

Q10 Do you have any other comments on the document?

Answered: 182 Skipped: 123

#	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. We have no particular comments to make regarding the Vision and Concept suffice to say that there must be consistency between the two and the Garden Vision must avoid any conflict with the Masterplan moving forward.</p>	3/5/2019 11:07 AM

Culm Garden Village Vision & Concept (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 10:57 AM
3	<p>By way of context, my wife was born in Kentisbeare and we have lived in the Parish for over 12 years. We spent our careers working locally in local government and the NHS both holding Director level posts. We know this area intimately and have professional experience of these types of developments. My key comments are: 1. Be clearer that, given its location, this is not really a stand alone garden village but an extension of East Cullompton. 2. Hear the concerns about road infrastructure, especially M5 access and the A373 around Hembury. The idea that the proposed relief road will support a further 500 homes to the east of the motorway makes no sense to those of us grappling with J28 access now. 3. Limit the development to quality housing with no extension beyond Phase 1, and bring in more and varied employment opportunities by better use of the town and existing business parks. Cullompton centre is dying (or dead!) and needs to be tackled alongside new developments like this. 4. Be more specific as to how affordable housing (private or social) will be protected for local young people. Finally! - thanks for the opportunity for public consultation: it was very useful to meet the project officer and other members of staff working on the proposals.</p>	3/4/2019 5:28 PM
4	<p>The River Culm downstream of Cullompton was judged nationally as heavily polluted when I began work herein 1974 as a pollution prevention officer and freshwater ecologist. Since that time progressive efforts and investments have turned it into an unpolluted watercourse capable of supporting a wide range of flora and fauna including salmonid fish. There is nothing in the concept plan to explain how the organic loading from residents and industrial development will be dealt with. I am very concerned that the River Culm in this location will NOT have the volumetric capacity to receive the increases in sewage from this massive increase in growth of the population. We need to know from the environmental agency what will be the new required efficient standard from all forms of sewage discharges viz Final efficient settled sewage and storm sewage organic concentrations (BOD); suspended Solids; Anatomical nitrogen and phosphorus and nitrate. P Morly Williams B.Sc M.I.W.E.M</p>	3/4/2019 4:53 PM

Culm Garden Village Vision & Concept (amended version)

5	<p>Whilst I accept the need for this development, I fell strongly that it is too big for the area. Cullompton is expanding already to the west as well as this planned development, creating even more traffic congestion for junction 28. The proposed new road along the railway line will relieve Cullompton Town Centre but the A373 will be overloaded. The closure of Old Hill Bridge will make matters worse. The road to Honiton is not a safe road as is, and with extra traffic and cyclists it will become a very dangerous route. In fact all the minor roads east of Cullompton will be adversely affected. This plan appears to be good for Cullompton but not for us folks to the east.</p>	3/4/2019 4:53 PM
6	<p>At the moment, pre relief road, Cullompton is gridlocked at the certain times of day. The 'relief road' will just temporary fix before we descend into chaos I cant see what the attraction is for the area, or how anybody would be pleased to have this monster on our doorstep.</p>	3/4/2019 4:35 PM
7	<p>It does not address the Countryside Park. It puts all sports and leisure provision into Phase 2 which could be 20 years away. It does not provide clarity concerning new road infrastructure: o Western Relief Road. o New or significantly improved Junction 28/28A or links to Honiton Road. o Links to Old Hill and Duke Street. o Large areas of land in the proposed allocation unavailable, at this time, for development. o No mention of separate pedestrian and cycle links spanning the River Culm, M5 motorway and main railway line.</p>	3/4/2019 4:33 PM
8	<p>The proposal development is too big, it is not being built in the right place, there is no infrastructure that will reduce the congestion around Cullompton. To think that everyone will cycle to work from home along cycle paths to Cullompton is a crazy idea. Reality suggest, that each new home will have 2 cars each and whoever lives in the new homes will be driving to exterrand taunton to work. Planners need to think of this as these ideas of no vehicules is never going to happen.</p>	3/4/2019 4:17 PM
9	<p>It is senseless to suggest a development of this size in this rural area, and it is also unnecessary. Development such as this are more appropriately placed in different areas of the country where there is sufficient infrastructure and road remotely off. There should be policies in place to protect rural villages such as Kentisbeare which is one of the nicest villages in the area. Significant development as suggested will destroy this rural beautiful area. A green buffer zone is essential however it must have very strict controls on it so that the two settlements remain completely separate and the beauty of the rural area is not destroyed by this proposal.</p>	3/4/2019 4:06 PM
10	<p>I went to the meeting here and was utterly dismayed at the plans for the new "garden village" at Cullompton. The town has no decent shops, no services (not even the basics like a bank or Post Office), no employment and very expensive parking for someone who just wants to pick something up from the butcher. According to the plans, the people of Cullompton will lose the only green space they have when the new junction is built (if it ever gets built) on the CT fields. Where are these people going to work? Certainly not in Cullompton, and if they go to Honiton they'll have to suffer the worst "A" road in the world to get there. What I found particularly galling was the two pictures on the front of your brochures at the meeting - showing photographic views over the glorious countryside which you are proposing to cover in tarmac and houses. These are NOT houses being built for locals and we've all seen the dire results at Cranbrook - it's a disaster. If you go ahead and built it anyway, despite no-one I know thinking it's a great idea, are there plans to put in the infrastructure first? I doubt it. Will these homes be sold to private landlords to be rented at sums local people cannot afford, as happened at Cranbrook?</p>	3/4/2019 3:59 PM
11	<p>Very pretty, full of promises, no thought for locals or locality</p>	3/4/2019 3:42 PM
12	<p>What provision is there for doctors surgery etc for the numbers of people involved? Hope it would not like Newton Poppleford where new houses have been built -promised a surgery - but the NHS has not the money to build and staff it.</p>	3/4/2019 3:33 PM
13	<p>There is no evidence that the population is growing sufficiently to warrant such a big development so we must all assume it is merely to try and generate income for the Council (5,000 houses paying £1,000 in council tax is some £5 million per year). Building houses out towards Kentisbeare - i.e. into rural Devon goes against the ideals and wishes of every rural dweller. We do not think you have given the rural community sufficient respect on this issue. I can only assume it is cheaper and easier to develop in Kentisbeare's Parish rather than in Cullompton's area.</p>	3/4/2019 3:29 PM
14	<p>There is no evidence that the population is growing sufficiently to warrant such a big development so we must all assume it is merely to try and generate income for the Council (5,000 houses paying £1,000 in council tax is some £5 million per year). Building houses out towards Kentisbeare - i.e. into rural Devon goes against the ideals and wishes of every rural dweller. We do not think you have given the rural community sufficient respect on this issue. I can only assume it is cheaper and easier to develop in Kentisbeare's Parish rather than in Cullompton's area.</p>	3/4/2019 3:28 PM

