resulting often in 20 minutes of vehicular queueing;** especially when loading is taking place at the 'Waterloo Cross' (the linking road suffering much pot-holed disrepair which will be exacerbated throughout the area if the expansion goes ahead).
- **The residents of Uffculme have limited road access to the M5, the main two running alongside Bridwell Manor and Uffculme School; both already suffering from the lack of two car passage at certain points; both with difficult access to join the top road (B) to access the M5 at Jctn 27; both already becoming increasingly hazardous due to the already increased weight of traffic, especially heavy goods vehicles; posing a hazard to people, children and domestic vehicles.**
- **Both these access roads are hazardous, having generally poor visibility, including at their respective junctions with the upper road B... (which also has poor lighting), currently having no assistance provided to aid safe access across oncoming traffic to join the traffic flow in direction of the M5.**
- **The alternative is to travel the 'long' route, Uffculme Road (the 'Uffculme straight'), to Willand roundabout and then retrace the journey back along the B... (upper road) where the site's access for 700 to 800 vehicles is to be situated, including at least 60**

heavy/commercial vehicles! This weight of traffic is compounded by the relative narrowness of the road for heavy lorry usage with large vehicles passing very close as they travel in the opposite direction, also creating sudden and significant backdraft as they hurtle pass small vehicles travelling in the opposite direction (and pedestrians).

- **Similarly, potential pedestrian use of the upper road (B...) has not been considered.** The pavement, in combination with a lack of lighting is already inadequate and dangerous for the safe passage of pedestrians; especially due to the closeness of the road to the path and the strong back draft created by passing heavy goods vehicles.
- There seems to be no consideration of the yet to be built Junction 27 major industrial and commercial development (or the current expansion of the Mid Devon Industrial Park with its industrial units or the large scale residential developments, not only in Uffculme but also Willand and Tiverton Parkway localities). Travelling along the 'Uffculme straight' in the direction of Willand to access Cullompton and/or the M5 at Jctn 28 is becoming increasingly congested; with traffic already trailing at peak times the whole length of Millenium Way at Cullompton for those travelling to Cullompton's Tesco etc or the M5 at Jctn 28; where queuing is regularly 30 minutes plus (on outward and incoming journeys).

Noise Pollution – This has been given little if any consideration; either whilst proposed building works take place or/and when the site is completed and the site is up and running:

- **700 cars and 60 lorries are going to generate significant noise and gas emissions/pollution.**
- **The noise and vibration effects from building works** in the early stages of Luccombe Park, were protracted and invasive. I am sure no residents in the locality would relish a prolonged repeat of this; with the **constant 'thumping' sound and accompanying vibration** felt all day every day, for weeks; even though we ourselves are not the nearest of properties to the building works; it drove us 'mad'; initially thinking a neighbour had a washing machine and tumble dryer running constantly in their garage (not attached to our house) but subsequently found this not to be the case as it was the building works.
- Is Mid Devon going to allow residents to suffer a repeat of the Luccombe Park building nightmare and inconvenience; including **protracted use of temporary traffic lights**, which impacted upon residents' movements ('imprisoning' Culm Valley Way residents for significant periods) and the additional misery which would be created going forward?

All the above makes a mockery of the applicant's expert conclusion that they do not see any negative traffic or pollution impacts prior to 2024! The area is already suffering impact from these!

Sewage - What exactly is the provision for this? This seems a vital consideration which has yet to be fully considered or addressed! **How can a 'large scale' development such as this be given any consideration at all without detail of provision for this and drainage in place?** We often suffer drainage issues and have noticed an increase in vehicular 'drainage' activity in the locality; as well as historical flooding across the

