
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 04 September 2018 17:52
To: Planning Policy
Subject: Proposal to redevelop Part of Baxters Farm Musbury East Devon

Sirs

I am writing to register with you my comments as appertaining to the above following the recent consultation exercise to villagers at Musbury Village Hall. I list these by number for ease of reference:-

1. I am very much in favour of the total land area under discussion being redeveloped given that villagers are amenable to the defined limit of the Village is extended to incorporate such. It is however reprehensible that one of the factors that influenced that decision namely the importance to provide so called affordable housing has been hijacked by the now passed development proposal at Doatshayne Lane Musbury before the Baxters Farm land was finally made available to progress the current proposal. This has given rise to some detailed questioning of the decision making process as the two proposals interact. It is welcome that the Development Brief caters for the provision of some smaller scale properties but presumably an incoming developer can argue against such if the Doatshayne Lane proposal incorporates sufficient affordable housing for the Village whether in terms of quota or otherwise. If the developer at that location seeks on secondary application to exclude the provision of affordable housing on grounds that it renders that the proposed development unviable it is hoped that EDDC will insist on its provision at Doatshayne Lane and not allow such to be in effect provided at Baxters Farm. If it does not the proposal at Doatshayne Lane should not have been allowed on policy grounds.
2. The foregoing said the suggestion that some units at Baxters Farm be built immediately adjoining the Village Hall is not at all sensible. This will be most unfair to the occupants given the noise from the use of and functions at the Hall which can be both regular and loud. I live up near the Church and with the wind in the right direction can so hear noise from functions at the Hall. There is also the issue of very considerable noise from traffic using the adjoining A358. This area should be used for additional car parking at the Hall which must be screened off by suitable planting and not the sloping area beyond the existing car park.
3. If that sloping area is so used it should be screened by suitable planting from the adjoining property Blundells (?) with that screening extended to the existing car park even if that results in the loss of a few car parking spaces from the existing. This I suggest is entirely reasonable.
4. It is hoped that any incoming developer will formulate its own proposals and not be compelled to adopt those set out in Development Brief. To incorporate the retention of the old farmhouse is in my opinion a retrograde step. It is an old building which has had its day being poorly maintained and not comfortable to live in. Why fiddle around with its conversion? It should be demolished along with the two old stone barns and other outbuildings which of their type were fine structures as part of a farm complex but not otherwise. An incoming developer should have a clean slate to work from. A realistic approach has to be adopted. The Planning Brief is poorly considered in this regard.
5. Access to the development should be off the Street not the A358 which will be far too dangerous. There are too many existing access points on both sides of the road.
6. The development should be extended to the additional land area above the sloping area mentioned at paragraph 2 above. For it to be suggested that such be utilised as a Travelers Site demonstrates a callous indifference to the interests of villagers and being so close to the customarily accepted centre of the Village namely The Post House. I cannot help thinking that the landowner, Devon County Council, was not at all amused by the suggestion let alone an incoming developer assuming that one could be found in light of such. I have no objection to the scale of the development being increased as a consequence. It strikes as odd that this additional land area is almost as extensive as that mapped out for building in the Development Brief. Far too extensive.

7. I see no merit in the formulation of a Community Orchard. Oddly reference to such appears on maps registered with you when a development proposal for part of the location was rejected in 1994. The grounds for rejection then make for interesting reading in connection with the points made at paragraph 1 above.
8. Provision should be made for some measure of residents parking for existing properties in the Village. The current dearth of parking is now virtually at crisis point. Profits from the development should not be secured by the landowner and the developer without this being accommodated.

I do not anticipate any of the points here made to carry any weight with you. The consultation exercise was all very well but at the end of the day you will do what you determine on unless swayed by the landowner or any incoming developer. The views of villagers count for nothing.

