
Report for: Cabinet

Date of Meeting:	17 June 2025
Subject:	Area B Masterplan. Stage 1 Public Consultation
Cabinet Member:	Cllr S Keable- Cabinet Member for Planning & Economic Regeneration
Responsible Officer:	R Marsh, Director of Place and Economy
Exempt:	N/A
Wards Affected:	Tiverton Cranmore
Enclosures:	Appendix 1 Table of Comments

Section 1 – Summary and Recommendation(s)

To inform Members of the outcome of the Stage 1 public consultation.

Recommendation(s):

- 1. That Members note the comments received at the Stage 1 public consultation (Appendix 1).**

Section 2 – Report

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 The existing Tiverton Eastern Urban Extension (EUE) Masterplan was adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) in April 2014 and updated in June 2018. Whilst covering the whole of the allocated urban extension, it was not able to address all of the allocation to the same degree of detail. This was due to the absence of some site-wide survey work for Area B. As a consequence the Adopted Masterplan SPD did not fully resolve the land use issues across the whole allocation. The Adopted Masterplan SPD therefore makes reference to the fully surveyed land area as Area A and the area requiring a greater degree of masterplanning, to the south east of the allocation, as Area B.
- 1.2 Policy TIV1(i) of the Adopted Mid Devon Local Plan requires the completion of masterplanning for Area B. Following Cabinet approval two stages of public consultation have already been completed on Area B. Stage 1 was

completed in 2017 and Stage 2 in 2020. Cabinet resolved to adopt the Draft masterplan – subject to updates – at Cabinet (3 September 2020).

- 1.3 Adoption of the document however was postponed for receipt of the Mid Devon Playing Pitch Strategy. The conclusions in the Strategy supported the delivery of 8 hectares of sports provision, on and off site of the EUE, as reflected in Policy TIV3c of the Adopted Mid Devon Local Plan 2013 - 2033.
- 1.4 The impact of delivering 8 hectares of formal play space is significant - including how Area B is zoned to accommodate it and the amount and density of development to support it. The Area B Masterplan was therefore postponed so it could be updated to address this issue as well as unresolved issues such as a secondary point of access into Area B.

2.0 Public Consultation: Stage 1

- 2.1 West Country Land has been proactively working within the Area B allocation and in collaboration with Mid Devon District Council undertook a Stage 1 public consultation between November 2024 and January 2025 (approved for consultation at Cabinet 12 November 2024). The Stage 1 public consultation included 3 staffed events at Tiverton Golf Club and Phoenix House (x2). There were also display boards at Tiverton Town Hall and Phoenix House and copies of the consultation material at Tiverton Library and a dedicated consultation website. The consultation material was advertised by letter, posters and on social media.
- 2.2 The Stage 1 consultation invited comment and feedback on some key items, including:
 - a new point of access from Post Hill including changed prioritisation of traffic;
 - the location for the formal sports including on the southern side of the former railway line;
 - up to 10 homes being served off Mayfair; and
 - the street pattern of the main through route connecting to Area A.

3.0 Consultation Responses

- 3.1 There have been 598 MDDC website visits to the consultation pages at the time of writing this report and 1,985 views from 413 users to the dedicated EUE website hosted by West Country Land. Each user spends an average of 4.5 minutes viewing the documentation.
- 3.2 A total of 110 people attended the staffed events.
- 3.3 A total of 35 people commented via the online feedback forms and 11 copies were submitted in paper form. In addition, 20 emailed (public and statutory) consultation responses have been received.

- 3.4 Consultation responses included those from Devon County Council, Historic England, DCC (Transport and Highways, Adult Social Care), Natural England, National Highways, Environment Agency and South West Water.
- 3.5 A summary of the responses received are included in Appendix 1. The responses are categorised under the 8 questions asked at the public consultation and another for 'additional comments'.
- 3.6 Some of the responses received relate to issues that are outside the scope of the Area B masterplan; on, for example, matters relating to the delivery of Area A of the EUE.