Culm Garden Village Vision & Concept (amended version)

15	This questionnaire and the document do not tally. It is full of unrealistic propaganda too may if, but, maybe, possibilities and false promises that people don't believe and so many people are unlikely to complete this questionnaire.	3/1/2019 8:16 PM
16	The document is very difficult to believe and to understand, thereby dissuading many people from completing it.	3/1/2019 8:12 PM
17	Only that accessibility on line seems to be a problem	3/1/2019 8:03 PM
18	Yes. Why not print some copies for people to see, You only seem to be after the younger generation. My parents have not been able to get out and about to see all this so I guess it is "bad luck about their views" No signs in the library well no wonder people think you DON'T want people to see it. And now £300,000 for development and engagement, how much on re-printing documents rather than asking in the first place	3/1/2019 7:31 PM
19	Make infrastructure a precondition, to avoid aspirations being dropped. Follow Garden City planning principles and stick to them in perpetuity to avoid this turning into yet another badly connected, ill planned housing estate.	3/1/2019 7:15 PM
20	I think the whole project stinks, British Rail have no plan to include a station at Cullompton and the traffic at the motorway junction is already terrible and will not be eased regardless of what extra roads are put in. The A373 is dangerous enough already and can not take any more traffic into Honiton.	3/1/2019 6:23 PM
21	There is clearly on over-reliance on private investment to meet housing need. Rather than the council loaning some govt money to build with or working with small builders to deliver housing in existing villages it is appalling that you feel the need to build brand new ones. How will a large new estate of buildings benefit anyone, besides commuters to Exeter who will no doubt also do most of their shopping there. All Mid Devon council are achieving is turning Cullompton, Crediton and Tiverton into commuter towns. Eroding their cultural and historical significance and dissuading people from working and shopping in those towns. New transport links at this village obviously sound useful to those who live there, but what about existing villages? Why not build handfuls of housing in existing villages and generate funding for new bus routes around Culmstock, Hemyock, Kentisbeare etc which are currently very cut off. Surely it is more eco friendly to help existing villages and potential bus routes? You should not build the village under any circumstances, you will cause irreparable damage to greenbelt and it will not benefit enough local people.	3/1/2019 4:22 PM

Culm Garden Village Vision & Concept (amended version)

