

Customer Feedback

Design Survey Collect Responses **Analyze Results**

- [View Summary](#)
- [Browse Responses](#)
- [Filter Responses](#)
- [Crosstab Responses](#)
- [Download Responses](#)
- [Share Responses](#)

Default Report

Displaying 139 of 152 respondents

Response Type: Normal Response	Collector: Web Link (Web Link)
Custom Value: empty	IP Address: 90.203.90.184
Response Started: Sunday, March 23, 2014 7:24:47 PM	Response Modified: Sunday, March 23, 2014 8:02:49 PM

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

Yes

A structured and substantiated approach is considered appropriate, however, I consider that the published dwelling numbers are premature until the Strategic Housing Market Assessment has been completed.

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

Please note that the status and protection of the AONB should not be diminished (the impact of, in and around it in terms of visual intrusion and the effect of increased development and the resultant car travel on the environment)

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?

Other

I support Option 1, with the focus after 2026 on option 2; however, the development allocation in rural areas should be restricted to the option 2 figure of 1,040 less previously allocated / approved sites / dwellings as long as the Strategic Housing Market Assessment substantiates this.

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(a) - Land at Junction 27 and adjoining Wiland

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

I am in favour of either Option 2 sites or an element of both. There is good infrastructure, roads, rail, airport and public transport, however, there is a need to improve the retail, employment, commercial and light industrial aspect of this options.

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?

Object

As detailed above, the figures as published are premature, they should be defined by the results of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment. Do not lose sight of the fact that affordable housing needs to be prioritised. Thought should be given to the balance of community, types and range of housing. The type of property and associated developments should reflect the individual settlements requirements as identified by their own up to date housing needs survey. This is particularly relevant in rural areas.

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?

Support

The retail should not compete with or diminish town centre. The commercial, light industrial should be increased. S8 is pivotal. The vitality and viability of town centres should be pivotal focus of the policy.

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

I strongly support this policy, all proposed development should be linked to sustainable principles, this is of paramount importance. The policy for proposed development in the AONB, National Parks and countryside should be resisted where it adversely impacts on any environmental, social or economic aspects with an increased level of scrutiny relating to visual impact, increased flooding, increased traffic or loss of greenfield space.

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?

Support

Other

The approach should continue to be Town centric, cascading to large settlements which can meet the sustainable development criteria with suitable infrastructure paramount. Increased standards of scrutiny as detailed reference Policy S10 above. The policy for proposed development in the AONB, National Parks and countryside should be resisted where it adversely impacts on any environmental, social or economic aspects with an increased level of scrutiny relating to visual impact, increased flooding, increased traffic or loss of greenfield space.

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.

The following response focuses on the proposed allocations for Hemyock Development in Hemyock would fail the criteria set out in the Local Plan for the following reasons - EXISTING FACILITIES - the school and medical centre are close to or over capacity. EMPLOYMENT - There is limited existing employment and no new employment is proposed, the previous study (July 2007 Cullm Development Plan Document) proposed a balanced employment and housing approach based on smaller sites including a higher proportion of affordable housing, which I consider to be more in keeping with a structured and appropriate growth for the village. HIGHWAYS & TRANSPORT - poor public transport links to key destinations, development would increase the need to travel by car therefore increasing carbon emission. The through traffic reduces the capacity of current highways due to the high proportion of commercial vehicles servicing neighbouring Districts, particularly the Dunkswell Airfield and Cullmhead industrial estates (East Devon/Somerset). The settlement is remote and the highways are poor quality and narrow and steep due to the topography. INFRASTRUCTURE - the current infrastructure cannot accommodate more sewerage or storm water drainage. The village is no longer self sufficient (no diesel/fuel and has no mains gas. ENVIRONMENT - Any development would have a detrimental affect on the visual and ecological species rich AONB. Climate change has seen regular flooding in the village already. The proposed development on the East side of the village would exacerbate the flooding problems. The proposed development would have a negative visual impact on the AONB as highlighted in the July 2007 Cullm Development Plan Document. In summary, I object to the scale of development proposed for the key reason that the purely residential approach at the end of the road infrastructure in an AONB is not sustainable against the criteria outlined in the Local plan review document.

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

Stephen Major

2. Please provide your postal address

House No - 1

Address 1 - Higher Mead

Address 2 - Hemyock

Town - Cullompton

Postcode - EX15 3QJ