

SITE CONSULTATION RESPONSES

SITE 4 ROOSTERS, BABYLON LANE

Many of these comments are agreeing or disagreeing in principle. There is further analysis to be done before a true picture can be achieved, but these have been typed up exactly as they appeared on the forms completed on or after the Consultation on 9th and 10th September.

TOTALS: Number of responses submitted: 121 (of which 3 wasted)

AGREE 81
(of which agree only housing 4, agree only light industrial development 12)

DISAGREE 37
(of which disagree housing 4, disagree housing and light industrial 31)

AGREE

1. This seems the site that will have least amount of impact on villagers.
2. I agree to have Light Industrial Units due to small lanes no good for large vehicles. (Not Housing.)
3. Suitable for light industrial similar to adjacent buuildings. Would not suggest suitable for residential.
4. Good idea!
5. Small industrial 'home' type industries. Difficult access for large vehicles. Already old development but care needs to be taken to stop development leading to large vehicle access.
6. Subject to property as a home business unit. Need to promote more employment opportunities.
7. Very difficult access in all directions.
8. Outside the village not interfering with little parking.
9. Provided not more than 5 residential units of which 2 should be 1 or 2 bed bungalows.
10. We have concerns about access – Babylon Lane takes a lot of through traffic, cutting through from the A396 to the Cullompton Road. It would need widening (and straightening).
11. Very narrow access roads.
12. Doesn't seem a very sensible place for housing, but maybe the site can be developed for business/industry.
13. For commercial/fewer dwellings. Distance from village – with 24 houses there would be a lot more traffic and/or footfall (e.g. school children) moving between village and site. Increased traffic on narrow lanes. May be better for light industrial use or other business/services.
14. I foresee a traffic problem in this quiet lane. Apart from that I think it would be a good idea.

15. I would support the development of this site for a mix of both light industrial units and residential dwellings, preferably within the next five years. This site is currently non-productive so redevelopment would enhance the area and provide a boost for the local housing stock.
16. No objections to the site. Looks very promising. Family homes would be great.
17. A useful hidden away area, good for development.
18. Why not?
19. Yes, for light industrial. Light industrial use much preferred, giving job opportunities in the village. Not really liked for residential use. Too far from village.
20. Light industrial units; not housing.
21. No problem, except if industrial units could mean heavy goods vehicles delivering timber, metal, etc dependent on use.
22. No objections.
23. Seems reasonable to make use for residential and light industrial.
24. A brownfield site – preferable to New Barn Lane development proposal as it is 'GREENFIELD'.
25. As this is a brownfield site it is less damaging to the environment and character of the village. This should be encouraged wherever possible.
26. There is real need for combined living/working spaces.
27. Favour light industrial units to encourage enterprise for village and surroundings. + start-up business hopefully exploiting broadband.
28. But not houses.
29. Provided allowance is made for likely traffic.
30. Agree to Residential. Already units here. I would like to see remainder as residential ? as 1.5 acres some affordable. Nice Units, good green space and parking for 2 cars per dwelling ? Number of units – children etc. – CAN SCHOOL COPE???
31. It is separate from the main village but still walkable. Good location.
32. Low village impact, no access problems Seems like a good choice.
33. This would seem more suitable for residential use. Light industrial would involve heavy traffic with large vehicles and access could be a problem. Lovely position for a small community. Excellent for young families wanting space and fresh air for children to play.
34. Creepage needs to be avoided. Think that 'small scale' development here required – too many houses squashed in would impact greatly on those already established in the area. Vehicle access needs to be carefully considered, as the lane is very narrow.

35. With reservations. The information provided on this site is confusing and contradictory. Small 'light industrial' development is appropriate but vehicle access is a significant problem and relevant restrictions would be crucial to limit development to businesses not dependent upon vehicle access. Small, attached private accommodation/housing may be justified subject also to vehicle concerns.

