

## Q13 Do you have any further comments on the Masterplan SPD document?

Answered: 75 Skipped: 32

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	<p>We act on behalf of Progress Land Ltd. The above documents have been published for consultation and we wish to make representations accordingly. As the Council are aware, our Client has an interest in land situated adjacent to Honiton Road, Cullompton. It sits within the East Cullompton site allocation in the emerging Local Plan (covered by draft allocation policy CU7 and associated policies) and is integral to it. To that effect our Client supports the policy relating to the allocation in the emerging Local Plan (and related policies) and the wider Garden Village proposals. Our Client has been part of a series of ongoing landowner (and/or their representatives) discussion meetings with the Council and other landowners, the purpose of which is to ensure that if and when the relevant policies are adopted then the allocation has every chance of being delivered. Early dialogue with the landowners has been encouraged and from our Clients perspective the meetings have so far proved to be both useful and informative. In that respect, we do not anticipate either document to identify any particular issues now or in the future with which our Client will disagree or indeed have any significant concerns. That said, both documents are intended to examine proposals for development at East Cullompton and the wider Garden Village and to that effect it is useful to provide observations accordingly. An initial point to make, relevant to both documents, is that it is recognised that there is a close relationship and synergy between the East Cullompton allocation as proposed in the emerging Mid Devon District Council Local Plan and the Garden Village which is expected to be brought forward via the Greater Exeter Strategic Plan (GESP). However, as stated in both documents, the actual process and procedure by which each proposal will be delivered differs i.e. Local Plan and GESP. In that context, it is clear that the timescales for the delivery of the allocation in the emerging Local Plan differs from that of the wider Garden Village via GESP. In our view, the Masterplan being produced in relation to the delivery of the allocation, whilst at the same time setting principles for development of the wider Garden Village, should not be delayed until that wider Garden Village is brought forward via GESP. The Masterplan for the East Cullompton allocation identified in the Local Plan should be a freestanding document. The Local Plan will anticipate rates of delivery in order to achieve a suitable housing land supply. That rate of delivery cannot be distorted through any delay with the delivery of the Garden Village should that occur. While there is a timetable in place for GESP to be brought forward there is potential for it to be delayed. We agree that the Masterplan should guide development within the allocation (to some extent) and it can also, at the same time, provide guiding principles to the Garden Village. However, there must be a degree of independence between the two. We also note at that the Vision and Concept document at P.6 states that the draft allocation requires comprehensive master planning and the adoption of a Masterplan as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) before any planning application is determined and that the Masterplan is subject to at least two phases of public consultation. Whilst we understand the rationale behind that approach we request that consideration be given to releasing any site and granting planning permission where it is clear that i) the objectives of the Masterplan and the Garden Village concept are clearly going to be met and ii) where the delivery of the allocation and Garden Village are not going to be prejudiced through the delivery of a particular site.</p>	3/5/2019 11:07 AM

