

From: Jube Lane
Sent: 15 April 2020 22:44
To: David Kenyon ; Planning
Cc: David Warburton wwallace; Hayward Burt
Subject: 19/03416/OUT/David Kenyon Manor Farm Templecombe

Dear Mr Kenyon,

I understand from your recent letter, that an extension of time has been requested in order to make changes to the above-mentioned application, to take into consideration issues raised by National Heritage and the Highways Commission. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the revised plan and additional documentation.

It has also been brought to my attention that the Government has advised all Councils across the country, to focus their attention on matters pertaining to Covid 19. This is to ensure that Council run homes, and all emergency services are coping with the current climate to help save lives. I was therefore surprised that planning applications are still being processed at this time.

I refer to the letter from Origin 3 dated 10 March, when they state that there were four areas in which they need to address and re-submit their plans. These being:-

1. Heritage
2. Highways
3. Scale of growth
4. Landscape & Visual Impact

I understand that National Heritage were unhappy about the proximity of buildings to the listed Manor Farm, and I understand that this has been amended now and reflected in the updated plan. Also, according to Origins 3's letter, the Somerset highways don't see that 80 houses would increase traffic in the village.

The letter states that it is only now points 3 and 4 which need to be satisfied now which, when they have done so, there will be a 'positive' outcome to the application.

All sounds very simple and straight forward doesn't it. Or does it?

I have been involved with this application from the outset, and have read every single objection submitted, attended Parish Council Meetings, SSDC meetings and the Developers meeting at the village hall. The updated plan submitted in no way addresses many of the main objections raised and in actual fact, it seems that all of the comments made by those who have sent in their objections have been ignored. I am sure you are well aware of the objections that have been lodged, but if I may, like to remind you of the following important points:-

Safety of passage for increased population through the village.

There are still many unanswered questions regarding how pedestrians would make safe passage through the village, especially children and the disabled.

Local Plan 2016 to 2036

Surely the Planning applications of 49 units at West Street, 70 units at Slades Hill and a further 19 units in Throop Road in addition to the 80 units proposed at Manor Farm over exceeds the total amount for the whole area as set out in the proposed local plan for 2016 to 2036. The Local Plan suggests a suitable figure of 75 possible housing numbers to be provided within this 20-year period.

Pumping Station

There have been no response to the questions regarding the Pumping station (noise etc)

CPRE

I would like to remind you of CPRE's comment in their letter of 24 January 2020 "In summary, CPRE Somerset considers this outline application to be contrary to NPPF definition of previously developed land, NPPF para 117, 118, 170(b), 180, policies SD1, HG2 and HELAA assessments"

I find it most remarkable that SSDC would accept a report undertaken by Origins 3 which goes against the HELLA assessment advising of just 35 units were suitable for the site, due to conservation issues. This obviously needs looking into further. The fact that they suggest that this report was produced without undertaking detailed Heritage assessments is a bit presumptuous, don't you think?

Village infrastructure and facilities to cope with the growth of population

With regards to the issue of growth, in the aforementioned letter from Origins 3, it states:

"As such, we do not consider the scale of growth proposed at Templecombe to be unreasonable. Indeed, no issues regarding capacity have been raised by statutory consultees that cannot be dealt with through contributions."

I believe that this contradicts the Highways comment in their letter of 7 April when it clearly states:

"For the junction of the A357 and A30, this scheme on its own will not create capacity issues, it is suggested however that the Local Planning Authority take consideration to the cumulative impacts of all the other development sites in and around Templecombe. The transport assessment has shown that cumulatively the developments in the area will mean this junction has practically no spare capacity."

Recently, the planning application for West Street for 49 houses was not approved by Area East due to lack of infrastructure in the village. This has now been referred to the Regulation Committee. All but one member of Area East were against that application. Can you explain how this additional planning for 80 houses would be any different as the same infrastructure applies? Is it simply that this plan would be more financially beneficial to SSDC? Surely if

Area East is essentially against West Street's 49 property plan due to village infrastructure, then the same would apply to Manor Farm's plan for 80 houses.

Looking at the amended plan, I can see that the properties closest to the listed building have been removed, however, the part that I have the most objection to are the five buildings of restricted height, adjacent to the houses in Templars Barton. As reflected in our letters to you, the ancient stonewalls which separate the field and our back gardens are very low, and easily accessible from the field. Building houses so close, would infringe upon our security, privacy and would increase noise levels. Also, the light pollution from street lighting would cause issues, not only into our homes but for the bats that live in the trees. Suggested 'screening' with trees would also block out natural light to our property. Is it really necessary to have these five homes built so close to our homes? I would even suggest that, if these five properties of restricted height were to be removed from the plan, that the majority of the most stubborn objections would be alleviated as these are the ones that cause concern to the most adjacent residents with regards to quality of life, light and noise pollution and wildlife displacement. It may be something to consider when discussing with Origins 3.

If the houses were kept up to the top of the site where the current barns are, then this would be less of an impingement, however, this still wouldn't rectify the issue of an increase in population which could not be sustained by the current infrastructure of the village and its amenities and services.

Can the amount of houses, which are now sought, be confirmed, as some units have been removed from the amended plan? Will they be erected elsewhere as the title still states 80 houses?

Also I would still like some sort of guarantee, entered into the planning, that the affordable and social aspect of the plan will be completed. As we know from past experience, these tactics are used as a persuasive measure to get planning approved and then tend to get deleted along the line once construction has started, due to some small print clause relating to profitability.

Can you also explain how this application will progress, as there are many concerns that this will be put through the system without the voice of the villagers? Not everyone in the village is able to access the site, and I understand that letters are only sent to those of us who are adjacent to the proposed site. There are many of us in the village with grave concerns over the increase of planning in the pipeline, and the impact it will have on our homes and quality of life. It would be an injustice if we weren't able to have the input we would have done if we weren't in the middle of a worldwide crisis.

Indeed, it feels a little like plans are trying to be forced through at a time when both residents and SSDC's attention may be elsewhere dealing with the current crisis which may restrict our right to object or put forward constructive suggestions.

In my opinion, all planning should be halted until such a time where this application can be dealt with in a fair and reasonable fashion. If this process can not be halted, I would like some sort of assurance that all of the original objections are still taken onto account during the planned 'closed door' on line decision-making process. It would be good to get some kind of written proof of what is presented at the meeting if we can't attend or have an online

presence and that residents that are able to, be given access to watch a live stream of the meeting, should it go ahead, to ensure that all sides are presented fairly.

Yours sincerely

Judith Lane