22	<p>After hearing about the above proposals over the last period of time and after attending most of the meetings included the recent consultations I would like to make you aware, in the strongest possible manner, our my objection to this plan. I find it difficult to structure this email to capture all the elements I wish to convey to you so please can I apologise in advance for the list format. 1) The requirement for housing on this scale - Nobody can deny that with a growing population we require new houses. What everybody is shocked about is the scale of the proposal. None of the advisors at the consultations can provide any proof that this amount of new housing is needed. Furthermore, they do not know where upwards of 30.000 people would come from or what would happen to the houses vacated. With Brexit looming over the county, inward migration will reduce, or so we are told reducing the need for housing further. 5) Destruction of prime farming land - Once again because of the ease of conversion prime farming land is being destroyed forever. Once this is gone there is no going back which is criminal. With the plans to leave Europe the production of food will become more important for us all. Once again, when building our garage sections of natural hedgerow could not be removed. Will this also apply to the planners and house builders or will it be one rule for one ----- 6) Employment opportunities - Although rates of unemployment in the area are good I am unsure how we will be able to support and supply employment to this increased population. Yes, people will commute, but this will put stain on the access to the transport links. This is where the sharing of the load with Junction 27, with its train station would help. The road the opposition way to Honiton is also poor. 7) Education – Schools in the area are good in are but can they support this influxes. Once again, the access to these facilities from this area is poor. (Cullompton/Uffculme). Will a new school be built or just houses? We feel we have been left in the dark with this from the start when Kentisbeare Parish Council where not informed of these plans. With more and more coming out of the woodwork weekly and the planned encroachment into the parish we wonder how intentional this was. I believe we, even after all the consultations are still being kept in the dark which is unfair. – • The Garden Village is only a future plan. But we need this to get funding for the junction 28 improvements for phase 1?? • We are only building out to Horn road. Oh no, it comes to Dead Road. • We are having a buffer zone but I have been invited to meet with Sport England about Sports facilities within the Buffer Zone/Parish of Kentisbeare. • We are told there will be natural breaks in the house plots. Turns out these are under the pylons where you cannot build. I think myself and the people to Kentisbeare and surround area would feel happier if they were given the truth and not treated in this way. We can then plan our futures to either live with this inevitable situation or plan differently. Stop treating me as a child and tell me the truth.</p>	3/1/2019 4:18 PM
23	<p>Regardless of some employment activities within the proposed development, or high speed broadband allowing home working, it is inevitable that a significant number of people in the proposed new development will be heading towards the M5 in the morning. They may work in Cullompton, or at places up and down the motorway. The effect of several thousand more cars heading to that junction will be significant and will lead to more congestion,. increased journey times, more pollution from idling vehicles and also make this part of mid Devon a less attractive place to live and do business. The lorries from the businesses in Kingsmill Industrial Park will find it even harder to get out, as some cars that have been queuing for longer will be less inclined to let lorries out, despite the advisory lines on the road. To prevent this the scale of the development should be reduced, possibly by having less housing density.</p>	3/1/2019 4:12 PM
24	<p>Firstly I would like to register my dismay at how awful the questionnaire you produced for the consultation is. It was totally obstructive. I would consider myself educated and found the questionnaire unusable (hence this email). Secondly you have not successfully illustrated the need for the projected houses within the local plan, let alone the Garden Village. Barrett's frequently sends us emails enticing us to buy a house in Saxon Fields by offering us tens of thousands of pounds discount, fully furnished with iPads and TVs. This would imply that they are struggling to sell the houses that are currently available and so how you justify a need for a further 5000 is a mystery. I was also very disappointed that Kentisbeare was not consulted in the initial stages of the bid for the Garden Village, especially when you have stated that you have local support. The only reason your garnered Cullompton Town Council's support is through false promises such as reopening the train station which you are not in a position to deliver, as confirmed by Network Rail.</p>	3/1/2019 4:04 PM
25	<p>Not sure we need that many houses.</p>	3/1/2019 3:53 PM
26	<p>No</p>	3/1/2019 3:50 PM
27	<p>I like the idea of the garden village but it must be very carefully planned - with a village centre with appropriate facilities: open area for meetings and outdoor events, village hall, shops, doctors surgery, schools, all accessible on foot or by bicycle with cars taking second place and a reasonable bus service to link the village with nearby towns.</p>	3/1/2019 3:43 PM

Culm Garden Village Vision & Concept (amended version)