4.0 Issues arising through the consultation

- 4.1 An option for a new road junction on Post Hill has arisen. This was presented at the Stage 1 consultation including a re-prioritisation of all traffic on Post Hill (travelling in a westerly direction) through the new Area B development.
- 4.2 Stakeholders were asked to consider a new junction on Post Hill as a means of access into Area B, capable of serving the whole of Area B. The main issues of concern arising through the consultation included:
- The design of the new junction and its ability to meet recognised guidance including Manual for Streets.
 - The ability of the junction to accommodate the turning movements of larger vehicles.
 - The re-prioritisation and the ability to retain appropriate traffic flows on Post Hill without queuing.
 - That Post Hill / Blundell's Road would continue to be used as the principle route as it's the most direct route.
 - The assurance that the 30mph Traffic Regulation Order can be achieved.
 - Gradients and forward visibility being unable to meet the requirements for safe and suitable access and crossings for all users.
 - The ability for existing road junctions to operate safely.
 - That the predicted level of queuing on Post Hill is underestimated.
 - That reprioritisation will encourage traffic through Halberton and Sampford Peverell;
 - Why the need for the new Post Hill junction? Can the new junction on Blundell's Road, near the A361, no longer accommodate the vehicular movements anticipated for Area A & B? and;
 - Why has the point of access (into Hartnoll Farm) been removed from the draft masterplan?
- 4.3 In response to the concerns raised, the developer and District Council have undertaken a full review of the Post Hill junction in consultation with Devon County Council (DCC) Highway Authority. The redesign of the Post Hill junction is ongoing.

- 4.4 Stakeholders were also asked about the change in priority at the new Post Hill junction; with all traffic being directed into Area B rather than along Post Hill / Blundell's Road. The main points of concern included:
- Post Hill / Blundell's Road will continue to be used as the arterial route resulting in queuing, pollution, irritation and accidents at the new junction.
 - The industrial traffic (associated with Hartnoll Farm) will continue to route along Blundell's Road and will causing queueing.
 - There will be an increase in industrial traffic through Halberton and Sampford Peverell as a means to avoid the new Post Hill junction.
 - Routing all traffic through Area B seems to contradict the rational for the new 'village neighbourhood' design of Area B.
 - The close proximity of the existing junctions with queueing right-hand-turning traffic will cause traffic incidents.
 - The prioritised junction represents a fundamental change to the adopted masterplan including the phasing of development and impact on the amenity of existing residents.
 - A roundabout would make more sense if there's sufficient space.
- 4.5 As detailed at paragraph 4.3, it is in response to the concerns raised that a full review of the junction, in consultation with DCC Highway Authority, is being undertaken. The redesign is on-going.
- 4.6 Stakeholders were asked through the consultation to give consideration for up to 10 new houses being accessed off Mayfair. The main issues arising were:
- Overdevelopment and impact on existing residential amenity.
 - MDDC withdrawing its "commitment" to there being no access off Mayfair into Area B. (see para 4.7 below for detail.)
 - Additional access off Mayfair contradicting the Adopted Masterplan SPD.
 - The drive to Mayfair Copse being single track; without capacity for additional traffic.
 - The drive to Mayfair Copse being under the supervision of a Management Company with rights of access and obligations to existing residents attached to it.
 - Services and utilities (including attenuation tanks) being located under the Mayfair Copse drive.
 - The gradient change between the services and the new housing causing likely and considerable disruption and inconvenience to the service provision of Mayfair Copse.
 - Impact on existing residential amenity.
 - Access should be taken off Area B not Mayfair; &
 - Mayfair should only provide emergency vehicle access.

- 4.7 The District Council made a Cabinet resolution in October 2017 that the master planning of Area B be progressed “subject to... access arrangements ... that do not include Mayfair and / or the Manley Lane / Post Hill Junction.” This decision was made on the basis that all the Area B traffic was being directed through Mayfair. The current enquiry for up to 10 dwellings taking access off Mayfair is a considerable reduction and on this basis was considered an acceptable question to ask at the public consultation. The comments received to that enquiry have principally related to the impact on existing residential amenity, the capacity of the private drive and the impact on existing services and facilities. The comments are noted and have been conveyed to the developer and Area B master planner.
- 4.8 Stakeholders were asked through the consultation process about the amount and distribution of open space across Area B. The main concerns arising noted:
- Not enough open space is being provided.
 - Woodland and hedgerow planting needs to happen in advance of any development.
 - The peripheral location of the sports pitch south of West Manley Lane does not support child safety.
 - The sports pitch south of West Manley Lane will harm the setting of the Former Railway Line.
 - Locate open space or allotments to the rear of Mayfair Copse.
 - The need for a greater emphasis on blue space (wetlands and water courses).
 - Why is a Country Park needed when there is countryside all around?
- 4.9 The location of the sports pitches south of West Manley Lane are discussed in more detail at paragraph 4.13. However, the inclusion of open space integrated within the development is recognised as a valuable amenity and place-making asset. Requests for open space (orchards, allotments, play areas) to act as a buffer for existing residential amenity was also requested as was greater recognition of the blue spaces. The Country Park is proposed as a means to provide opportunities for public access.
- 4.10 Stakeholders were asked to consider the amount and spread of uses across Area B. The main issues arising included:
- Keeping the land bordering the canal clear of development.
 - Extent of development and loss of green fields.
 - Design, layout and height of buildings.
 - No guarantee that Area A and B will have road or other connections.
 - Too few elderly or retirement homes.
 - The need for a local shop and facilities central to the development.
 - Not enough green space within the development to preserve the sense of countryside.
 - The site for the Gypsy and Traveller pitches not being identified.

