

Appendix 1: Summary of Comments*

Area B Stage 1 Public Consultation (Nov 2024 – Jan 2025).

Q1 What are your thoughts about a new junction on Post Hill?	
Consultation response	No. of responses
No objection in principle. Seems sensible including improved connectivity across the whole of the EUE with multiple points of access creating less strain on one single point of access as proposed through the Adopted Masterplan.	X12
Ensure cycle and pedestrian connections including to the Former Railway Line, Grand Western Canal, Mayfair and the town centre are made available including informal surveillance for safety and account of Active Travel England toolkits and Healthy Streets guidance.	X9
Strongly disagree with the design and layout of the new Post Hill junction including the re-prioritisation. The vast majority of the traffic including HGVs will continue to use the main Blundell's road route (having an impact on the proposed school and existing Blundell's School). It is too close to Manley Lane & Golf Course Lane where visibility and gradients are poor. Both junctions will require a left or right turn on to what will frequently be queuing traffic. A new junction has been constructed on Area A to support all the traffic generated on the EUE – why the need for a Post Hill junction? The new Post Hill junction should be a roundabout.	X33
The junction introduces a material change to the proposed secondary point of access into Area B compared to the adopted Tiverton EUE Masterplan SPD. The access shown across Manley Lane (into the Hartnoll Business Centre) is safe, suitable and deliverable, as agreed by the Council at a Public Enquiry, and should be retained. It is also capable of supporting the accelerated delivery of Area B, without reliance on access being provided from Area A and can support bus services to serve the TEUE as a through route. This route is no longer identified and a significantly inferior secondary access approach is being proposed instead.	X1
<p>There are a number of significant deficiencies in the proposed Post Hill junction:</p> <p>The arrangements would change the priority of Post Hill so that it would not be in accordance with the established road hierarchy of the Adopted TEUE SPD.</p> <p>It would unnecessarily increase turning movements, which would interrupt the predominant flow and materially increase the potential for vehicular conflicts.</p> <p>The design of the access is not in accordance with either Manual for Streets or Design Manual for Roads and Bridges.</p> <p>The arrangement provides little to no deflection for westbound right turn vehicles, which is a significant safety concern for head-on vehicular collisions.</p> <p>It would be reliant upon a successful Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to reduce the speed limit on Post Hill from 40mph to 30mph when there are no guarantees that this would be forthcoming.</p> <p>Even with a successful TRO, the arrangements fail to meet the design requirements for a 30mph road, with insufficient forward visibility for westbound vehicles, and would obstruct the visibility for right turn vehicles entering and egressing from Manley Lane creating risk of collisions.</p>	X1

<p>Insufficient space is provided for manoeuvring HGV's, leading to encroachment into adjoining lanes.</p> <p>The access proposals fail to provide adequate provision for crossing pedestrians, and inadequate visibility to the pedestrian crossing point nearest to the desire line.</p> <p>No consideration has been given to the vertical design, where ground levels drop significantly away from Post Hill. Without this detailed design, concerns are raised regarding the physical and residential amenity impacts.</p> <p>Access arrangements may not be able to achieve maximum gradients of 1 in 20, required to provide safe and suitable access to the site for all users, including wheelchair users.</p> <p>The proposed access is forecast to take the full build out of the TEUE, resulting in significant queueing and delay on the Primary Route of the identified road hierarchy, where there is currently none.</p> <p>Insufficient space is provided for the predicted level of queueing right-turn vehicles, contrary to design standards, and providing for this additional queue length would extend the junction across the Manley Lane junction.</p>	
The re-prioritisation will encourage traffic to and from Junction 27 of the M5 through Halberton and Sampford Peverell rather than using the new A361 junction.	X6
Phase 2 of the A361 road junction needs to be completed first.	X7
A new junction at this point is acceptable but Area B should be constructed west to east with the new junction completing the loop, back to Blundell's Road, at the end of constructing Area A and B.	X1

Q2 What do you think about a new junction that gives priority to traffic from Area B over traffic using Blundell's Road?	
Consultation response	No. of responses
Blundell's Road / Post Hill is an arterial thoroughfare including for the industrial traffic of Hartnol Farm & should be retained as the principle route. The vast majority of traffic will be going between Blundell's Road and Halberton. Giving priority to Area B will be dangerous, cause accidents, irritation, create more pollution and make it difficult to use Manley Lane and the Golf Course Lane. Construct a roundabout.	X41
Area B should not be linked to area A as it will create more issues than solve issues. People will drive to the neighbourhood centre and school and will park on Blundell's Road making it unsafe. Leave area B with its own entrance.	X1
Access was always planned from Area A into Area B. This represents a fundamental change including the phasing of development and impact on local residents.	X1
Hartnol Farm industrial traffic will re route through Halberton / Sampford Peverell to avoid Blundell's Road.	X3
Support the re-prioritisation but can't assume that most traffic will not take the most direct route along Post Hill / Blundell's Road.	X6
Directing all traffic through the 'village neighbourhood' of Area B seems to contradict the design rational for Area B	X2
If bus services (Services 1A, 373 and 122) are rerouted through Area B many residents from Braid Park and Post Hill would have further to walk to access public transport. The existing bus stops on Post Hill are a 'lifeline' which would no longer be easily accessible.	X3

