

Customer Feedback

Design Survey Collect Responses **Analyze Results**

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

Default Report  
 Displaying 144 of 152 respondents

**Response Type:**  
Normal Response

**Collector:**  
Web Link (Web Link)

**Custom Value:**  
empty

**IP Address:**  
31 53 55 220

**Response Started:**  
Sunday, March 23, 2014 6:07:42 PM

**Response Modified:**  
Sunday, March 23, 2014 10:06:26 PM

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

No

In principle, the Vision and Spatial Strategy is generally sound. But closer examination of the Plan shows that developers have put forward sites in areas where MDDC have previously approved lots of development and where they think they are most likely to succeed in future. What else would explain the stark contrast between the proposals for Uffculme and Willand and those for Kentisbeare and Holcombe Rogus? Instead of continuing to add to areas that have had lots of development but little investment in their infrastructure, MDDC should aim to achieve a more even distribution across the district. This is not what big developers want; they want economies of scale and to maximise their profits. It is not what our councils want: they want to minimise their costs and get developers to pay for infrastructure improvements; and it is not what many of the people living in the most desirable and valuable areas and properties want. MDDC should certainly develop underused and brownfield sites within the towns in preference to greenfield land, and making our towns more vibrant is highly desirable and challenging. But it should be allowing more, smaller-scale, original development in small villages too, otherwise these risk being the preserve of the retired and the wealthy.

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

Other

In the past two years, I have taken part in consultations on the Devon Minerals Plan, the Devon Waste Plan and a retrospective planning application for a "strategic" aggregates plant to serve Devon's construction market. I am thoroughly weary of the term sustainable. Councils and developers/operators have a far more flexible view of what this means in practice than people who have to live with the consequences of their decisions, and it is essentially meaningless. When Aggregate Industries wanted to reduce their costs, they shut a quarry and plant in Exeter and sold the site to housing developers. They extended their Uffculme blockworks, got retrospective planning permission and now HGVs bring 200 tonnes of aggregates from Plymouth, Dorset and East Devon to Uffculme for bagging and then it is exported again: very little of it is used in Mid Devon. Devon County Council said this was sustainable, and doubtless Mid Devon District Council will also decide that applications it cannot afford, or does not want to, challenge will be sustainable too.

**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

As previously stated, the council should be more much amenable to applications in smaller villages. The countryside should be a place where change is carefully and sensitively managed, but it does happen. In too many Devon villages, the social and demographic mix is unbalanced, and the well-off retired are able to challenge development because, unlike younger, working people they have the time to do so. They also have a strong incentive to preserve the value of their properties. People aspire to live in villages, and younger people should have more opportunities to do this in Mid Devon instead of having to live in small, unimaginatively designed homes on large housing estates.

**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)

Local representatives in Cullompton have expressed support for development east of Junction 28, and as part of that area has previously been developed, it should be preferred to greenfield sites. However, Mid Devon and Devon County Council must ensure that the infrastructure to support more development is properly planned and resourced as this has clearly not been the case in other parts of the town. No local representatives from Willand, Uffculme and Burlescombe have expressed support for plans to develop land at Junction 27 and adjoining Willand, and MDDC has already permitted extensive commercial and residential development in and around Willand and Uffculme, which have the largest populations in Mid Devon after the 3 towns. MDDC and DCC have patently failed to "protect and enhance their environmental assets, including their character, biodiversity, heritage and setting", and infrastructures improvements commensurate with the level of development permitted have never been funded and delivered. The sums of money being made available for improvements to Junction 27 are relatively small, and I have enquired of the head of planning at Devon County Council whether any money has been budgeted to improve the mini-roundabout at Waterloo Cross. It has not. Data gathered for a transport assessment for Aggregate Industries' planning application last year indicated that it will be nearing capacity in 2018, and as MDDC and DCC have permitted businesses that operate large numbers of HGVs and OGVs, significant investment in Junction 27, the A38 and the B3181 will be required if any large development is permitted. Population statistics for Mid Devon show that, when added together, the largest parishes east of Junction 27 comprise 11,000 people. The principal means by which they get to the biggest town in the district, the nearest city and the railway station is via Junction 27. Plans to develop close to it must be rigorously assessed and no development should be permitted without significant investment in the roads.

**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

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?

Object

Given the number of premises to let in our towns and the spaces available in business parks, it is very difficult to understand why the council sees a need for so much more space over the plan period.

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?

No Response

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.

No Response

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

Joanne Ferguson

2. Please provide your postal address

House No - Down Farm

Address 1 - Appledore

Address 2 - Burlescombe

Town - Tiverton

Postcode - EX16 7LF