- 4.11 The comments are noted and will be given greatest consideration at application stage; being points of detail. In collaboration with DCC, Officers are ensuring that the developers of Areas A and B continue to communicate to secure vehicular, pedestrian and cycle connections. This also in recognition of the proposed neighbourhood centre in Area A that will provide local facilities for the whole of the EUE. A suitable site for the Gypsy and Traveller pitches is yet to be identified, with this work on-going.
- 4.12 Stakeholders were asked to consider the location of the sports, play and allotment space. The main points raised were:
- No sports, play, allotments south of West Manley Lane.
 - The proposed sports facilities are not well integrated with the new or existing development for car, pedestrian or cycle access.
 - Sports pitches and their associated lighting & hours of use, close to listed properties, harms their setting.
 - Allotments close to the listed properties harms their setting.
 - Locate allotments, play areas & community orchards to the rear of Mayfair Copse.
 - Include a buffer strip to the rear of properties on Mayfair and Post Hill.
 - Traffic & parking will be a problem for the sports pitches if there's not adequate provision when used by clubs.
 - How would the sports facilities south of West Manley Lane be accessed other than via Manley Lane?
- 4.13 There is a clear concern about the sports pitches being located south of West Manley Lane; on the margins of the development and within the wider countryside setting. Without them being well integrated into the actual development, concerns have been raised about how they will be accessed, particularly by car, and especially if used by sports clubs. Consultation comments reference the Council resolution that no vehicular access will be allowed on to Manley Lane / West Manley Lane but it is not clear how an increase in vehicular activity on these lanes, associated with the sports facilities, can be avoided. Additionally, it is considered that the lighting associated with the sports pitches will be impactful on the Grand Western Canal Country Park and Conservation Area, the Former Railway Line and Blundell's Conservation Area and upon the proposed Country Park. Similar concerns regarding the impact of the sports facilities north of West Manley Lane upon the setting of the Grade 2 listed building have also been raised. A further assessment of the locational needs for delivering and operating a successful sports club facility in addition to ensuring its accessibility by various modes of transport will be undertaken.
- 4.14 Stakeholders were asked to consider the construction of Area B being undertaken in an east to west direction. A number of comments were received the main points including:

- Construction traffic from the A361 would travel the length of Blundell's Road / Post Hill to access Area B causing environmental, road safety and residential amenity issues.
- A road connection between Areas A and B is imperative.
- Phase 2 of the A361 road junction is needed for the construction traffic, prior to Area B commencing.
- The phasing of development from west to east, as set out in the Adopted Masterplan SPD, should be retained.

4.15 The comments received indicate an aspiration for the development of Area B to follow the construction of Area A, with construction traffic avoiding Post Hill on the basis of impact on residential amenity. However, should a new junction on Post Hill be achievable it will facilitate the early delivery of Area B with contributions from it improving the distribution and flow of traffic across the local network.

4.16 Stakeholders were asked about the design concept for Area B; one that uses the nearby villages of Thorverton and Silverton as a design concept. The comments received were generally supportive on the understanding that hedgerows are retained. However, challenge was recognised in replicating the historic growth of villages with a varied mix of house types, plot and garden sizes with modern housing constructed in a short period of time. Other comments consider the design concept less important than the delivery of a scheme that overall is cohesive and which offers good access to the A361 and to the town centre with sufficient social, education and healthcare facilities for the population it will accommodate.

4.17 Stakeholders were also invited to offer additional comments through the consultation process. The main issues raised were as follows:

- Pollution of Tidcombe Fen SSSI and surface water drainage.
- Pedestrian and cycle connectivity.
- Suitable provision for doctors, dentists and other social facilities as a result of the increase in population.
- High quality design and construction.
- Wildlife protection and environmental credentials.
- How is the masterplan delivered if the whole of Area B is not in the ownership of the developer?
- Capacity of the existing sewage treatment works.
- Mix of tenures.
- Appropriate consideration for the historic environment.
- Sustainable water consumption practices.

4.18 Many of the comments received would be points that would be addressed at the detailed application stage. However, officers have made contact with health providers and discussions are on-going. The development of Area B would also make financial contributions to health care providers. Officers have also

been assured that there is planned capacity at the existing sewage treatment works.

- 4.19 In acknowledgment of the point raised about how will the masterplan be delivered if the whole of Area B is not in the developer's ownership, Officers can confirm that a hybrid application is expected at a future date with full and outline details on those areas of Area B within the ownership of the applicant and any partners. This would represent a phased delivery of the strategic allocation. For an allocation of this size, a phased delivery is not uncommon. Any planning permission will require a S106 legal agreement to secure contributions and a well-considered strategic approach to the delivery of Area B and the EUE as a whole. On this basis it is considered acceptable.