28	Has there been any consideration of the effect of 5000 houses on the environment? 5000 dwellings = 10 to 15000 people 5000 dwellings = minimum of 5000 cars - most houses have 2+ cars. 5000 dwellings = huge waste problems An environmental disaster re our carbon footprint and pressure on already stretched amenities as I don't believe the new ones will be in place.	3/1/2019 3:26 PM
29	If a village of this size has to be built, and I don't know that there is a need for such a large number of new homes, I would like to think that an adequate road system (A373 widened) and new M5 junction to the south of Cullompton be built first to ameliorate construction traffic and traffic when the village is in use. Building of the Cullompton relief road will not, in itself, ease the current congestion at junction 28. The eastern buffer zone should be at the boundary of the Parish.	3/1/2019 3:15 PM
30	The garden city should be built at the junction 27 where there's a railway station and roads to the motorway are a lot better.	3/1/2019 2:58 PM
31	The proposed size of the Garden Village is excessive and has not been consulted on properly	3/1/2019 1:35 PM
32	Having excellent flood defence etc is crucial to overall plan. The areas which are highlighted for development are all subject to flooding with high rainfall. The green links could include a footpath to enable outdoor exercise for non sports minded people and also where dog owners could safely and sensibly exercise their dogs.	3/1/2019 1:34 PM
33	I am in favour of this development but i think we should talk about integration with all of mid Devon and in the future it will be part of the Exeter plan	3/1/2019 11:57 AM
34	None other than I have previously explain.	3/1/2019 12:56 AM
35	Do it for the right reasons, not to support the local Mid Devon pension pot.	3/1/2019 12:55 AM
36	There are a lot of fine words and jargon which will need looking at further in the future when the detail starts to appear from the vision.	2/28/2019 11:22 PM
37	The concepts and vision are all very laudable but the reality is likely to fall well short of this. My fear is that the cost of delivering the concepts and vision will not stack up financially. Inevitably the development will fall short on many areas and be likely any other speculative housing development.	2/28/2019 11:19 PM
38	Too large a development in an area that doesn't need it	2/28/2019 10:34 PM
39	I think you should be asking do want this scheme rather than comments on your plan	2/28/2019 9:59 PM
40	Yes. Please don't forget the infrastructure. It is dangerous parked on the inside lane of the motorway waiting to exit into Cullompton. It is a shame that the existing developments in Cullompton haven't been finished properly before attention and resource is diverted to the new development. There is a danger of two unfinished developments.	2/28/2019 9:55 PM
41	It is a nice piece of one sided propaganda.	2/28/2019 9:32 PM
42	The motorway improvements need to be made before the village is built	2/28/2019 9:14 PM
43	Developments like this have failed in the past to deliver on their vision, electing instead for large numbers of similar houses and minimal infrastructure development or improvements to maximise profits.	2/28/2019 8:43 PM
44	None at this time	2/28/2019 8:32 PM
45	It looks very thorough and really well presented - excellent mix of text and photos - well done.	2/28/2019 8:28 PM
46	The size is ridiculous. it should be scaled back, sustainable, with affordable environmentally friendly housing. I feel that the consultation on this proposal has not been carried out fairly and clearly. The documents produced are marketing tools rather than consulting tools with a lot of empty, wishy washy promises that when asked the responses have been, 'well that hasn't been confirmed' or 'We will do a feasibility study into it'. some of these things are fundamental to local people developing a full informed decision about something of this scale that will change the landscape, feel and ultimately way of life for the areas existing tenants and communities. Scale it back	2/28/2019 8:02 PM
47	The green buffer area to remain a green area, a park could be located there. The garden village to not expand into the green buffer area.	2/28/2019 7:47 PM
48	Well done	2/28/2019 6:24 PM

Please do add my strong objection to this project to the consultation process. We have 12 years to address the issue of global warming across the world and any development of any kind should be absolutely guaranteeing that it will reduce the use of cars and increases use of public transport. Improving road systems and increasing traffic flows is not a solution. It would be far more sensible to locate any development where there is already a railway station and good public transport system in place, not to add to the problems of a small town which is already struggling with traffic issues. The A373 is awful and an accident hotspot, particularly between Kentisbeare and Cullompton. Increasing the traffic on this road is not going to be addressed by improving access to the motorway. The buses are few and far between and cause increasing problems with the single track road. My husband is a chronic asthmatic whose symptoms are brought on primarily by traffic pollution. I feel very strongly about this and would like my objections noted. I have seen the letter and Network Rail have clearly stated that it is not their intention to open another railway station so close to Tiverton. For it to appear on your maps as if it is a foregone conclusion is very deceptive. I know that you don't live in the area but the traffic is horrific already. Sitting on the hard shoulder of the motorway for 20 minutes waiting to get onto the slip road to get off the motorway is really frightening and dangerous with the lorries thundering past. Our local builder was crashed into whilst queueing to get off at the Tiverton junction and with increased traffic trying to get to the station this is only going to get worse. The plan is fundamentally flawed and it is wrong of Mid Devon to be implying that a Railway station will be open when it runs contrary to the Rail Company. If you are that confident that it will then you should delay the close of the consultation period until you have that agreement confirmed in writing. I am writing to strongly object to the proposed garden city at Cullompton. I filled out the questionnaire broadly supportively because I believed your hype that the train station would be opened at Cullompton. You have basically lied on the prospectus because I have seen a letter from the rail company to say that they have NO plans to open the railway at Cullompton. To go ahead with such a project without a train station at Cullompton is an logistical and environmental disaster. Improving access onto the motorways is not enough. Both the Cullompton and Tiverton junctions already have traffic queueing back down the hard shoulders of the motorway and it takes an average of 50 minutes for me to get into Cullompton during rush hour traffic. This is weight of traffic getting into the town. Not getting onto the motorway. The pollution is horrific. The A373 is already a traffic nightmare with the road being single track in several places. It cannot take a higher volume of traffic. This cannot be allowed to go ahead.

