

**From:** [Penna, Andrew](#)  
**To:** [Plan admin](#)  
**Subject:** FW: APPEAL REF: APP/D3315/W/18/3205705 Gladman  
**Date:** 09 January 2019 15:58:40  
**Attachments:** [Letter to Planning Inspectorate 09.01.19 - Re PRoW.doc](#)  
**Importance:** High

---

## Appeal correspondence

Andrew K Penna  
Monkton Heathfield Project Team Leader  
Taunton Deane Borough Council and West Somerset Council  
01823 219511  
[a.penna@tauntondeane.gov.uk](mailto:a.penna@tauntondeane.gov.uk)

[www.tauntondeane.gov.uk](http://www.tauntondeane.gov.uk)  
[www.westsomersetonline.gov.uk](http://www.westsomersetonline.gov.uk)

---

**From:** gateslm49@gmail.com [mailto:gateslm49@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** 09 January 2019 15:43  
**To:** Tim.Salter@pins.gsi.gov.uk  
**Cc:** Penna, Andrew <A.Penna@tauntondeane.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** APPEAL REF: APP/D3315/W/18/3205705 Gladman  
**Importance:** High

Dear Mr Salter,

I would be grateful if the attached letter is brought to the attention of the Planning Inspector responsible for this Appeal Hearing.

Kind regards,

Lynn Gates

---



Virus-free. [www.avg.com](http://www.avg.com)

49 West View  
Creech St Michael  
TA3 5DU  
9<sup>th</sup> January 2019

Mr T Salter  
Inquiries & Major Casework  
The Planning Inspectorate  
Room 3/J Kite Wing,  
Temple Quay House,  
2 The Square,  
Temple Quay,  
Bristol, BS1 6PN

Dear Mr Salter

Gladman Developments Planning Application 14/17/0033

Langaller Lane, Creech St Michael

Reference:

- a. APP/D3315/W/18/320705
- b. 04-GDL-3-P-Highways & Transportation Matters -PROOF OF EVIDENCE OF DAVID SCHUMACHER dtd 19 December 2018

I refer to the following extract from Ref.b. para 6.1.21 & 6.3.1

[Delivery of the Improvement to PRoW T10/23](#)

[6.1.21 As mentioned above Technical Note 01 \(TN01\) \(CD 6.6\) addresses the issues regarding the delivery of the proposed improvement to PRoW T10/23 to improve the pedestrian/cycle connections between the south - western corner of the site and Hopkins Field. It can also be confirmed that these improvements can be delivered either within the highway boundary or within land under the control of the Appellant.](#)

[Inadequate Footway Provision in the Village](#)

[6.3.1 As mentioned above Technical Note 01 \(TN01\) \(CD 6.6\) addresses the issues regarding proposed improvements to the site's pedestrian connectivity and accessibility to the village.](#)

The above extract refers to the improvement of the existing PRoW which runs from the entry into Hopkins Field, behind 63 West View and continues across an open field and onto the proposed development site to join the main road at the North End roundabout. Only yesterday did I learn that that these improvements included the provision of a 3 metre wide tarmac cycle path and footpath.

In view of the lack of consultation/notice by Gladman regarding their proposals, the residents of West View have been given no opportunity to raise their considerable concerns with the Planning Directorate. Police guidelines 'Secured by Design' state that the routes for pedestrians and cyclists should be integrated to provide a network of supervised areas to reduce crime and antisocial behaviour. It also says that Public

footpaths should not run to the rear of, and provide access to gardens, rear yards or dwellings as these have been proven to generate crime. It further advised that where a segregated footpath is unavoidable, for example a public right of way, an ancient field path or heritage route, designers should consider making the footpath a focus of the development and ensure that it is: • as straight as possible • wide • well lit • devoid of potential hiding places • overlooked by surrounding buildings and activities • well maintained so as to encourage surveillance along the path and its borders.

Given that the appellant is restricted by the amount of land that is available to them they cannot change the actual route of the PRow. This means introducing a 3 metre wide pathway and increased pedestrian use to the single, narrow, muddy track to the rear of the houses at the lower end of West View (No. 63-71 odds), currently used predominately by daylight hours, dog walkers. The other side is open field. These houses mainly have high boundaries (over 6') which obscure any possible view of the footpath. The land here is also in a dip, further inhibiting any possibility of the path be viewed at this point. This is contrary to the Police Guidelines that routes should be integrated and should not run to the rear of properties as 'these have been proven to generate crime'. Indeed there is also concern that should an accident or incident occur on this pathway (given it is intended as a main route to the school and doctor's surgery) that any cries for assistance would go unheard.

Further, it is also understood that the appellant intends to meet the guidelines in respect of lighting by the installation of floodlights across the length of the 3 metre pathway. Residents of houses, and especially bungalows (No. 73 odds onwards) at the lowest point of West View, and the cottages at North End, given the proximity to the path, will suffer from light intrusion and it will mean that their homes will be easily viewed from the PRow.

I reiterate that it was only by chance, that the above information was gleaned yesterday and that there has been no opportunity for residents to express their views on these proposals. Given the significant impact on homes in the area, concerns regarding security and safety, I respectfully ask the Planning Inspector to take this into consideration and reject this appeal.

Yours sincerely,

Mrs Lynn Gates