## East Cullompton Masterplan SPD Issues Opportunities & Concepts (amended version)

2	<p>This is the consultation response of the Exeter Diocesan Board of Finance (EDBF), the administrative arm of the Diocese of Exeter (which is the Church of England in Devon), in respect of the 'East Cullompton Masterplan SPD: Issues, Opportunities and Concepts' and 'Culm Garden Village: Vision and Concept' documents. Although these documents and their attendant consultation processes are separate, referring as they do to two different stages in the planning process, they are of course closely related and mutually dependent. This response relates to elements of both documents and, crucially, the relationship between them. Please would you therefore attribute this response to both consultation processes. I refer you to our responses submitted to the Local Plan Review (April 2015), in which we expressed support for the provisions of policy DM23 and supporting para 4.70, and also subsequently in February 2017, particularly in as much as they refer to 'East Cullompton'. The Diocese of Exeter is committed to engage constructively with the emerging proposals for East Cullompton / the Culm Garden Village and to work with the local parish of St Andrew's Cullompton for the benefit of the residents of the Garden Village, as well as of the town as a whole. This is the pattern in long-established, historically-developed parishes and communities throughout Devon and the EDBF has in the last 15 years developed a substantial record of engagement with large scale new housing areas around the County (for example, in Cranbrook, Sherford and Newcourt). This commitment to future populations has led to joint planning and working with a range of partners and ultimately the early and effective delivery of services, both statutory and non-statutory, in the new communities themselves. The EDBF seeks to play a similar role in respect of East Cullompton / the Culm Garden Village. It would also help for the phraseology and vocabulary to be mutually consistent. The wording in the 'Vision and Concept' ("services and facilities will be provided, including") is stronger and more determinative than the wording in the Masterplan SPD ("this could include") and therefore would be preferable in both documents. Furthermore, the Engagement section of the 'Vision and Concept' document refers to a 'church', and the 'well connected' key principle in the same document refers to 'faith spaces'. The Masterplan SPD, on the other hand, refers to 'worship space'. The wording that is often adopted in other similar planning processes is 'places of worship' (as in the aforementioned para 4.70 of the Local Plan), and our consultation responses therefore relate to the planning and delivery of services that relate to a 'Christian place of worship'. Finally, as was expressed in our consultation responses to the Local Plan, we are strongly supportive of the intention that the Masterplan SPD should fully take into account the longer-term context of the Culm Garden Village. The quantum, arrangement, design and sequencing of the community-focussed services and facilities, from the earliest planning phases onwards, need to correspond as far as is possible to the over-arching goal of a permanently sustainable garden village, with all of the same beneficial characteristics as those to be found in historically-developed communities of a similar size throughout Devon.</p>	3/5/2019 10:56 AM
3	<p>Only to re-iterate the size and extent. We feel it is too large and we would not want to see any encroachment on Kentisbeare Parish boundaries.</p>	3/4/2019 5:34 PM
4	<p>Pylons, escarpments and rivers all affect East Cullompton plans. There is a need for care in locating green infrastructure with such pylons and escarpments that will make the green space less usable. There needs to be better planning for being offices, business and commerce in order that local people can work locally. There also needs to be a shopping plaza in East Cullompton to reduce vehicle traffic over the M5. The proposed secondary school needs to be located within the Cullompton Parish boundary.</p>	3/4/2019 4:39 PM
5	<p>As above, the development is oversized.</p>	3/4/2019 4:19 PM
6	<p>As above.</p>	3/4/2019 4:12 PM
7	<p>Think it's too large.</p>	3/4/2019 4:06 PM
8	<p>It is already blindingly clear that the road and infrastructure cannot facilitate any more vehicles.</p>	3/4/2019 3:25 PM
9	<p>It is already blindingly clear that the road and infrastructure cannot facilitate any more vehicles.</p>	3/4/2019 3:24 PM
10	<p>While the Cullompton development reluctantly acceptable I consider the wider "Garden Village" to be wholly unnecessary and far too big.</p>	3/1/2019 8:59 PM
11	<p>While the Cullompton development reluctantly acceptable I consider the wider "Garden Village" to be wholly unnecessary and far too big.</p>	3/1/2019 8:58 PM
12	<p>The proposed garden village will be bisected by the A373 Honiton Road. This will be major block to the true integration of developments to the north and south of the road, without careful planning!</p>	3/1/2019 8:51 PM
13	<p>Good plan to have 2 consultations at the same time and have to get people to ask for paper copies. Most people don't have a clue what is going on and hiding the display on the back of the other one helps hide it more. We don't all use social media so give all an equal chance to have a say</p>	3/1/2019 7:59 PM