The development is too big, it is inappropriate and too damaging to the environment, the current residents and the way of life in rural Mid Devon. The consultation process has lacked thought or respect for the current residents of the area. It has been an exclusive and inaccessible process – Thought on This Consultation. Mid Devon are pushing for most people to engage via the internet - the documents and the questionnaire being presented online. However - the majority of residents will be accessing these documents via mobile phones or tablets. Many people do not have printers. Therefore to answer the questionnaire, which repeatedly asks you to refer to, and comment on, chunks of the documents, is a difficult if not impossible task - and one which causes frustration and instant 'disengagement'! The vocabulary used is exclusive - you are all so familiar with your own jargon that you do not notice that you now speak the 'lingo' of marketing and housing policy - we don't. Therefore the questions appear dense and hard to follow... therefore frustration and instant 'disengagement' At one stage there were three separate versions of the questionnaire. One on the panels at the exhibitions, one in the brochure, one online – all different – result, confusion and disengagement. If people 'give up' on the questionnaire - there is no where that actually says "You can write a letter instead". I know that Mid Devon staff were certain that the intention to say this was there on page 35 of the concept document - but it does not actually say it! It says Written responses to this document can also be posted/ delivered to: Which most people are taking to mean - you can fill in the questionnaire as a written document and deliver or post it. It needs to say "or if you don't want to fill in the questionnaire you can write a letter or email and send it to"..... If you are genuine in your desire to 'engage' with residents, it would be really good if you went out for 'proof reading' - to people who are not involved with the project - to get some idea of how your words come across to those not living and breathing your world - i.e. outside your bubble. Understand how the material you produce is received by people who are not in your desk-top, IT savy, lingo speaking, project familiar, corporate world. If you are genuine in wanting to consult? and many think this is a big if. What happens if you don't like the feed back? The whole of this consultation has felt disorganised and confusing - the mixture of the Local Plan and the Garden Village has increased this. These events happening in tandem may be 'essential' - but the way it has been presented has led to an increased confusion - different maps, different questions, all looking the same - At the hall in Kentisbeare there were people staring at maps of the local plan saying - "this is the garden village then" ... and then nearly falling over when it was pointed out to them that no - that was just a possible phase 1. There must be a way that you could change Font, or background or something - to distinguish one from the other - not just rely on a subtle heading at the top?! There is an growing, if cynical view, that Mid Devon DC are doing all in their power to tick the box of public consultation in the way that is least likely to get a response - as they don't want a response. There is another growing view that it is pointless to respond - because you won't listen. I would love to have either of these views dispelled. I would also love each of your meetings about this project to start with a few moments silence and contemplation - and commence with the promise that you will "Do No Harm" to the residents, the environment, the community and the planet - surely we have a right to that reassurance.

51 We are writing in response to your latest consultations – referenced above. In short, we are disappointed that your latest documents give no real answers to the matters highlighted in our response to your last document (our letter dated 2 February 2017). That letter of ours indicated that we are not opposed to the provision of more housing in this area. We were and are, however, greatly concerned that the volume of proposed new housing: a. unnecessarily uses agricultural land which would be better employed in food production; b. is disproportionate to the local potential for existing and new jobs, leading to an unsustainable local environment and unnecessary increases in road traffic; c. takes no account of the existing flood risk, or the potential to exacerbate this; d. seems likely to overwhelm the existing road infrastructure (in the town, on the approaches to the motorway and on the A373), with insufficient plans to improve this in advance of the new house-building; and e. seems likely to overwhelm existing services (including NHS and emergency services) with insufficient plans yet in existence to improve this in advance of a significant increase in population. Further detailed views on these matters are set out in our earlier letter. It seems to us incredible that – two years on – the planners have provided no real answers to the above questions which we know are shared by many in Kentisbeare and Kerswell – and, indeed, in Cullompton. In short: ↘ Has the case actually been made for the destruction of good agricultural land, particularly given the likely impending Brexit? ↘ Is there really a need for 5,000 new houses here? ↘ Will there really be sufficient jobs created (bearing in mind Cranbrook down the road) or is Cullompton “doomed” to be a town of people dependent on benefits? ↘ Are the planners confident that the flood water can be dealt with – not only on the proposed development site but also on the A373 where – already – the surface becomes dangerously water-logged after relatively little rain? ↘ Do the planners consider the motorway junction to be safe for people to cross on foot from “East Cullompton” to “West Cullompton”: already, we regularly see unaccompanied schoolchildren “dicing with death” in crossing the motorway slip roads (on both sides of the bridge). ↘ When will we get the improved motorway junction with a separate access from the A373? ↘ In the meantime, has the Devon Highways Authority given real thought to the likely traffic flow on the A373 – both in the approaches to the motorway bridge (already a problem junction) and further back for example in the “chicane” west of Horn Road, in the hamlet of Dulford, east of the other entrance to Kerswell where the A-road is effectively single-track, and at Hembury Fort? Already, the volume of HGVs using the A373 causes significant concern to pedestrians and cyclists, and those in smaller cars. Without forward planning and action on the road structure, we seem likely to see more fatalities on this road. ↘ We are pleased to see proposals for a healthcare centre in East Cullompton – but can the planners please be clear that this will be built and commissioned – along with improved road access to the motorway – BEFORE significant numbers of new houses are built? So – broadly – the two new “concept” documents seem to us unnecessarily vague at this stage in your proposals. We very much hope that your next proposals will respond positively to the above – and, most of all, will clarify how any proposed new roads and other infrastructure will be built BEFORE the houses and any new workplaces are built.

