

Customer Feedback

Design Survey Collect Responses Analyze Results

- View Summary
- Browse Responses
- Filter Responses
- Crosstab Responses
- Download Responses
- Share Responses

Default Report

Displaying 70 of 152 respondents

Response Type: Normal Response	Collector: Web Link (Web Link)
Custom Value: empty	IP Address: 109 154 99 49
Response Started: Wednesday, March 12, 2014 11 24 12 AM	Response Modified: Wednesday, March 12, 2014 9:02 45 PM

1. Do you agree with the Vision and Spatial Strategy?

Yes

2. Draft Policies S1 and S2 set out the Council's approach and priorities for sustainable development. What is your opinion about these policies?

Support

1. Policy S3 includes two options for the distribution of development over the plan period (2013-2033). The first option is to continue focusing development in the three main towns according to their current sizes and roles. The second option is to provide for long-term growth (post-2026) in a new community. A separate question deals with the location of a new community, but please indicate your opinion in principle below. Which option do you prefer and are there alternative options we should consider?

Option 1: Continue to focus most development in the towns up to 2033

2. If the Council chooses to pursue Option 2 under Policy S3 (the new community option), which location would you prefer and why?

Option 2(b) - East Cullompton (east of Junction 28)

1. Policies S4-S6 are strategic housing policies setting out a potential target for annual rates of housing across the district, the proportion to be affordable and adaptable, the amount of public open space to be provided, and the Council's approach to ensuring housing delivery. Do you support these policies or have suggestions on how they could be improved?

Other

-Developers should not be able to renege on agreements about the number of affordable houses -The housing density of 40/hectare is too much for many village locations and should be reduced. -A RIBA study (The Case for Space Sept 2011) finds that the average new home currently being built in the UK is only 92% of the recommended minimum size, and they are tending to get smaller. In Ireland new builds are 15% bigger than here, in the Netherlands they are 53% bigger, and in Denmark a staggering 80% bigger. Housing is not just about numbers, bricks and mortar - it is fundamentally about people, their lifestyles, health and happiness. A RIBA survey in 2010 found that 69% of people who WOULD buy a new home said that energy efficiency was the most important reason for doing so. 60% of people who WOULD NOT buy a new home said the small size of the rooms was the most important reason. RIBA surveyed people who had moved into a new build in the last 2 - 5 yrs and found they didn't have enough room for storage, for entertaining or having guests to stay, nor could they fit their furniture in or have room to try out different arrangements of furniture and fittings. Space in the home impacts on how and where food is prepared and consumed, how household waste is managed, how recycling is managed (space for wheelie bins outside, space indoors for bins etc), what furniture can be used etc etc. Poor quality housing and overcrowding also impact on health, well being and education. Some of these issues should be explicitly addressed in your policy statements.

2. Economy and Infrastructure policies are set out in Policies S7-S9 of the options document. These propose 154,000 square metres of commercial floorspace (including retailing) over the plan period (2013-2033) and set out the Council's approach to town centres and infrastructure delivery. Do you support these policies or have suggestions about how they could be improved?

Other

Not sure how you reconcile the J27 retail proposals with the policy of protecting and enhancing town centres. You say in para 2.13. regarding the proposal for development at Cullompton, that the Council must 'carefully consider' the effect on economies of Tiverton and Exeter (Exeter??!!) What about the effects of the proposal at J27 on Tiverton, Cullompton, Wellington, and Taunton? The proposals seem to include provision for a cinema -what about the Tivoli? A garden centre - what about the Old Well House and Tumpike garden centres just yards away.

1. Policy S10 seeks to sustain the quality of Mid Devon's environmental assets and minimise the effects of development on climate change. Do you support this policy and do you have suggestions about how it could be improved?

Support

Improve the policy with much tighter demands made on developers to build much more energy efficient homes, to install water conserving systems, to be firm about the provision of affordable homes, to have a bias in favour of local firms, to make sure that the infrastructure is in place in a timely way - shops, medical services and, most important, schools

2. Policies S11-S15 set out strategic policies for the towns, villages and countryside, including expected annual rates of development for the towns which can vary depending on the options discussed under Policy S3 (amount and distribution of development). Do you support these policies and do you have suggestions about how they can be improved?

No Response

1. The Site Allocations section of the Local Plan Review options document includes numerous options for development sites in the towns and villages. These exceed the amount of development likely to be required, but the Council wishes properly to consider all the available sites before making decisions on which are most appropriate. Please tell us your opinion on specific sites in this chapter of the plan, continuing on a separate sheet if necessary. Providing detailed reasons for any objections will help us evaluate and compare the suitability of different options.

