

Dear Hazel Jeffery,

Thank you for your correspondence gathering community comments in connection with the site adjacent to King Alfred Way, Newton Poppleford. In relation to the received comments the following response is offered.

The internal roads are a suitable width and layout to accommodate the level of vehicle movements associated with the proposals. The turning head at the end of the cul-de-sac is typical of that within a residential layout and is capable of accommodating the turning movements of a large refuse vehicle and a large rigid delivery vehicle. The internal highway layout has been designed in accordance with the aspirations set out within the Manual for Streets (this is the best practice guidance on residential street design) to provide a shared surface arrangement to ensure the highway is not overly dominant rather encouraging vehicular and pedestrian interaction to encourage lower vehicle speeds and increase pedestrian safety.

There is no emergency vehicle access onto Farthings Lane. The links to Farthings Lane are for pedestrian use only.

Devon County Council as highway authority will produce the street lighting design to accord with their requirements.

The development will have the benefit of an underground storm water retention system. The underground tanks will be of a sufficient size to accept all storms up to and including the 1 in 100 year event with an additional 30% storage to account for predicted climate change over the lifetime of the development. Outflow from the tanked system into the public sewer network will be controlled using hydrobrakes that limit outflows to the greenfield run-off prior to development. This approach will control all surface water from the site and ensure that the existing problems with agricultural run-off during extreme storms will no longer be a problem to residents further downhill.

The use of infiltration systems such as permeable paving and tree pits that take surface run-off have been discounted at this site due to its topography and the impermeable nature of the underlying geological strata's. Use of these products at this location would result in an unacceptable flood risk to downstream properties.

With regard to the small amount of additional surface water volumes discharged that would have been trapped in the topsoil etc. it may be possible to dispose of these using rainwater harvesting for the flushing of toilets within the dwellings etc. It is however necessary with this type of system to examine the "carbon cost" of the materials, maintenance and power requirements. In this particular instance water supplies in the area are not in any way challenged and fed adequately under gravity hence provision of this type of infrastructure that requires pumps, electric supplies and a considerable amount of plant can be considered as a "doubling" of requirements and as such we would deem them fundamentally unsustainable for use at this location. The payback costs to the householder in relation to reductions in metered water\sewage charges will also not be sufficient to cover the capital installation costs over its lifetime, combine this with staining to WC's from recycled water and the health risks associated with outside taps on this type of system, it is our experience that most householders disable these systems after a very short period of time. To account for the additional volumes retained further attenuation storage will be added with outflows controlled to the rates associated with long term storage.

It is the responsibility of SWW to maintain the off-site public sewer network and capacity within the system to accept the development has already been confirmed by them. Any existing off-site problems should be brought to SWW's attention to ensure that any maintenance required takes place. However, as part of the planning application process, a drainage assessment was carried out

and this confirmed that adequate connection into the existing foul sewer system in King Alfred Way can be achieved.

The contributions to be provided as a result of the development are specified within the Section 106 attached to the outline consent. It is CDE and Cavannas intention to honour the Section 106 requirements in full which include the provision of a Footpath Management Report prior to development confirming how a sum of £25,000 will be spent towards footpath improvements.

In terms of the Doctors surgery, discussion with the Doctors is still ongoing. Please be assured it is CDE and Cavannas intention to provide a surgery building to the agreed level of provision. You may recall that CDE did in fact originally agree to be legally bound into building and fitting out the surgery. However, this became the focus of a legal challenge by some residents such that this requirement had to be removed. Nonetheless, the surgery building will be provided even though planning policy does not require its provision.

With regards to the impact during development upon residents, the outline consent requires details to be provided prior to commencement on site through a Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP). The CEMP will detail how construction works will be undertaken and managed in accordance with the planning application, planning conditions, contractual and legislative requirements and construction industry best practice.

In relation to the Community Hall, there was little support on this matter during the outline process, hence the community hall was omitted. The current scheme has progressed along this manner pursuing the surgery building.

As mentioned there are definite ecology benefits associated in reducing the fragmentation of the central hedgerow from two to one opening. Given that the hedgerow would be permanently intersected in just one location and it is linked to the hedgerow at the northern end it is reasonable to assume that the local dormice population will make some use of it.

I hope the above information is of assistance.

Yours sincerely,

Ed Brown

Development Manager

Cavanna Homes