

9/10/2014

Dear Mr Young

Further to our telephone conversation earlier today, as you suggested to me in your capacity as the Programme Officer for the upcoming Hearing, I am sending you this e.mail for you to pass it on to the Inspector for his deliberation and for us to await his response to the same.

As I explained to you in our telephone conversation I am contacting you/the Inspector on behalf of the combined Collaton St.Mary Residents Association and Collaton Defence League coalition and at their direction and behest. This follows a Meeting held yesterday evening between our two groups, now styled the Combination [and partly but not only formed with the intention of creating one voice for our Community], in which was highlighted and discussed the draft Programme of Matters to be Discussed at the Hearing and the List of Participants at the Hearing, which we had only just received the details of from Mr David Watts of the Paignton Planning Forum.

Although we are members of our Community Partnership/ the Forum and regular attendees at the Forum's Meetings we have concluded that, notwithstanding this, our aims and interests and those of the Forum do not completely coincide and concur, and that we have a special case to be additional Participants at the Hearing, and be able to put forward our special case to the Inspector ourselves because:-

- 1.Our village has been singled out specifically by Torbay Council in its Local Plan as a significant Future Housing Growth Area in Torbay and is already being targeted by developers looking to make large new housing developments in our Area-for example the recent failed Taylor Wimpey proposal on land lying to the north of our village on the A 385 Totnes Road and the projected Bloor Homes application/Bloor Homes[Collaton St.Mary ][Boyer Planning] named as one of the Participants at the Hearing.

- 2.Our village is topographically, historically, demographically and actually a distinct entity from the remainder of the Paignton conurbation as being predominately a rural/countryside/agricultural/tourist area at the apex of the divide between Town and Country and lying at the centre of the Blagdon /Yalberton Valley complex [as an inspection of Google Maps readily reveals] with its own distinct and unique character and concerns contrary to the Core Strategy being expressed and promulgated in the Local Plan and which deserve a fair Hearing.

- 3.It would be demonstrably demographically, undemocratic and contrary to Localism if only the Paignton Planning Forum and the Churston Broadsands and Galmpton Community Partnership [with whom we share concerns and aspirations] were to be represented as Participants at the Hearing and a disservice to our Community/Village and its environs.

4. Particularly as a number of developers interested in developments in our village and its environs and their representatives are already declared Participants at the Hearing and able to put forward and project and advance their case for allowing unwanted major housing development in our Area unchallenged by our Community.

5. We consider that for our Community, and for those that come after us, that we are a special distinct case for consideration within the Paignton conurbation, and that as such being totally relying upon Paignton Planning Forum to be able and willing to put IT before the Inspector is unrealistic and unacceptable in the circumstances as/and that Paignton Planning Forum may already have difficult and wide ranging considerations and representations to make to the Inspector over and above and distinct from our own position, which WE deserve the opportunity to make, and which not may be adequately put to the Inspector by the Forum.

6. We consider that to date, for reasons which can only be the subject of conjecture, our Community has not been adequately and fully and properly communicated with, explained to, consulted and informed as a distinct community singled out for a Growth objective in the Local Plan build-up to date; for example the shop in Paignton Town Centre and the travelling Road Shows initiatives that were undertaken by the Council in Paignton in order to advertise to the Community their Local Plan aims made absolutely no mention of Collaton St. Mary and did not visit our Community, in our considered view, contrary to the Duty to Consult [and which in our opinion the Council has only paid lip service to any event], and as such we wish for this fundamental omission to be exposed to the Inspector and others.

Accordingly, for reason of all of the above, and more, we formally request to be included in the list of Participants at the Hearing. We respectfully await your considered response, which we trust and hope and expect to be in the affirmative.

Nigel R. Jones LL.B[Hons] CSt.MRA & CDL

Dear Mr Young

As an addendum to my earlier e.mail to you re. the above I write to place it on record between us and the Inspectorate that in the to be welcomed event that the Inspector should agree to permit our Combination to be one of the Participants at the Hearing that in so being, for obvious reasons, we would not be nor should not be regarded as being a Rule 6 Party and that this should be acknowledged and accepted by the Inspector in his determination of and response to our request/plea for participation.

Nigel R. Jones LL.b[Hons.] C St.MRA & CDL