S3 option 1 would be the preferred option. If option 2 is adopted, then 2b is preferred. The proposals for the commercial and retail development at J27 are both very vague, and sound as if a whole mix of proposals have been thrown in to make it sound attractive, by people who don't have any idea of the area (the cinema, the garden centre proposals). The implications for the traffic at J27 are huge, the effect on the surrounding small towns equally so, the employment opportunities are vague and probably not that great - large shed warehousing takes up a lot of space with only a very small number of job opportunities. Devon is a beautiful green county and so the impression given to people arriving in Devon on the M5 will be very unattractive - warehouses, commercial buildings and then a crowd of houses abutting onto the edge of the motorway, deeply unattractive and damaging to Devon's image. The housing proposals between the Halfway House and Waterloo Cross will obviously have an enormous impact on Willand and Uffculme, and it is ludicrous to suggest otherwise. Issues relating to traffic, schools, medical services, transport services, green spaces, safe cycling routes all have to be resolved. If option 2a is chosen then I see no need for any further development in the existing village of Willand and would object to all the small schemes in the plan. Furthermore, it is my understanding that Cullompton council is keen for the 2b option to be viewed positively. If option 1 is adopted then my views on the development proposals within Willand Parish are: all the sites are outside the current settlement area; all the sites have significant problems with either access or infrastructure. 1. Quick's Farm: probably the least objectionable proposal, though it is outside the settlement limit, and a very long way from any village resources - shops, school, village hall etc. Also, the housing density proposed is too great. There are real problems with access - the stump of road from the Willand Moor estate will, I assume be extended, giving very poor access onto Willand Moor Road, just by a children's playground. Willand Moor Road is not suitable to take the increased amount of traffic. The Uffculme Road would have to be altered to incorporate cycle and safe pedestrian access, and traffic calming - which has implications for the heavy traffic going along to the factory in Uffculme and the Industrial Estates along the road. 2. Land along the B3181 between the Woodland Trust and the Garage. 39 affordable houses. Again I question the housing density. And what green spaces will be left for play areas. 3. Land east of M5 adjacent to Meadow Park. 142 houses. If the land along the B3181 is developed there is some sense in also permitting this development, which would lie behind it. However it is a very large development which will impact considerably on the people of Meadow Park. Again the density needs looking at, as does the access. Currently there is a well used public footpath bordering this site and passing through a small conserved wooded area. Even if the footpath is re-routed, it will no longer be a pleasant countryside walk bordered by trees and fields, and this would mean a significant loss of amenity for the people of that part of Willand. Furthermore, what measures would be taken to shield the houses nearest the motorway from noise and fumes. Should houses be built so close to a very busy motorway? There are all the usual concerns about the sewage drain provision, the drainage of surface water, the infrastructure needed to support such a large development. And, of course, the fact that Willand School is full to overcapacity and simply cannot accommodate more children. Overall, this is too big a development in a village that has already had huge development, without adequate infrastructure provision in the past. 4. Dean Hill Rd, between the M5 and the railway. 54 houses. This is a mad proposal. 54 houses is ludicrously out of proportion to the current housing there. The site is crammed in between the railway and the motorway - why would anyone choose to live there unless desperate. There is currently no mains sewage or drainage to the existing houses, so it's difficult to see how this would be managed in the proposed new build. The traffic access onto the B3181 would be downright dangerous, and in the other direction the road becomes rural, single track, with deep ditches on both sides and it also crosses the railway at two narrow angled bridges. It is totally unsuitable for the traffic that the development would engender. The proposal has nothing to recommend it. 5. Lloyd Maunder, backing onto the railway. 41 houses. This development is at the other end of the same lane as in site 4., and all the same objections regarding traffic apply here too. The other access from this site would be through factories to join the small roundabout on the Halberton road. Is it really appropriate to cram houses in between motorway and railway and also in such close proximity to factories which have in the past been the subject of many complaints regarding smells and emissions. As I have said housing is not just bricks and mortar, it's about people's quality of life and this site is inappropriate for housing development. 6. Willand Industrial Estate. The current site, Mid-Devon Business Park has been open now for several years and has not been anywhere near fully developed. Where is the demand for further development? 7. Lloyd Maunder (Two Sisters) industrial development. Any development that encroaches onto a flood plain should be refused permission.

2. The Council adopted its Development Management Local Plan (LP3) in October 2013. This plan is included in the options consultation without modification, but pages 102-107 explain where amendments or new policies are being considered. Do you have anything to say about the amendments or new policies being considered, or comments about the existing adopted policies included within the consultation document?

No Response

1. NOTE: RESPONSES CANNOT BE REGISTERED WITHOUT A NAME AND ADDRESS Name

Sarah Mohun

2. Please provide your postal address

House No - Barnwell

Address 1 - Jaycroft

Address 2 - Willand

Postcode - EX15 2RE