2/28/2019 5:51 PM

52 The document lacks any note of minimising the inevitable impact on existing communities. There are many wishes expressed, such as possibility for a train station at Cullompton, however this is a possibility and not a mandatory part of the vision. Given the extent to which the development would expand the pressure on all aspects of life, from health, employment, travel, access to all services, more definitive and concrete statements for what must be a part of the development need to be included.

2/28/2019 5:47 PM

I feel that the proposed plans will have a detrimental impact on the village of Kentisbeare where I have lived for 15 years. Kentisbeare is a beautiful village with its own identity and a genuine sense of community. The village is fortunate enough to have a church, pub, village shop and school. All of these things give Kentisbeare its heart - they are undoubtedly a lifeline for less mobile/affluent residents but they need the commitment of the whole community (which they have at the moment) to continue to flourish. The proposals to build a school and shops just a short distance away will immediately be the end of our village school and shop, and that will irrevocably change the spirit of Kentisbeare. There is talk of the new garden village providing local employment, possibly a hotel. The draw of this part of the county is the countryside - the open, green spaces which will be taken away if the garden village is built. Who will want to come and stay in a hotel in a housing estate? The reality is that most people can not and do not work locally - they have to go to Exeter or Taunton or further afield. Access to the M5 is already diabolical and there are no firm plans in place to address it. The traffic lights that were introduced at junction 28 recently have made the problem worse (I know this because I travel to Exeter every day for work). The A373 is single carriageway all the way to Honiton with many parts not even being wide enough for 2 vehicles to pass, so how will it support 10000 more cars? This road has notorious accident hotspots already. Access out of Horn Road, Dead lane and Post Cross onto the A373 is already an issue. Where are the plans to address this? The traffic around/through Cullompton is horrendous. This is something that the council have talked about addressing for years and yet they have utterly failed to do so. People, especially those with children or the less mobile, don't want to go to Cullompton because it's really dangerous to walk down the high street with huge lorries roaring past. Again, it will not be able to support 10000 more cars. The idea that there will be lots of lovely cycle paths and footpaths through the garden village so that residents can get from Kentisbeare to Cullompton might well entice city dwellers/those who frequent centre parcs, but the truth of the matter is that those of us who live here already have exactly that! We love the footpaths, the fields, the quiet lanes. We can already get to Cullompton quite happily on a bike (but we choose not to because Cullompton is a nightmare for traffic!). Social housing will of course be built and then councils around the country will ship all their difficult residents down as was the case with Ilfracombe and more recently Cranbrook. There is no community with this sort of set-up - no passion or love for the place you live in because you haven't chosen it yourself. When we moved to Kentisbeare we spent weeks travelling around Devon villages at different times of the day, popping into pubs and shops, visiting schools, just walking through and around places so get a sense of what the villages offered and what was unique about them. Only then did we decide on Kentisbeare. Kentisbeare is idyllic and unique because it's surrounded by open countryside and is incredibly peaceful, yet at its heart is a thriving and nurturing community of people who look after each other. This isn't something you can manufacture or create - it's made up of centuries of history, families, connections, stories and advances are done gently with real care and respect for the environment and that's what makes Kentisbeare special. We don't want to become a suburb of Cullompton and/or the garden village. We are absolutely proud of what we already have - a traditional, unspoilt, quiet village nestled in the Devon countryside. Please don't take that away.