Priority should be given to the direction of travel carrying the most traffic. I think priority should be given to traffic from Area B over traffic using Blundells Road but not until the connection with Area A has been established.	X2
---	----

Q3 What are your thoughts about 'up to 10 new homes' having vehicular access off Mayfair?	
Consultation response	No. of responses
No objection in principle. People living on Mayfair will not like it but it would take a bit of traffic off other routes.	X7
Agreed in principle as long as the number of dwellings is not increased and there is no road traffic access to Mayfair from Area B (other than for emergency vehicles).	X5
Object. This represents overdevelopment with little consideration for the existing residents of Mayfair. Provide access for these 10 dwellings from Area B not Mayfair.	X17
MDDC made a public declaration that there would be no access off Mayfair into Area B for residential vehicles. To serve even 10 dwellings is in conflict with this resolution.	X10
The drive to Mayfair Copse is a single track lane. If a car is parked along it, there is insufficient room even to provide emergency access.	X3
All the residents at Mayfair Copse are part of the Management company with rights of access and obligations including what can and cannot happen to the single track unadopted road leading to Mayfair Copse. There is some doubt that it would be able to support a heavy flow of construction traffic without damage to the road or refuse lorries thereafter. A considerable number of vital services are located along the road including mains electric, drainage and attenuation tanks. The different height levels between services to the existing housing and the new, and the impact of development both during and after construction, would cause considerable disruption and inconvenience to all the services.	X10

Q4 What are your thoughts on the change in the amount and distribution off the open spaces?	
Consultation response	No. of responses
No comment / no issue.	X5
The addition and change in distribution is supported with a pleasing distribution and amount of open space accessible from all parts of the development. A greater emphasis on incorporating 'blue' space (wetlands and water courses) is also required including along Alsa Brook and the impact of drainage on the Tidcombe Fen SSSI and the maintenance of it to ensure the delicate balance of the SSSI and its wildlife is protected.	X22
All areas south of WML must be retained in its natural state in both Area A and B.	X5

Object to the change in distribution. Concerns raised about the sports field to the SE of Area B – pushed to the edge of the development, safety of children. It should be more central and of encroachment around the Former Railway Line.	X3
Not enough public open space (including a public square available for outdoor cafes at the centre of the development) or allotment space.	X5
Consider locating allotments or sports fields to the rear of Mayfair Copse.	X3
Who would run and maintain the sports field / manage the Country Park?	X3
Un-necessary development without employment opportunities nearby.	X1
Having a green route from the north side of Post Hill through to the country park and beyond will be a good walking route rather than relying on Manley Lane &/or the Swan's Neck carpark.	X1

Q5 What are your thoughts about the amount and spread of land uses across Area B?	
Consultation response	No. of responses
Accepted but land bordering the canal and former railway line should not be built upon.	X8
No objection. The variable densities of residential development are good including the distribution of other land uses such as employment land, sports pitches and allotments. Ensure the early delivery of affordable housing and the big blocks of green space are needed to keep the sense of rurality.	X15
Object on the basis that the development is not required representing a loss of green fields, trees, hedges & wildlife. The density of development is too high with poor provision for supporting infrastructure including homes for the elderly / retirement homes.	X21
Neutral. The issue will be the number and design of the houses and access to a local shop / bakery etc.	X7
No information about the location of the traveller site(s)	X1

Q6 Do you have any comments on the proposed locations of sports, play and allotment space?	
Consultation response	No. of responses
No comment.	X6
Support in principle – if the amount of open space proposed can be achieved. Ensure the green spaces to the south of the development are accessible by cycle and foot including from Area A with connection to the former Railway Line and the Grand Western Canal. The sports pitches would be located on lower ground with less potential for light and noise pollution. Play areas alongside them are essential.	X13
No sports, play or allotments south of WML. This will push it to the margins of the development where it won't be well integrated with new or existing development or infrastructure including car, pedestrian and cycle access.	X4

