

From: Stephen Gill <stephen.gill777@btinternet.com>
Sent: 25 September 2021 10:47
To: SW-Neighbourhood Planning
Subject: MACKPLAN Regulation 15 consultation.

CHILLATON SIITE A: Land East of Marlow Crescent.

Thank you for your further consultation on the above.

I note your comments on my previous response to the Regulation 14 stage and am disappointed that the queries and issues raised at that time have not been addressed.

My 'highly suspicious' comment at that time related to the fact that I questioned whether the other material planning considerations (Affordable housing at 66% and land for community facilities) involved in the above proposal had been 'discussed ' or weighed against any concerns you may have about the location of the site in Chillaton .

Your comment that it is mentioned, merely in the description of the proposal, together with your frank admission that 'the issues identified are predominantly with the site itself rather than the nature of the development', merely confirms my original suspicions.

Within your comments relating to the above you mistakenly consider my role to be purely to 'champion your clients proposals '. As the former Chief Planning and Development Officer at West Devon (responsible for both Planning Policy and Development Management) and former Environment Director for the SW Regional Assembly , my 'role ' continues to be to promote sustainable development and good planning practice- irrespective as to whether any client is involved.

I consider your comments on my 'role 'to be a diversion thus avoiding any response to the specific issues I have raised, namely:

*you consider the proposal to be in conflict with the findings of the SHLAA. But that in turn is in complete conflict with the findings of the appointed Government Planning Inspector into the Local Plan Review. He considered the site to be well related to the village and without constraints (ie the dwellings could be located to avoid the flood plain and to avoid any adverse harm to the amenities of neighbouring residents). You have not explained, as requested, as to why you think the Planning Inspector was wrong in his assessment.

*you consider dwellings in Chillaton to be contrary to policy as it is classed as 'countryside'. However , this fails to take account of the fact that the NPPF allows for a 'cluster ' approach whereby villages which would otherwise be considered as within 'the countryside ' could accept some development where there is reasonable access to services in a nearby village . Under such an approach, some development could be allowed in Chillaton without any policy breach. I have raised this point but it has not been addressed.

As previously set out in my earlier comments, a more holistic approach needs to be taken to any site assessment exercise. A perfect, local and relatively recent, example of this is the development to the west of Tavistock, off Callington Road, for approximately 650 dwellings. The site was identified as having many constraints, namely: detached from the town centre, prominent in the landscape, impacts on the World Heritage Site, impacts on the highway network. However, when other material considerations were taken into account - particularly the possibility of reopening the railway line through infrastructure contributions- then the balance shifted significantly.

The proposed site in Chillaton would provide all the identified Affordable Housing need (thus allowing the remaining housing requirement to be located on small sites of less than 4/5 dwellings) together with a large area of land handed over to the Parish for 'community facilities'. Given that these three elements chime perfectly with your three stated objectives / residents preferences, it is difficult to understand why there is no discussion within the document to show how these matters have been considered, discussed, balanced against any other issues.

I fully appreciate that there may be arguments for other sites to progress instead but my concern remains, as it has done throughout, that there is no evidence from the latest version of the NP that a full, holistic, site assessment taking into account ALL material planning considerations- has taken place. This is in addition to the concerns raised above relating to the complete ignoring of the Government Planning Inspectors comments on the site and the NPPF advice regarding 'cluster villages' - thus not ruling out Chillaton as having some potential for limited development.

Yours faithfully,

Stephen Gill Dip TP, MRTPI
Chartered Planning Consultant.