In accordance with the consultation period that closes on 1st March 2019, I wish for my comments below to be taken into account. I wish to stress in the strongest possible terms that I object to any form of a Garden Village to the East of Cullompton. In particular I object to the naming of the proposed development on the East of Cullompton (that is fundamentally a part of the Mid Devon District Council (MDDC) Local Plan Review 2013 - 2033 submitted back in March 2017) now being rebadged Culm Garden Village, Phase 1. Despite no prior public consultation at all, and since MDDC and Cullompton Town Council arbitrarily submitted an Expression of Interest in 2016, we find MDDC is attempting to launch us into working up a Garden Village development that will destroy the rural nature of this part of Mid Devon. Suddenly we have two glossy documents (over 75 pages combined) about a Garden Village that we were not consulted about, to comment upon as if someone has already agreed to the idea. I think not. The currently attractive and historic town of Cullompton (P.20 MDDC Town and Village Character Assessment 2012) will in effect become a dormitory town as part and parcel of the Greater Exeter Strategic Plan. Why does MDDC offer up its own rural and agricultural landscape to the aspirations of the City of Exeter for dormitory towns? The recent documents published as part of the Garden Village visualisation process make minimal reference to the full extent of the proposed development : in fact one solitary page and one empty map shaded green (P.4 East Cullompton - Masterplan Supplementary Planning Document stage 1: Issues, Opportunities and Concepts, Consultation December 2018) in a combined total of approx 75 pages. This seems deliberately misleading. The current publications show many plans that all relate to approximately 160 hectares of mixed housing and light industrial development East of Cullompton outlined in the 2017 Local Plan Review. We are being shown a vision that is omitting to indicate the full size and impact of the intended development. There is no depiction at all of the true expanse of 5000 houses that will be built all along the A373, across Horn Road and up to Goodiford Crossroads and Dead Lane in due course. The current consultation, ending 1 Mar 2019, asks for people's consideration and opinions on quite another previous plan, (namely MDDC Local Plan Review 2013 - 2033) but it has now become the Garden Village Consultation, Phase 1 which MDDC no doubt hope will inevitably be followed by the massive Garden Village Phase 2. To my mind, this borders on the flagrantly dishonest and most certainly is not open and transparent. By engaging with your Questionnaires and Vision as currently laid out one is in fact opening the door to very much worse yet to come. In addition, what right did Cullompton Town Council have to suggest to MDDC that the land that is completely outside Cullompton town and parish boundary should be used for urbanisation of this type in the creation of a Garden Village (P. 4 East Cullompton Masterplan Supplementary Planning Document). I would suggest, none at all. This is development within the Kentisbeare Parish with no consultation whatsoever. I believe that this proposal by MDDC for a Garden Village spreading outside the Cullompton boundary has not followed due process and therefore should be discarded immediately on legal and procedural grounds. Subject to (a) MDDC setting a better informed housing target that more accurately reflects current data and (b) any development remaining well within the Cullompton parish boundary, the vision for the style of building in the region of 1500 homes has to be commended. 75% affordable and rental housing would be good so long as ring-fenced for local people, and not sold off to Local Authorities around the country. However, the issues remain unchanged since the Local Plan Consultation in 2017, namely Environment, health and well-being : I believe the existing rural environment of a natural green space within 1 mile of Cullompton Town Centre should be preserved for the continued benefit of the current and forthcoming generations of Cullompton residents. The local population use exactly this area for their outdoor activities that support health and well-being. Activities such as dog-walking, cycling, fishing, photography, bird-watching and horse-riding. How can these activities possibly be enhanced or even the same amidst a development of potentially more than 1500 houses? Cullompton Town Council have done their residents a disservice with little or no consultation before giving Mid Devon District Council the go ahead to launch this project which will have little or no impact on them personally. Why would footpaths and cycle paths in a built up area, albeit one with trees in it, be in any way preferable to the network of rural lanes and paths teeming with wild life, that are there now. Flooding : still a major issue and still not being addressed in a responsible manner. Infrastructure : where is there any logic in the argument that if you build a complete new town almost the same size as the existing one - ergo it will come with new infrastructure. I think those are extreme and mistaken lengths to go to when addressing the infrastructure needs of Cullompton.

Culm Garden Village Vision & Concept (amended version)

-
- 55 I wish to object to the above proposed development as I feel it really is too large (the number of dwellings proposed would be greater than the present Cullompton) and it is planned to be built in a location that has potential for flooding (I believe even the appointed flood survey company indicated that problems with flooding could arise at some point). I do get the impression that MDDC are hoping to get all their "housing eggs in 3 large baskets " - one of which is the East Cullompton development - so they include an excessive number of dwellings at each site (simply to meet their own overstated targets). Despite the intention that this development will have its own employment potential, it is unlikely to create sufficient jobs to match the quantity of people living there, so numerous journeys will be required leading to more congestion/queuing at J28 M5. Based on the general average today that most households utilise two cars, this development (initially 1753 houses, with 850 to follow, then up to 5000 +) could mean thousands of additional cars. Even if these are "clean" electric vehicles they will place a heavy demand on the local road system - much of which consists of country lanes leading to small villages. In addition these houses will be in very close proximity to the already gridlocked M5 Junction 28. The Honiton road A373 soon becomes a narrow winding road that will not carry much additional traffic (it really should be re-classed as a B road). It is unsettling to be asked to accept this large development without some traffic infrastructure solutions being physically implemented (and this needs to be prior to the first digger bucket being pushed into the ground for the planned development). (Publication East Cullompton Masterplan Supplementary Planning Document Dec 2018 Page 32 simply states " the potential construction of a solution to M5 access"). The Vision and Concept document (December 2018) page 4 states "The Garden Village will help to deliver M5 J28 motorway improvements" but does not say how !
- 2/28/2019 4:31 PM
-
- 56 It is far to large for this area,most homes have 2 cars our country roads will be swamped with traffic It's bad enough now without adding to it. Where are all the well paid jobs coming from people working in a garden shed won't make a fortune, you only have to look at Cullompton main street no one spends there money in this area they all go else where, no matter how many homes you build you won't make cullompton the spending capital of Devon. Will there be Schools and a new Health Center put in place before all the homes are built, and more to the point where are the Teachers and doctors coming from as there always seems to be a shortage of them.
- 2/28/2019 4:26 PM
-

