

Creedy Bridge, Crediton – 17/00348/MOUT

Presentation to Sandford Parish Council, 16.04.18, by Gleeson Strategic Land (with explanatory additions from SPC).

P.1. Outline:

1. *Local plan allocation:* was originally designated 165 dwellings, increased to 200 to meet current central government direction; the current application is now 'reduced' to 257 from 326.
2. *Housing land supply:* currently MDDC supply falls short of the 5000 no of units required by the national land supply sufficient for 5 years.
3. *Application background:* originally had a reserve designation included employment and industrial but was changed to amplify land supply requirements with no employment provision.
4. *Original submission:* 326 units + old peoples home and school and possibly gypsy and traveller sites.
5. *Revised scheme:* 257 units, omitting employment and including 5 traveller and gypsy pitches.
6. *Community infrastructure and financial contributions:* £1.9million.
7. *Consultation:* the original consultation had little detail but concentrated on exploring e.g. the environment, and opportunity for density, etc. and also provision for the rugby club.
8. *Questions:*

P.2 Local Aplan Allocation:

shows original adopted policies map 2013 and proposed modifications 2018. MDDC formally released THE SITE FOR DEVELOPMENT, August 2015.

P.3 Housing Land supply:

Infographic showing purported deficit in MDDC 5-year housing land supply and speculative applications.

P.4 Application background:

1. *Pre-application discussion with MDDC – recap.*
2. *Landscape and heritage-led design principles to reflect the characteristics of the site and surrounds – however as there are no details apart from the number of dwellings and proposed layout that includes an area for a primary school, 5 gypsy and traveller pitches adjacent to the primary school and also for the rugby club AND **proposed CLOSURE OF PEDLAR'S POOL LANE**, so traffic would be funnelled through the housing site.*
3. *A desire to be as 'policy compliant as possible' within the constraints of the site – surely the design should be completely policy compliant???*
4. *Presentations to MDDC members planning panel and design review panel.*
5. *17/00348/MOUT Validated 6th March 2017.*
6. *Feedback and Response – no real comment. Revisions – re-consultation to 15th May, 2018 as requested by Cllr Judi Binks.*

P.5 Original Submission – coloured copy of layout scheme.

P.6 Planning application process – Statutory Consultee Responses:

1. *No objection from: Historic England / Environment Agency / Natural England / South West Water / DCC – Highways, Surface Water Drainage / Flood Risk, Waste, Health care, D&C Police, Sport England / MDDC – EHO, Housing Enabling, Conservation, Ecology* **HOWEVER most of these agencies have caveats on their reports** about what must be done so this could be misleading.
2. *MDDC request for: amended heritage buffer / reduction in housing numbers/density / provision of G&T pitches (Gypsy & Traveller).*

P.7 Consultation feedback – Sandford Parish Council

1. *Your comments:*
2. *Principle of development to be a mixed development????*
3. *Housing numbers and affordable percentage.* – proposed to be 257, which is 25% higher than the allocation by MDDC Local Plan and only includes 21% affordable (not 28%); Gleesons said that with the 5 pitches for G&T it would amount to 23% affordable housing instead of the 28% requested by MDDC.
4. *Part Flood Zone 3* – 8.5 ha land will be ‘safeguarded’ (**which means to be sold to**) for the rugby club.
5. *Ecological impact* – has been assessed by Gleeson’s experts and mitigation measures included within the scheme that will require a management system **which would be paid for by the residents** of the houses.
6. *Distance from the Town Centre* measured as 2.5k but was unable to say if that was over the hill or round the main road.
7. *Community infrastructure* s106 monies to be put towards an increased bus service (even though this does not exist at present); land has been safeguarded for a primary school based on 63 primary school children but, as above, DCC would have to purchase this land.
8. *Traffic* will obviously increase and is estimated to have 2.3cars per dwelling.

P.8 Revised scheme –

This layout purports to show what the revised scheme **MIGHT** look like, including the closure of Pedlar’s Pool Lane but there is no indication of the form of the houses as Gleesons propose to sell on the development when (if) they obtain planning permission. As this is only an outline application there is no knowing what the final scheme could be like as there are so many ‘reserved matters’ to be discussed before the scheme can be finalised.

P.9 Application background – revised submission – What is the same?

