

Buckland Brewer Parish Council

Minutes 23rd March 2016: Appendix 1

Andy Bennett – 9 Southwood Meadows.

Material Considerations which I would like to bring to the parish councils attention and note that I am strongly opposed to this development for the following reasons.

Firstly - Non Compliance with council planning policies/government planning guidance.

Village settlement Plan

Outside of the proposed plan which has taken full account of the needs of the developing community until 2031.

Any Additional development would render the plan unsustainable.

The applicant would have had every opportunity to take part in the consultation and formulation of that plan but chose not to.

The land agents planning statement makes a number of references to the fact that the local plan is not yet in place and therefore not applicable and the development should be approved in its absence based on their application being a sustainable development. However they then go on to cherry pick what they refer to as emerging Policies linked to the local plan and saved policies from the Torridge local plan which they state is out dated, to add weight to the proposed development.

Highways & Access

The access is deemed unsuitable for reasons of safety and adverse increase in vehicle movements within a cul-de-sac that was never designed for through traffic.

18 houses would mean 100% increase in vehicle trips.

There are no pavements (verges referred too, these are service strips and not able to walked over safely). There has been safety

consideration for elderly pedestrian users and disabled vulnerable users of the shared surface area within Southwood Meadows.

The access at its narrowest is 4.3 mtrs which is below the stated dimensions on the original planning app for South Meadows under which highways planning approval was granted. The proposed development will need to have a designed road width of 4.8 m wide. There are already issues with vehicle movements within the cul-de-sac due to vehicle parking. Although no recorded injury collisions, my own vehicles have been subject to 2 damage collisions in the last few years due to vehicle manoeuvres.

There are regular vehicle obstructions due to parked cars and the weekly rubbish truck is unable to access fully and must reverse only being able to part enter the cul-de-sac on most weeks.

Detrimental impact upon residential amenities

Why is there a Play area included when sited next to an already more than adequate playing field with amenities. This will only discourage the use of the existing open space and play area which is there for the good of the whole community.

Extreme Loss of privacy and overlooking of existing residential properties.

Human Rights Act in particular Article 1 This states that a person has the right to peaceful enjoyment of all their possessions which includes the home and other land.

Additionally, Article 8 states that a person has the substantive right to respect for their private and family life.

The 6 affordable houses in 3 blocks of 2 semi detached plots have been placed directly behind the 5 properties that back onto the proposed site. There appears to be little attempt on the part of the agent or land owner to discharge their responsibility under planning laws and policies to mitigate and reduce the detrimental affect to existing residents and protect their privacy.

The agents or land owners have placed a greater emphasis on protecting the visual impact to the church (as a heritage asset), although the visual impact assessment report finds any impact to be of moderate severity and identifies the impact to the 5

residential houses as being at risk of high adverse effect with a very large significance of effects on privacy and likely to suffer the most damaging impact. Any high visual impacts of this severity represent a key factor in the decision making process of the planning officers.

There is also no mention of planning application 1/1602/1988 approved and confirmed as still current in 1998. This is for 2 large properties on the land already owned by the applicant. One of which in the far north east location beyond the current No.7 Bungalow will be directly in front of the church when viewed from the east of the proposed site.

The plan should make more use of the upper North east part of the plot relieving the impact of loss of privacy and overlooking.

If the parish council are minded to support the application this should at least be documented as a possible planning restriction for the planning officer to consider.

Highway safety and access

Transport Statement

Sec.4 NPPF states

Encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion. local planning authorities should therefore support a pattern of development which, facilitates the use of sustainable modes of transport.”

There are no reliable public transport links to the village only twice a week and mid morning to early afternoon. This will not satisfy the needs of the majority of people requiring transport to and from work or other rural locations off of the bus route. This will then lead to a reliance on personal vehicles and be in direct contradiction to NPPF policies of planning applications being able to support sustainable modes of transport.

The transport statement TRICS data (vehicle movements) is taken from edge of town locations as no village data available this is unreliable. The data that is published is from a desk based assesment and online data tool called TRICS (TRICS is an online data tool used to evaluate trip generation reports and is used by almost all of the local authorities it is however very dependant on the correct selection of data sets and criteria)

Appendix C full data not available – we need to know that the persons preparing this report have achieved a balance between their selection criteria and the size of their selected data sample to achieve a realistic set of resultant data.

The transport report goes onto to say :

The services and facilities in the village will not necessarily be lost if this development is not allowed, In addition, the loss of the existing facilities would increase the reliance of residents on the car and increase social exclusion for non-car owners.

It is my view that loss has already occurred in respect to the public transport not through lack of use but through local authority cost savings and therefore the new development instead of reducing the need will increase the need to reliance on residents own vehicles and increase social exclusion of non car owners.