5.0 PPAG

- 5.1 The consultation responses were presented at a PPAG meeting on 19 May 2025. Detailed consideration and discussion was given to the responses made to each question as presented at the public consultation. In summary:

Q1 & 2: Members were pleased that the concerns raised through the public consultation had been listened to and a redesign of the junction is proceeding. A specific comment raised was that full consideration in the redesign is given to the existing junctions of Putson Lane, Manley Lane and Enterprise Way and to the flow of traffic in and out of these junctions.

Q3: While there was general concern about 10 units being accessed off the private drive to Mayfair Copse and the impact of those 10 units on the junction at Post Hill, discussion ensued on what constitutes a 'severe adverse highway impact' and what was more acceptable – fewer larger homes on this part of Area B or more, smaller homes?

Q4 & 6: Members noted the comments that arose through the consultation and acknowledged the request for a buffer strip, play facilities or community orchard to the rear of Mayfair Copse.

Q5 & 7: Members confirmed a deficiency in GP and other health services in the area and that elderly / care home provision is not all that's required but accommodation for independent living too.

Q8: All members supported a design concept for a 'village neighbourhood'.

6.0 Next Steps

- 6.1 A provisional timetable for the next stages in the production of the masterplan is set out as follows:

Action	Summary	Date
Cabinet	Stage 1 consultation responses: reported	17 June 2025

Action	Summary	Date
Cabinet	Draft Masterplan, HRA & SEA Screening: report for Stage 2 public consultation	8 July 2025
Stage 2 Public Consultation		August / September 2025

Financial Implications: No budget has been set aside by the Council to support the production of the masterplan. It will largely be funded by the developer including the production of the draft masterplan for public consultation, booking of venues and neighbour consultation. The Council will be providing 'in-kind' financial support through Officer involvement and hosting on line communications and social media.

Legal Implications: The process for preparing the Draft Masterplan will be in compliance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. Planning policy requires the production of a masterplan.

Risk Assessment: Policy sets out that masterplanning should take place before applications are submitted. Delay in the production of the Draft Masterplan could in turn delay the delivery of housing on this part of the site.

Impact on Climate Change: A core principle within the Draft Masterplan is to support the Council's commitment to achieving net zero carbon emissions by 2030 through design and timely delivery of infrastructure, dwellings and employment. The Draft Masterplan will have regard throughout to climate change and within the confines of adopted planning policy seek to promote development that responds positively to climate change.

Equalities Impact Assessment: The masterplan will be required to meet the policy requirement for pitch provision for the gypsy and traveller community which will result in a more positive outcome for that community. No other equality issues are identified within the emerging masterplan, but it is noted that design should have regard to the needs of different groups in the community including by age and disability.

Relationship to Corporate Plan: The Masterplan will provide guidance on the planning and delivery of a strategic site for Mid Devon. It is intended to support the Adopted Tiverton Eastern Urban Extension Masterplan SPD (2018). The Masterplan will directly relate to the Corporate Plan 2024-28 priorities including:

- Planning, environment & sustainability;
- Community, people & equalities;
- Homes; and
- Economy & assets.

Section 3 – Statutory Officer sign-off/mandatory checks

Statutory Officer: Andrew Jarrett

Agreed by or on behalf of the Section 151 Officer

Date: 5.6.25

Statutory Officer: Maria de Leburne

Agreed on behalf of the Monitoring Officer

Date: 5.6.25

Chief Officer: Stephen Walford

Agreed by or on behalf of the Chief Executive/Corporate Director

Date: 5.6.25

Performance and risk: Steve Carr

Agreed on behalf of the Corporate Performance & Improvement Manager

Date: 21 May 2025

Cabinet member notified: yes

Report: Exclusion of the press and public from this item of business on the published agenda on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information. No

Appendix: Exclusion of the press and public from this item of business on the published agenda on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information. No

Section 4 - Contact Details and Background Papers

Contact: C. McCombe, Area Planning Office, Major Projects

Email:

Telephone: 01884 234277

Background papers:

Adopted Local Plan Review 2013-2033:

[Mid Devon Local Plan Review 2013-2033](#)

Adopted Tiverton EUE Masterplan SPD (2018):

[11742-teue_masterplan-supplementary-planning-document-rev-q_lr.pdf](#)

Tiverton EUE Design Guide (2016):

[160624 Design Guide DH.indd](#)

Tiverton EUE Area B Masterplan 2020:

[19045_draft-spd_final-for-cabinet_200114.pdf](#)

Cabinet 16th January 2020

Cabinet 30th May 2019

Cabinet 26 October 2017

Cabinet 2nd February 2017