

**CRANBROOK PLAN DEVELOPMENT
2013-2031: February 2019**

**ANSWERS: Issues and Questions
For Examination
29 November 2019**

P. Boekman (367)

Matter 6 Cobdens Expansion Area

Issue 9 Is the Cobdens Allocation (Policy CB4) Positively Prepared, Justified and Effective?

- Q74 (a) The acquisition of land is as legal procurement carried out by East Devon District Council (to be confirmed).
- (b) There is no concise supporting evidence within the East Devon Local Development Scheme, the Cranbrook Common (Ginkgo June 2016), the Cranbrook Plan 2017-2031 and the sustainability appraisal of the Cranbrook master plan October 2017 that adequate preparation has been made within the development feasibility that there has been appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians.
- (c) There is no concise supporting evidence within the East Devon Local Development Scheme, the Cranbrook Common (Ginkgo June 2016), the Cranbrook Plan 2017-2031 and the sustainability appraisal of the Cranbrook master plan October 2017 that adequate preparation has been made within the development feasibility that there has been appropriate access for infrastructure and services including environmental constraints.
- Q75 (a) There is no concise supporting evidence within the East Devon Local Development Scheme, the Cranbrook Common (Ginkgo June 2016), the Cranbrook Plan 2017-2031 and the sustainability appraisal of the Cranbrook master plan October 2017 that adequate preparation has been made within the development feasibility that there has been appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians.
- (b) There is no proper documentation in place evaluating the landscape impact which this development will cause.
- (c) There is no further documentation in any of the feasibility reports produced which fully assess the input risk through redevelopment.
- Q76 The figure of 1,495 dwellings has been based purely on the maximum capacity that a developer can build. It is not based on a detailed feasibility study of the actual housing requirements within the area.
- Q77 There is a need for a comprehensive development scheme in relation to this allocation and the Cranbrook Plan as a whole. The Cranbrook Plan 2013-2031 dated February 2019, the economic development strategy for Cranbrook (undated) and the Cranbrook Town Council Business Plan are inadequate for preparation for a feasibility reference dwelling allocation whether for the Blue Hayes Scheme or for Cranbrook as a whole.
- Q78 There could be a requirement for mixed-used areas within the development. What is proposed is not justified and it is not effective.

- Q79 It is not clear that the A5 use class premises, accord with national policy in paragraph 90 c of the framework. What is contained within CB4 of the Cranbrook Development Plan document is imprecise as to a range of business spaces or premises. There are no firm proposals at all with any substantiation of planning to support.
- Q80 The allocation of housing in the Cobden area and in the Cranbrook Plan as a whole is defective due to the restriction of a single line track for trains running into and out of the existing Cranbrook station to Exeter in one direction and Yeovil to the other. In addition the railway stock is inadequate and of a certain age with no provision for replacement. There is no provision within the National Transport Plan and British Rail to improve the railway system. Therefore if a second station was built at Cranbrook it would have nowhere to go. The existing facilities and station facilities need to be improved.
- Q81 There is no delivery mechanism in place for a second station.
- Q82 The creation of a new station would not affect the timings of services at Wimple station as the existing railway line and rolling stock is inadequate even for the provision that Wimpole station provides. None of this has been taken into consideration in the Cranbrook Plan.
- Q83 It is not known how the land allocated is to be protected.
- Q84 There is no assurance that development land to Cobdens Lane will encroach into Wimpole boundaries.
- Q85 The allocation of the site at Cobdens is in violation of the provisions including within the development items 1, 2 & 3. The land forms a settlement that goes back many hundreds of years and is predominantly agricultural. The development is in contradiction to the distinctive landscape and environmental qualities within where it is located.
- Q86 It is not clearly defined within the EDLP that is to remain separate to provide a green buffer space between the settlements. i.e. (SANG). There are no firm undertakings.
- Q87 There is no justification for development on the land identified as green wedge within Strategy 8 of the adopted local plan. The development is in breach.
- Q88 Consideration has not been given to the impact on archaeology and heritage assets.
- Q89 The only objective criteria on the recommendation to place only one of the overhead lines underground is cost.

- Q90 The placement of pylons underground is practical and should be recommended. Its only restriction is costing by the developers.
- Q91 It can be said that if the pylons are not placed underground it would blight the development of housing property in the Cobden area.
- Q93 No consideration has been given to the impact of the proposed development with reference to the closure of the southern end Cobdens Lane and the movement of farm vehicles. In addition, Cobdens Lane is used as an overflow to relieve traffic within Whimple village when traffic is heavy. In addition, as Whimple is subject to flooding, Cobden Lane is the only road with access into the village.
- Q94 The siting of junior sports pitch away from the main sports hub is not practical.
- Q95 There is no rationale for the siting of 10 pitches at the Cobden's Lane site to accommodate Gypsy and traveller community as there are no facilities or services in that area.
- Q96 The location of the provision is in breach of government guidance on the provision of sites.
- Q97 There is no consideration given by the Council in respect of the landscape impact.
- Q99 The spatial strategy with reference to the distribution of Gypsy and travellers pitches is ill-defined.
- Q102 There is no evidence to demonstrate that safer and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided. There is no transport within the Cobden area and the road system is inadequate.
- AQ9 Refer to a letter of objection proposed Gypsy and Traveller site at Cobden issued on 16 April 2019 to East Devon District Council.