	<p>Uffculme straight in the region of the Luccombe Park development and beyond.</p> <p>Flood risk (none?)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I find this a strange conclusion as I have repeatedly, following heavy rainfall had to travel along Bridwell Lane up to the ‘top ‘road’ (B...); to avoid the flooding which takes place along the stretch of road passing between the Hitchcock’s site and Langlands Industrial Estate/ Luccombe Park (Uffculme Road); and have witnessed other more intrepid drivers stranded, broken down in the flood water as their vehicle has not been designed to negotiate deep water or ‘flooding’! • Surely the further reduction in natural soakaway land down to Uffculme Road and across it, by the increase in concrete coverage will exacerbate the likelihood and extent of flooding in this locality (and potentially of homes); especially as the land on the ‘Uffculme straight’ side of the site (and the site itself) slopes downwards to the ‘Uffculme straight’ and beyond? The fields becoming flooded now from Uffculme to Cullompton (and no doubt beyond) <p>Finally, the existing site is an eyesore and very visible from Bridwell Lane and Uffculme Road. The village of Uffculme remains a small one, which would be visually and practically dominated by such an extension of the Hitchcock’s site, as proposed. To allow this proposal to go ahead would render Uffculme a giant industrial estate which has a tiny residential component at its centre. Its residents would find themselves living in the middle of a giant industrial estate (combined areas)with detrimental associated issues. This cannot be right or humane on any level; noise, pollution, flooding, inconvenience, hazard, ‘green’, environmental and ecological issues and last but not least, the health and safety of local residents with their right to live in a decent and appropriate environment; one in which they can thrive and which is conducive to their general well-being.</p> <p>If the residents of Uffculme had been happy to live in the midst of an industrial estate, they would have moved into an area where such existed and one in which the house prices and council charges would have been significantly lower than residents of Uffculme have paid for the privilege of enjoying some semblance of the benefits just listed There must be more appropriate ‘brown’ sites where this plant could be situated; it certainly does not need to be situated in a location which results in residents finding themselves but a speck in the middle of an industrial estate/s!</p> <p>I hope these comments may contribute to any discussion and subsequent decision.</p>
3	<p>19/01608/HOUSE - Erection of single storey extension and separate garage/annex/workshop accommodation - Tanglewood Dukes Orchard Bradninch.</p>
4	<p>19/01156/FULL - Installation of a 24MW Reserve Power Plant with associated infrastructure - Land at NGR 302839 111143 Lloyd Maunder Road Willand.</p> <p>There is an error on page 63 of your agenda (Plans List No 4) Under conclusion it states that ‘The proposal is considered to be unacceptable, having</p>

	<p>regard to the Development Plan.....’</p> <p>This should read ‘The proposal is considered to be ACCEPTABLE, having regard to the Development Plan.....’</p>
--	---

AGENDA REPORTS

	<p>17/00348/MOUT - Residential development of up to 257 dwellings and upto 5 Gypsy and Traveller pitches; 8.6 hectares of land made available to facilitate the relocation of Crediton Rugby Club; up to 1.1 hectares of land safeguarded for the delivery of a primary school; access arrangements from A3072 (Exhibition Way); pedestrian and cycle access on to Pounds Hill/Stonewall Cross junction, Old Tiverton Road and Pedlerspool Lane; landscaping and area of public open space; and other associated infrastructure and engineering operations - Land at NGR 284185 101165 (Creedy Bridge) Crediton Devon.</p> <p>Sandford Parish Council has enquired whether S106 contributions identified towards improvements to the existing Public Rights of Way network could be used to deliver a footpath/cycleway between the Pedlerspool site (Creedy Bridge) to the village of Sandford. Through a meeting with the Local Highway Authority it was explained that the S106 monies contained within the Heads of Terms have been allocated to identified projects and therefore changes at this late stage are not possible.</p> <p>The scheme for the Sandford Path has not been worked up to a point to show exact costings involved with confirmation obtained by land owners but an alternative route of achieving this project following further work such as through the Boniface Trail (which has Cabinet support from Devon County Council) has been outlined to Sandford Parish Council.</p> <p>Extract from officers report to highlight changes being proposed</p> <p>3.1 The proposed changes to the planning obligations heads of terms 1, 2 and 4 are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The safeguarding of a 1.1ha site for a Primary School and obligations securing the transfer of said site to Devon County Council if required by the County Council within an agreed time period running from Commencement of Development and expiring 5 years after any Commencement on the western development parcel. 2. The setting out of a 0.3ha site for provision of up to 5 pitches for the Gypsy and Traveller Community or (if approved by the Council pursuant to the approved scheme) provision of a site with equivalent capacity off-site (or the expansion of an existing Gypsy and Traveller Site) and the following provisions regards delivery and operation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prior to Occupation of more than 75% of Dwellings: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Provision of 5 serviced pitches on-site prior to Occupation of more than 75% of Dwellings; OR (ii) If approved by the Council in writing (having regard to criteria under DM7) provision of 5 serviced pitches off-site (new site or extension to existing) OR provision of land off-site and contribution of £500K for Council to deliver. Prior to Occupation of more than 43% of Dwellings:
--	---

	<p>(i) Submission and approval of scheme confirming which of the above options is proposed</p> <p>Cascade:</p> <p>If offer the pitches/site (whether on or off site) to RP's for more than 12 months (and then Council) for nominal consideration and Owner is unable to find party willing to contract to take the G&T site then Owner may opt instead to discharge obligation through the provision of 5 extra Affordable Housing Units (either on the G&T site pursuant to new full application for said land or elsewhere within the Development). Mix of said units to be 60/40 rented/intermediate as per existing Affordable Housing units.</p> <p>4. The safeguarding of 8.6ha of land shown edged [] on Plan x appended hereto for the relocation of the Crediton Rugby Club and provisions requiring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• said site to be transferred to the Council or its nominee (i.e. the Rugby Club) if called for within a period expiring at the date 15 years from the grant of the planning permission; and• the provision of a suitable temporary and permanent access road to the boundary of said site.
--	---