## East Cullompton Masterplan SPD Issues Opportunities & Concepts (amended version)

14	Infrastructure first. Clear and wide separation from Kentisbeare. Connection to and integration with Cullompton to avoid the existing town becoming the 'wrong side of the tracks'. Use s106 payments from developers to rejuvenate the existing town centre. Reopening the train station will be a fundamentally important step towards reducing M5 traffic by enabling commuting to/from Exeter and should be a priority/pre-condition.	3/1/2019 6:39 PM
15	The green village is too large - will have a huge negative impact on local farming hamlets and villages. The disruption will be terrible, congestion on A373 will be appalling. The green village must not go over Kentisbeare's parish boundary and engulf our village. Buffer zone must not have facilities but cut number of houses and include them in the village.	3/1/2019 3:35 PM
16	My biggest reservation is accessibility. The M5 is already busy most of the time - and even more so in the summer and holiday periods. The new development may bring an average of 2 cars per household - i.e. up to 10,000 additional cars. How will the road network cope? There is already a considerable build up of traffic at the motorway junction in the mornings and late afternoons. It will almost certainly be chaotic. In addition, the other access road - the A373 - is already totally inadequate, especially beyond Keepers Cottage. It is worse than many B roads. Finally, the B3181 will become even busier, and its limitations will be exposed. I really think the development is far too big for the roads that serve it.	3/1/2019 3:12 PM
17	Don't do it until there are jobs and the housing is needed. No more second homes in the UK!!	3/1/2019 1:06 AM
18	It is noted on page 20 that South West Water has indicated that foul drainage would be directed 3km to the north to Willand Sewage Works. Some planned provision will need to be made to improve and mitigate vehicle access to that site as current movements are through housing estates and then a narrow lane where currently lorries are breaking down the road edges and affecting drainage. Some clear indications need to be available as to what happens if there is a failure at the pumping station?	2/28/2019 11:14 PM
19	Lacking in detail. Fails to mention this development is part of a social & ethnic cleansing exercise by Birmingham & Manchester councils. Does Mid Devon Council want to be part of something that sounds similar to what happened in Germany in the 1930's	2/28/2019 10:58 PM
20	Development is far too large, creates strain on local communities and will make the area difficult to navigate by road	2/28/2019 10:43 PM
21	Don't start it until the existing developments and infrastructure are in place.	2/28/2019 10:05 PM
22	Developments on this scale will always detract from the local environment, they are not environmentally sustainable, and will increase traffic, pressures on resources (natural and built), and will have a negative impact on rural life increasing noise and light pollution and reducing air quality. There are also significant commercial pressures on developments of this type to cut back on good intentions in order to maximise profits and dividends to shareholders.	2/28/2019 9:11 PM
23	I fee it would be important to use the all through school as an opportunity to promote learning as a lifelong concept through education from early years and into retirement through mixed age usage, dementia friendly / third age integration and link it with good mental and physical health.	2/28/2019 8:53 PM
24	It should be scaled right back to look at the actual area needs not the councils quota for new housing. The infrastructure needs to be the first focus and the council should stop with the marketing ploys and tell residence the clear facts with timescales as far as what would come first, then what, then what. The dangling carrot of a train station on the documentation is misleading as I understand this is not in scope and feasibility studies have not been looked at and is not on network rails radar. Be CLEARER and give people the facts rather than trying to SELL them something in over complicated and nonsense, contradicting jargon.	2/28/2019 8:18 PM
25	The garden village not to expand into the green buffer landscape area, as much green space as possible, a good traffic system	2/28/2019 8:00 PM
26	Much of the design seems to be done by those who rarely visit Cullompton or live in areas where any development will not affect them significantly. See earlier comments about where will the Garden Village traffic go. Sorensen from Highways said at Cullompton Town Council meeting that the aim was that Honiton Road would ultimately be a secondary route into Cullompton and traffic there should REDUCE, especially for heavy traffic.	2/28/2019 6:41 PM
27	well done	2/28/2019 6:03 PM
28	no	2/28/2019 5:07 PM

