

## Update Sheet

Item 1 - 22/00040/MARM - Reserved Matters for the erection of 60 dwellings following outline approval 17/01359/MOUT on Land and Buildings at NGR 302469 114078, Higher Town, Sampford Peverell

### Consultee Responses:

#### Sampford Peverell Parish Council – 15<sup>th</sup> August 2022

The documents concerning this Reserved Matters application which have been added since June have been studied by all Members of Sampford Peverell Parish Council. We appreciate the continuing efforts that have been made to improve and clarify the application and feel that the overall plans are much better now. The plans for refuse collection are clearer, with public waste bins marked, and the open space specification is better, for instance specifying minimal use of herbicides and hedge-cutting. However we still have a few concerns:

Road speed around the area. We appreciate that changes to speed limits are controlled by DCC, but we suggest improved signage or gateway markers at the corners of the site could make it much clearer to drivers that they are entering the village. We would be happy to talk to Edenstone about our ideas.

We are very concerned about the effect of climate change, as evidenced by the recent heatwave, and like the district and county we want to reduce carbon emissions in the area. The changes in building regulations that took effect in June urge developers to install electric heating systems combined with renewable energy sources such as photovoltaics. The email from the developers' agent states "Unfortunately, the power company have advised that there is not sufficient power available to service the site as an 'electricity-only' development and they have no programme at the moment to upgrade the system. It is not, therefore, possible to propose an alternative system to that currently put forward". We contacted Western Distribution who could not tell us exactly what was said in this case, but they assured us that Sampford Peverell has no limit on the amount of electricity that can be used here, and there is also no limit on the number of houses that can have solar panels installed. Could the developers please explain the statement in their email? At the very least they could install solar panels, which are common in the village, and which are now well designed to fit in almost invisibly into new roofs. As the attached photograph shows, it is perfectly possible to build new houses (to the right) in the style of much older houses (to the left) with the most modern installations included (solar panels built into the roof structure). We expect a convincing explanation why this cannot be done for this development at a time when carbon footprint is of foremost concern.

We are happy that the LEAP for young children is now in the heart of the housing, with trim trail equipment provided to the north for teenagers and adults, we would, however like to see details of the equipment to be provided in both areas, and assurance that the trim trail equipment will not allow the overlooking of nearby houses.

The road hierarchy document does make it clear which roads are to be at an adoptable standard, but it was previously stated that they would not actually be adopted. We would like to be clear who will maintain these roads, collect rubbish from them, install and maintain the lighting along them, and what it means for, say, visitor parking.

We would still like to see a lighting plan. Item 20 in the list of planning conditions from the Appeal Inspector said that "no street and/or external lighting of public areas shall be installed

on site except in accordance with a sensitive lighting plan that shall have previously been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority". We have not yet seen such a plan. The email from the agent says "This will be dealt with through the discharge of the outline condition (Condition 20 of planning permission 17/01359/MOUT) and this further detail remains within the MDDC's control". This missing plan is a requirement, as lighting is part of 'Appearance' in Reserved Matters.

We know parishioners who live near the site have other concerns regarding privacy, or the type and size of landscaping or planting near their homes. They are making their own objections and we hope their concerns will be dealt with.

Lead Local Flood Authority (D.C.C) – 18<sup>th</sup> August 2022 (response to concerns over drainage raised by Mr Byrom on 15<sup>th</sup> August 2022).

*'I responded to Jamie (response contained on page 7 of Jamie's letter). I responded to Jamie's further email this week stating the following:*

*The northern and southern connections of the eastern footpath are considered negligible and we consider that the highway drainage should be able to manage this (I am not aware that my Highways colleagues have raised concerns with these areas).*

*The southwestern footpath connection has been left to drain onto the highway (this is not uncommon). The flows would either drain west or south and I have not been made aware of any concerns with the drainage systems in these roads (only the systems draining eastwards down Higher Town and Turnpike).*

*We are content with the proposals.'*

Local Highway Authority – 26<sup>th</sup> July 2022 (response to concerns raised by objectors to gradients)

*'The gradients within the site for the footway have indeed already been agreed with the Highway Authority at 8% so the further reduction to 7% will of course help.*

*I should point out that the guidance for gradients are a guidance and if these can not be met, it would down the Highway Authority to agree on whether steeper gradients would be acceptable. And this is the case for many developments throughout Devon as a whole due to the topography of the County. The Developer has spoken to the Devon County Council Agreements Officer and gone through the proposal of what can be achieved regards the footway and proposed landing points, which has been agreed.*

*As you know this development is not being put forward for adoption and therefore the County Highway Authority would be asking for the development to be built to an acceptable standard, under the APC (Advanced Payment Code) of The Highway Act 1980. And the gradients proposed would be an acceptable standard.'*

Objections received further to the revised information submitted.

Further to the writing of the officer report which is prepared just over two weeks in advance of the planning committee, 7 additional letters of objection have been received to the earlier 4 letters referred to. In summary the additional grounds of objection are:

- Failings of the drainage design for the development
- Concerns of the Design Review Panel and how they assessed the proposal

- Requirement of a condition to remove permitted development rights
- Concerns to the position of the allotment shed
- Note that residents object to the proposed oak tree which could be relocated opposite the cemetery
- The erection of 60 dwelling will add to infrastructure pressures
- The Council is withholding documents with comments referred to in the committee report from Highways and Natural England which are not viewable on file
- Land levels need to be reduced further to protect amenity to residents of 42-46 Higher Town
- Additional planting is required to screen harmful effects of the development
- The Trim Trail along the cycleway should not be allowed
- Objection to the proposed gradients which are not in accordance with guidelines
- Concerns over a Member briefing and that residents should be included
- Concerns in respect to the Open Space Specification and Management Companies
- Evidence required for site's capacity for electrical consumption needs to be made public
- The site could take a number of years to build and should include solar panels
- Evidence required of no specific archaeological mitigation in accordance with Policy
- There is no detail of drainage runoff onto Higher Town and how it will be dealt with

On the matters of objections received throughout the planning process, complaints have been received that the correct number of objections have not be referred to within the committee report. Members should be aware that there have to date been 61 letters of objection received (all viewable on file), which are from 24 individuals residing at 18 properties. In some instances individuals have written in multiple times and the public access website links these objections together in providing a total for objections.