36. This seems a reasonable proposal, my only concern relates to the impact of traffic on the junctions @ both ends of babylon lane. Having attended to the injured @ an accident at poundsland cross, any increase in traffic from this proposal (and Glebe) need to address road safety and increased use of New Barn Lane/rd and Babylon lane. Dr Jessica Pales

37. Good to use brownfield site. Support location. Need more info on existing planning issues. Slightly concerned about impact on traffic in that area. Need more info about how many houses.

38. Visual impact minimal. Present land a waste of resource. Not suitable for retirement housing or for those without cars as remote from the village,

39. for residential use – to include affordable housing.

40. Industrial units preferred – need employment opportunities in the village.

41. As long as it is a mixture of residential and small industrial as small employer opportunities are limited in Silverton.

42. Would be good for small industrial units and storage units.

43. Concerned about restricting traffic flow because of such narrow lane must be in keeping with the village.

44. Only a maximum of 5 houses, roads narrow to village and main road.

45. Good for housing outside of village.

46. More housing needed. 4 beds.

46 a. This site has least impact on the village and would benefit from development due to the sites current condition.

DISAGREE

47. Agree only for light industrial units, disagree for houses

48. The lanes leading to Roosters are narrow and used daily by walkers and cyclists (especially children). Development with a few houses (less than 6) might not affect the lanes greatly, but the number of houses proposed is too large, the lanes would be damaged by this and lane users put at risk.

49. A development of this scale so far outside the village would essentially constitute another hamlet or village and this would require utilities and access which is currently inadequate. The lanes surrounding cannot be widened to accommodate the extra traffic and there would be no safe pedestrian route to the village.

If development of this scale is to be considered it should primarily be part of the wider development plan for the area and not specific to the parish. It lies far outside the scale indicated in the Parish plan for developments of 5 – 6 dwellings maximum.

50. Access for lorries again is an issue.

51. No indication given as to the number of dwellings/light industrial units being planned in a narrow lane.

52. roads not suitable for big vehicle access.

53. Narrow road.

54. Way too many houses – very narrow access much used by cyclists and walkers. Heavy traffic on the lanes into Roosters, and into the village. The access is not sufficient for the number of homes proposed. Silverton School at capacity.

55. Not suitable for residential – too remote. Existing (road) access is single width in both directions with little or no passing places. Better to use for light industrial site!

56. Too far out. Spoiling local lane walks.

57. Is this too far out of the village. Not for houses but I do agree for industrial units.

58. Only for business units.

59. The access for large lorries accessing the site is too small – only units not requiring large deliveries could be sited here.

60. Negative. Vehicle access a problem.

61. Access from all directions.

62. Sporadic development in open countryside. Road access is difficult.

63. Development of this site would cause grave problems for access as the lane is so narrow there are no passing places from Poundland Cross to the site itself.

64. Will create unnecessary traffic problems.

65. I think this would be ideal for housing development but not industrial due to the narrow roads. The + roads approaching Roosters is extremely dangerous so any development would need to consider better visibility.

66. Difficult access issues, lane too narrow.

67. Isolated site for so many new houses. Would not contribute to sustainability of the village. Difficult for children/elderly to access village amenities.

68. 24/15 dwellings far too many.

69. Unsuitable roads.

70. Road v. narrow and sharp bend. Outside village.

71. This is outside of the village with difficult access for vehicles and pedestrians.

72. Too many for out of village.

73. With that amount of houses then the traffic impact will too high for the size of the lane!

74. Housing development should be within the village boundary. Road not work.
No good. Drainage and Flooding all would be a problem.

75. I can see the logic of developing a portion of this brown-field site but the scale of the housing proposed seems wrong. This would effectively be a hamlet created in an area completely unsuited to it. A more modest number of units – 4/5 – might be more understandable.

76. The lanes in this part of the village can not support a development of this scale. Access is narrow and dangerous for cyclists and pedestrians. The school is already at capacity and can't support this scale of development, nor can Newcour Road and Fore Street serving the village amenities, which are already becoming congested and at times dangerous.