1. *8.6 hectares of land made available to facilitate the relocation of Crediton rugby club* – this would be sold to CRFC
2. *Up to 1.1 hectares of land safeguarded for a primary school* -safeguarded actually means the land is designated for school but would be **SOLD to DCC**.
3. *Access from A3072* refer to the revised layout and **CLOSURE of Pedlar’s Pool Lane**.
4. *Pedestrian and cycle access on to Pounds Hill / Stonewall Cross junction, Old Tiverton Road and Pedlar’s Pool Lane* – see previous consultation direct with DCC Highways.
5. *Landscaping and areas of public open space* – the major area of public open space is where the land is too steep to build on.

P.10 Application background – revised submission – what is different?

1. *20% reduction in no. of dwellings to 257 (-69 units)- which is still 25% more than Local Plan allocation.*
2. *Increased provision of affordable housing to 21% + 2% gypsy and traveller pitches but SHOULD BE 28%.*
3. *Revised developable area to create increased landscaped buffer to the SE of the site – which is adjacent to Shobrooke Lodge and land where even a shed is prohibited as adjacent to a listed building.*
4. *Up to 5 G&T pitches (gypsy and traveller pitches).*
5. *Revised illustrative layout plan indicative relocation of Primary School to Pedlar’s Pool Lane – adjacent to the primary school allocation.*
6. *Reduced density to 30dph (dwellings per hectare) – which is still more than the Local Development Plan allocation+ 5 gypsy and traveller pitches = 23%*

P.11 Community Infrastructure provision

1. *21% affordable housing (54 units) + 5 G&T pitches.*
2. *Sustainable travel measures (public transport contribution and the provision of travel plan vouchers) - £955,000 essentially part of the cost Gleasons/land owner contribute towards the cost of the infrastructure needed to cope with the increase in population.*
3. *Primary education £846,424 (£13,652 per pupil based on the scheme generating 62 pupils) the site is estimated to bring 62 primary school age children into the development, i.e. that is just over one child every fourth dwelling???*
4. *Early years education - £64,250 (£250 per dwelling) Primary special needs - £36,392.*
5. *Healthcare provision - £93,291 (£363 per dwelling) which amount would go to the CCG to determine expenditure???*
6. **TOTAL £1996,757.**

P.12 Community Infrastructure:

1. *21% affordable housing (54 units) + 5 gypsy and traveller pitches.*
2. *1.1 ha site for primary school – safeguarded which means land to be sold to DCC.*
3. *8.6 ha of land for relocation of the Crediton Rugby Club – safeguarded which means land to be sold to CRFC. **This land is on EA designated flood plain and cannot therefore be built on.***
4. *Public open space and children’s play areas but only for the younger children on land that is very steep and there is no provision for the older children/youth.*

P.13 Works to the public Highway

1. *Access arrangements from A3072 (Exhibition Way) refer to the transport assessment documents on the MDDC website ‘transport assessment’ document.*

2. *Pedestrian and cycle access on to the Pounds Hill / Stonewall Cross Junction, Old Tiverton Road and Pedlar's Pool Lane (to be closed); and the*
3. *Provision of passing places along Stonewall Lane – which would entail taking down some mature trees.*

P.14 Consultation:

1. *Public engagement events 16/17 April 2018 – this was deemed to be not at all helpful as the amount of detail available was so sparse as to be even worse than the original consultation as this consisted only of two layout drawings that 'represented' a revised potential layout and the old layout on the site contained within power point presentation sheets but not even a power point available.*
2. *Presentations to Sandford and Credion Parish Council 16/17 April 2018.*
3. *MDDC planning application portal 17/00348/MOUT.*
4. *Deadline for responses 30 April 2018 – subsequently extended to 15 May 2018 following a request by Cllr Judi Binks, MDDC.*

P.15 Questions

P.16 Changes to the illustrative scheme – original submission (illustrative) and revised scheme (illustration) were attached to the notes.

P.18 17/00348/OUT Creedy Bridge, Crediton

Land at NGR 284185 101165 (Creedy Bridge) Crediton Devon (even though this site is now acknowledged as being within Sandford Parish)

Revised description of development:

Residential development of up to 257 dwellings and up to 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 Pedlar's Pool Lane; landscaping and area of public open space; and other associated infrastructure and engineering operations.

Further discussion:

The scheme submitted by Gleesons has to include the cost of land purchase, site investigations, planning applications, s106 contributions and profit AND then selling the scheme on to a house builder, who will also want to make a profit from the construction of the houses. Gleesons assert that their scheme has to have 257 units to ensure financial viability (for Gleesons) AND, say Gleesons, making best use of allocated sites to enable other sites NOT to be brought forward to fulfil Central Government requirements for future housing need/land supply.

However, as this is an outline application there is no knowledge the type/specification of housing distribution, finish or layout. The additional flood prevention measures will have to be paid for by residents through a management charge/company.