## East Cullompton Masterplan SPD Issues Opportunities & Concepts (amended version)

29	To conclude, I am not against building new properties, after all, people have to live somewhere, but without due consideration of some , if not all of the above then I would say that we will be making a mistake and will store up problems for the future generation.'	2/28/2019 4:09 PM
30	Not taking local views on board, cannot see how it is deliverable when even the possible motorway Junction is in the paper at £80-£120,000,000	2/28/2019 2:53 PM
31	No additional comments.	2/28/2019 2:39 PM
32	The plan is far too ambitious in size and will ruin the beautiful rural nature of this area for ever, please scale back to original size and stop after stage 1	2/28/2019 10:15 AM
33	No	2/27/2019 11:34 PM
34	Only as previous	2/27/2019 10:22 PM
35	It makes no mention of future development after 2033. The scope of this area is very large and apparently incompatible with the term "Village". The Countryside around Cullompton will be impacted in a major way that cannot be called enhanced.	2/27/2019 9:01 PM
36	Public consultation is required for Phase 2 of the build as there didn't appear to be any consultation on the revised plan of the original area.	2/27/2019 1:26 PM
37	The principle of Garden towns and in this case village is a good one and certainly a philosophy that can usefully inform planning in the 21st century. However my overall feeling, having read the plans, is that there are several factors which should not be overlooked. 1. The cost of land now tends to mean developers cram properties closely together for more appealing profit margins. The sense of garden village would soon be lost. 2. There is no commitment at this stage to ALL properties having the BEST credentials regarding insulation and carbon emissions. For all future development this is vital. 3.The proposed Garden village does not actually meet the governments own definition...they should " be distinct new places with their own community facilities." They should be "a new discrete settlement , not an extension of an existing town or village." The whole plan as conceived looks just like a huge add on to Cullompton and comments made in the plan about integrating with Cullompton are contradictory to the government's definition.	2/27/2019 11:26 AM
38	1 There has to be a catchment based study to assess the flood risks of the proposed development 2 there needs to be far more attention given to NFM and SuDs if the scheme is to be granted permission 3 There needs to be massive forward funding of critical road infrastructure 4 There needs to be much more engagement with South West Water about critical water and sewerage assets and how such a development can be accommodated and what capex they will need to make improvements to existing assets 4 There needs to be engagement with the EA about the hydrologiacla nature of the proposed scheme area and how such aquifers are properly safe-guarded 5 There needs to be much more realism around delivery of J28a, the relief road and massive improvement of the A373	2/27/2019 10:24 AM
39	The size of this proposed development is out of keeping with its location, and poses issues in terms of flooding traffic control and general transport. The provision of other amenities such as healthcare is not guaranteed and non-provision of this will place an unmanageable burden upon the ocal services which are already struggling to cope.	2/26/2019 9:39 PM
40	The question should be if local residents approve the garden village at all. Not just what development is going to look like.	2/26/2019 7:47 PM
41	This consultation should be about whether we approve of a garden village rather than what it entails.	2/26/2019 7:47 PM
42	This consultation should be seeking residents' approval for a Garden Village not consulting on how it will look	2/26/2019 7:47 PM
43	need to ensure a clear and all encompassing plan with all on board and suitable and something that will compliment the existing surroundings and facilities	2/26/2019 7:41 PM
44	Too big.	2/26/2019 4:36 PM
45	Pylons and escarpments and rivers affect East Cully plans. Need to be careful that putting green infrastructure under pylons prevents creating better larger more usable public green space. Jobs. Need better plans for bringing in offices, business, commerce, so people can work locally. Also need new shopping plaza in East Cully. Secondary school site needs to be kept within Cullompton Parish not Kentisbeare Parish.	2/26/2019 4:20 PM
46	No additional comments.	2/26/2019 10:08 AM

## East Cullompton Masterplan SPD Issues Opportunities & Concepts (amended version)

47	the scheme is to large and doesn't include enough consideration to traffic, flooding and impact upon the existing local community	2/25/2019 10:35 PM
48	No	2/24/2019 5:54 PM
49	Too many houses are to be built.	2/24/2019 5:08 PM
50	Insufficient account has been taken of the impact on the parishes outside Cullompton. The housing demand has been inflated and the problems of the road network and flooding have been downplayed.	2/24/2019 3:53 PM
51	it is very poorly conceived, with regard both to need and execution. It has not been properly consulted on and as such should be revisited from scratch following a proper planning process.	2/24/2019 3:29 PM
52	No mention of or provision for emergency services and Policing included.	2/22/2019 10:32 PM
53	No development creating occupancy and consequential increased resident traffic should be undertaken until such time as transport links have been developed/improved. In particular J28A should be completed first or the combination of pre existing traffic, displaced traffic and commercial traffic created by the building work will cause gridlock during the day. Given the the fact that a flood plain is being used for part of this development there must be a credible scheme to mitigate the flood risk both at the development site and higher surrounding communities through which such waters currently flow. Covering acres of undeveloped land with concrete will eliminate a natural method of drainage and surface water dissipation for which there will have to be a viable alternative.	2/21/2019 10:01 PM
54	The "improved" M5 J28 is already inadequate. No new building should start until an adequate junction has been created. I was informed at the Cullompton Library road show yesterday (19th Feb) that your traffic planners state that the existing junction "works" and that it could cope with an additional 500 dwellings being built down the A373. This is simply incorrect and when the additional traffic fro those 500 houses is added to all the additional construction traffic from both the A373 development and the J27 "Gateway to Devon" development are ongoing there will be no sensible route to take to and from the M5. Horn Road and Long Moor are already used as rat runs to avoid J28 and many of this living in Willand already go backwards to J27 in order to get to Exeter rather than try to access J28.	2/20/2019 7:22 PM
55	Speed limit on A373 will need to be reduced including and beyond the proposed settlement limit. At the planning stage, the impact on existing properties in the proposed area should be minimised in consultation with the property owners whose house values will be diminished by the development. This to be achieved by substantial green buffers around the boundary, locating low impact facilities such as allotments near the houses (i.e. north of the houses at Newlands Cottages).	2/20/2019 1:33 PM
56	Yes. We need tonget J28 sorted before any development starts. Cullompton/ Culm Garden Village facilities must be within their own bounds. Please dont ruin the character, identity and beauty of the parish of Kentisbeare and other surrounding villages	2/19/2019 11:14 PM
57	A smaller number of properties would have less impact on the beautiful surroundings. Not building on any of the land would keep the surroundings beautiful. we moved here in a Village not to be engulfed by a huge monster of construction and disruption for years to come.	2/19/2019 7:15 PM
58	Yes, please ensure that any development only proceeds with the consent of the local communities. The current proposal does not have this consent and should be stopped	2/18/2019 2:06 PM
59	As in 12 above!! This is 13 and shows the consideration given to this document! There is no factual documented support for any of these proposals. It is all supported by a "need for more housing"! Where are the new owners going to come from? London by cashing in large capital gains? Young people from the South West or just more housing. The case is not justified nor supported in this exhibition. Employment is expected to materialize and the M5 to take any traffic growth. In any new development, the infrastructure should come first to match the plan as per Milton Keynes.	2/15/2019 3:58 PM
60	Search area should stop west of Horn Road and not go eastwards at all. Green belt between the development area and Horn Road. Green belt immediately adjacent to A373 (both sides). I see no reason to develop right up to the A road.	2/14/2019 3:55 PM
61	No building before infrastructure. If no new school then this is doubly important as at present there is not even safe pedestrian access across J28.	2/14/2019 3:46 PM
62	Please could space be allocated for a church and priest (as in Cranbrook) to live in and work for the good of the community.	2/12/2019 5:07 PM

