

Pilton Residents Group

23 Northfield Lane Pilton Barnstaple EX31 1QE

Mike Kelly
Planning Manager
Civic Centre,
Barnstaple

9th April 2015

Ref – our email sent on 11th March 2015

Dear Mr. Kelly,

We are extremely disappointed not to have received a reply in regard to the email sent to you almost one month ago. (A copy of the email in question is attached on page 2.)

As you will know, Councillor Greenslade was also copied, and on learning that we had not yet received a reply, he further requested that you respond to us on this matter. So far you have failed to do so.

As stated in the email, we have found major inconsistencies in every TA done for each Pilton application submitted, and yet we are constantly being told that the cumulative traffic impact has been considered in every case.

There are serious doubts about statements made to Planning Committee Members during the last meeting on 4th March 2015 in regard to the validity of the Transport Assessment submitted for Raleigh Park (57503), and the subsequent reassurances provided by the applicant's agent.

To date, no real evidence has been provided by either the applicant, or Devon County Highways Officers, in order to support the statements made to Planning Committee Members.

Since we now have confirmation that this application will be brought back to Committee on the Thursday 16th April, it is unreasonable and somewhat undemocratic not to provide us with the incontrovertible evidence requested.

This evidence is essential before the necessary assurances can be provided to Members and community that ***everything really has been considered*** with regard to the cumulative traffic impact on North Barnstaple, and in particular on traffic flow at the Pilton Bridge Junction, as a result of the proposed developments within Pilton and the Ilfracombe S. Extension.

We eagerly await your response.

Yours sincerely,

Geoff Pugsley
for Pilton Residents Group

Annex

From: [Geoffrey Pugsley](#)
To: [Mike Kelly-IPlanning](#)
Cc: [Mair Manuel -Councillors](#) ; [Frank Biederman - Councillor](#) ; [Eric Ley -Planning](#) ; [David Worden-Planning](#) ; [Brian Greenslade- Councillor](#) ; ken.miles@northdevon.gov.uk
Sent: Wednesday, March 11, 2015 7:02 PM
Subject: Pilton Residents Group

Dear Mr Kelly,

At the Planning Meeting on 4th March 2015 to consider the Raleigh Park Application (57503), there was much discussion and concern shown by Councillors in regard to the cumulative impact on traffic at Pilton Bridge and taking into account other planned developments for Pilton and the Southern Ilfracombe Extension.

Councillors Warden and Biederman were amongst those seeking reassurance from Matthew Collins that the total cumulative effect on traffic at Pilton Causeway had been fully taken into account by DC Highways.

Immediately after the response given by Matthew Collins to Councillors, you confirmed your presence at a meeting on Monday 2nd March with the developer's agent, who had stated that the Traffic Assessment submitted for this application was '*a full assessment and considered everything including the Ilfracombe Southern Extension*'.

At the Planning Committee Meeting, the developer's agent spoke again and reiterated that a full Traffic Assessment had accompanied this application and that it took everything into account.

The Pilton Resident Group have looked at the T.A., and we are unable to find any specific reference to the Ilfracombe S. Extension within any of the five documents submitted. We would like to know where this is stated.

Similarly, Ilfracombe appears to be absent from other T.A.s. submitted by other Pilton applicants.

The published minutes for the Raleigh Park pre-application meeting which took place on 30th May 2013 do not include any reference to Ilfracombe development. In view of statements made about it's inclusion recently, can you please explain why it was not mentioned at such a crucial meeting?

We have also ascertained from examining other T.A.'s that *no other developer* has done sensitivity test modelling of the Pilton Bridge junction taking into account *all* Pilton sites.

Initial examination of the Raleigh Park T.A. suggests that the modelling process used to assess the Pilton Bridge Junction differs with respect to T.A.'s from other applicants, specifically Raleigh Park and Trayne Farm. This may well account for major differences in modelling output data.

We understand that this application will be brought back in less than three weeks. It is therefore imperative that the statements made to Members at the last meeting in regard to the T.A. being *totally comprehensive*, and in particular that consideration was given to the Ilfracombe S. Extension, be backed up with incontrovertible evidence.

We would hope that you are able to give our concerns some priority in view of the timescale.

Yours sincerely,
Geoff Pugsley