No lighting or artificial grass should be installed.	X1
The sports pitch located towards the centre of the site has clear potential to harm to the significance of the setting to the Grade II listed Prowses Farmhouse and would be more suited to allotment use. The allotments south of Prowses Farm would have a negative impact on the setting of the listed farm house, Blundell's Conservation Area and West Manley Lane. This location would be more suited to community orchard.	X2
Consider allotments, community orchard, a children's play area or a planted buffer strip to the rear of Mayfair Copse.	X8
Inadequate space for allotments when most houses will have tiny gardens & people are keen to grow their own these days.	X2
Ensure there is sufficient parking – especially at drop off and pick up. If these sports pitches are to be used by clubs, for matches, traffic and parking will quickly become a problem.	X1
How would the proposed sports facilities and car park south, of the Manley Lane railway bridge, as well as the Country Park, be accessed from Area B, other than via Manley Lane? MDDC resolved at its Cabinet Meeting on 26th October 2017 that access arrangements for Area B should not include those at Mayfair and/or Manley Lane / Post Hill Junction.	X1

Q7 Do you think the proposed phasing plan to develop Area B from east to west is the correct approach?	
Consultation responses	No. of responses
Support in principle. As long as the new Post Hill access is amended and satisfactorily completed.	X10
Object. The point of access into Area B was to come from Area A. The original plan should be retained to allow residents to have easy access to Area A amenities. A reversal of the phasing plan would also result in construction traffic from the A361 travelling the length of Post Hill to gain access into Area B. It is far better, on environmental and road safety grounds, for development to progress from West to East so construction traffic will then take the shortest route to the site and create less congestion on the existing road system. It is imperative that provision is made to ensure that a road connection is made between Areas A and B so that the whole area is served by a new road system, compliant with the latest Highways guidance. Furthermore, it is essential that Phase 2 of the A361 road junction is completed.	X23
Phase 2 of the A361 road junction is needed before construction starts on Area B.	X5
There is not enough GP / dental care to support the new development with existing services at capacity. The existing GP surgeries are unlikely to have capacity to support the retirement home.	X16

Q8 Do you think that a more informal design concept for Area B could work with the more formal design of Area A?	
Consultation responses	No. of responses

A variety of design layouts is welcomed and makes the area more distinctive. The detailed design of house types, materials, sustainable design and finish will be really important along with the infrastructure and services (including the school, shops, drains, power, bus routes and social facilities) in place to support it.	X22
It will not give area B any discernible benefits. Comparing it to Thorverton, Bradninch and Silverton gives it no extra meaning. You cannot replicate the organic growth of these villages with diverse housing styles, plots and appearances with modern housing and the change in style may appear confusing between Area A and B.	X10
The proposed road layout interrupts natural linear features (hedgerows and treelines). The impact on protected species (including commuting bats) should be considered and appropriate mitigation made.	X1

Q9 Additional comments	
Consultation response	No. of responses
Ensure connections for cycles and pedestrians including to the Former railway Line and Grand Western Canal are available and have user safety prioritised.	X3
No access from the development on to Manley Lane or West Manley Lane is welcomed.	X2
The consultation assumes that access between Area A and B will be available so that Area A and B can be occupied in a cohesive and permeable way. Unless the developers of Area B acquire the necessary rights to cross into Area A any linkage will not be provided. Area A has taken on significant infrastructure burdens which if to be shared with Area B need to be recompensed for	X1
Management companies are the usual way to secure long term management of green infrastructure. It is suggested that a contingency plan – such as the LPA adopting the SUDs is identified	X1
For phased development, a high level, site wide Biodiversity Net Gain plan should be required for the mitigation and enhancement measures to ensure that there is a comprehensive scheme that each phase of development can contribute to. Each reserved matters phase can then provide the finer detail for delivery including green / brown roofs, street trees, SUDs, new cycle and footpath routes, bird hides and the planting of native tree species.	X2
There is concern that there is not sufficient capacity at the designated sewer treatment works regardless of the comments from South West Water.	X2
Devon County Council's Need Analysis identifies a need for Extra Care housing in Tiverton. Area A proposes a new care home within the urban extension. The County Council would therefore like to see the development of Extra Care housing units within Area B in a central location.	X1
There are a number of historic assets within and beyond Area B where 'harm to the significance' of them and their setting might occur without careful management. X3	X1

The expansion of Tiverton through the Tiverton EUE and the associated population growth and inward investment, can be sustainably exploited to help deliver the revitalisation of the town centre, and address the issues which are responsible for the Tiverton Conservation Area being At Risk.	X1
With increasing pressures on existing water supply resources and infrastructure, more sustainable water consumption practices are critical. SWW support the implementation of water efficiency measures to meet the enhanced Building Regulations standards including the use of rainwater harvesting and greywater recycling within proposed development.	X2
To minimise any potential overlooking of properties and invasion of personal privacy, any new building behind Mayfair Copse, should be bungalows only	X1

* Column 1: each row is an Officer summary of all the comments received about a particular issue. Column 2 confirms the number of individuals who commented on that subject.