## East Cullompton Masterplan SPD Issues Opportunities & Concepts (amended version)

63	The proposed Cullompton relief road is essential - to help manage the additional traffic to/from Culm Garden Village. An adequate supermarket is essential as Aldi car park already too small. Ensuring Cullompton town is effectively integrated via pedestrian or cycle routes.	2/12/2019 4:55 PM
64	Please can you provide clarity on the areas of uncertainty flagged, especially what the actual planned development footprint is.	2/11/2019 7:39 PM
65	You need to listen to people and scrap this appalling idea and stop being so greedy. Do you really think that company's will want to relocate to this area. This area is a farming area and that is why most of us live in the area as we want to see green fields and not concrete jungles, if we wanted that then we would move to Exeter!	2/8/2019 12:58 AM
66	Nope, if you have read my comments this far you will no I have absolutely no support for this or faith in a local authority to provide a decent outcome	2/7/2019 8:46 PM
67	My biggest concern is the provision of adequate infrastructure to overcome the bottle neck that access to the M5 and Cullompton presents (already a problem). The redevelopment of Cullomton as a viable shopping area should be a priority.	2/7/2019 2:27 PM
68	The planners should look at the traffic problems we already have getting over the motorway bridge and then into Cullompton with traffic also coming from the industrial estate near the motorway bridge. Furthmore closing the small bridge from Cullompton to Mutterton is further madness as it will cause even more congestion to the existiting problem .This would be before people live there as the building work will create traffic chaos alone!	2/7/2019 2:20 PM
69	The so-called garden village should not be built.	2/6/2019 9:04 AM
70	No	2/6/2019 6:26 AM
71	no	2/5/2019 8:58 PM
72	I am very unhappy about it. I think I have made that clear.	2/4/2019 7:04 PM
73	Please just get on with it and ensure that you use every opportunity to also get improvements to transport networks into Exeter and Taunton, particularly the provision of a station	2/3/2019 4:39 PM
74	It is a chronic waste of public time money and effort. It is a political stunt to solve a non-existent problem. Only politicians, planners and developers stand to gain anything.	2/3/2019 3:19 PM
75	As it stands, nothing in the document appears to offer any benefit to the current residents of Cullompton and surrounding area; therefore, as a Cullompton resident, I cannot support it. Furthermore, most of the questions in the survey are heavily loaded around laudable principles that reasonable people would struggle to disagree with and worded in such a way as to ensure a desired result. The aims and aspirations set out in the document may be attractive and appeal to prospective residents of the garden village, however there is little or nothing of relevance to the current population of Cullompton and no mention whatsoever of the impact this development will have on the existing town.	2/1/2019 4:31 PM