Having lived all our life, and now with our own family, we were somewhat taken aback by the size of the planned development when viewing this at Kentisbeare Village Hall recently. The heading of the proposed development states Village and this is far from the truth and misleading – a village would have one less 0 at 500 surely? Objections are as follows: • Concerned with size of build and infrastructure not being put in place prior to build. • Ecology – what reports have been considered re the wildlife in the area; should MDDC be a council that cares for our children's future and not just government targets to build • Flooding: 5000 homes set in concrete on a flood plain, schemes will be put in place to protect these homes but what happens downstream i.e. Kentisbeare. • We already have beautiful unspoilt areas surrounding our village/parish which stretch past Horn Road and should be left untouched for all to enjoy au natural, without any structures built upon it. Leisure time in country is listening to the birds, seeing wildlife, walking, cycling and enjoying the open country side and not the sound of a rugby or cricket match and countless cars trying to access that facility. • The majority of local residents have paid highly inflated prices to live in such a lovely area and are privileged to still have a post office whereas Cullompton does not. Kentisbeare has a popular small primary school which then feeds to an outstanding secondary at Uffculme, but with the proposed build it is likely that the school would close to support the newer and larger school planned for this new development; potentially decreasing house prices. • With regard to the existing A373 and MDDC/DCC not realizing what an increase in traffic usage will have, is absurd, as there are more employment opportunities in the town of Honiton and Heath Park Business Centre, not to mention the vast and varied selection of shops, restaurants, a twice weekly street market, pubs and no fewer than 5 supermarkets, sadly, Cullompton has no or very little to offer, and with only 2 supermarkets how would these stores cope with the increase in population, with many smaller shops already struggling, particularly with high rents from greedy landlords and little local government help for the small business. • With the size of the development on the outskirts of Tiverton, and the opening of a new junction to allow access to the link road; why and where would all these people be coming from to live in these houses and why the need for further development serving junction 28 – especially as plans are afoot for development in the near future for junction 27. • Social houses: should be for local people in Devon and surrounding local areas, and or those already working in the area. Giving social housing to people outside of Devon gives no guarantee of employment with little investment of companies wishing to set up in the area – for instance Ikea was lost to Exeter as junction 27 deemed unsuitable, Morrisons lost to Bridgwater leaving empty warehousing at the Willand Business Park, with the recent social climate, companies withdrawing from the UK does not bode well for future investment here. • Our children want to be able to stay near family with affordable homes being paramount with schemes to help to buy and with high importance finding ways to stop the second homes and greedy landlords buying to rent • Why this area – with poor access on and off Junction 28 M5 motorway, which needs to be addressed with some urgency and priority before even contemplating this development and with only a proposal not a guarantee of opening a new railway station for the town. • Our objection with the proposed size/build is that this would be larger than Cullompton itself and its Infrastructure: growing up in Cullompton and the much-discussed relief road 30 years ago was talked about this being Langlands and Forcefield Drive – with development of houses taking up this land this is now not possible forcing the CCA fields to be used which 30 years ago was ruled out being community gifted land and now it appears is fait au complete. • Relief road proposed through CCA would make no difference, even if traffic flow management was to be a one-way system through the town. The Motorway traffic during peak/rush hour to and from Exeter, Honiton, Taunton even though the Traffic lights were installed, has made no difference with traffic queuing on the motorway which is highly dangerous. Should you live in Langlands or any of the new developments on Old Tiverton Road, why would you take the new relief road which will take you out of your way, and would be quicker still to head along station road and right along old Tiverton road – the traffic lights from Honiton/Kentisbeare since the traffic light installation has significantly worsened – 5000 homes is unlikely to make this better.

Culm Garden Village Vision & Concept (amended version)

58	<p>Culm Garden Village is basically an extension of the Cullompton East Development which was first announced in 2015. It would appear that in 2016, the Garden Village concept was first muted by the Government and Mid Devon jumped on the bandwagon partly as a way of trying to secure extra funding. My concerns are as follows: I accept that more houses are required in the UK and also that the Government wants a certain amount to be located within Mid Devon. The size and scale of the Garden Village is quite excessive and regrettably it includes bulldozing agricultural land. At Garden Village exhibition on February 16th in Kentisbeare Village Hall, when in discussion with Paul Brockway, the Culm Valley Village consultant, he made it perfectly clear to me and another person from the village that the Cullompton East Extension 'Phase 1' was 'Done and Dusted' and that it was going to happen. Did he know something we did not or is he a Clairvoyant? In the light of the fact that the enquiry into Phase 1 was at that point still on going, I look upon his declaration to have been very unwise and irresponsible. He may well have told other the same information which in turn might have deterred them from expressing any concerns they might have had thinking that it would be a waste of time. He also said he understood as to why residents of Kentisbeare might be apprehensive about the whole plan. During any on going development it is inevitable that there will be works traffic lights installed on the A 373. These in addition to the existing lights at Jnt 28 will cause huge delays. So what will happen. Motorists trying to get to Cullompton/M5 will take to the lanes. These lanes are very narrow and inevitably there will be a large number of RTA's daily. MDDC keeps on trumpeting about the re-opening of Cullompton Station. Having been in touch with Network Rail, they state that they have no plans to re-open it. However I do understand that Taunton Deane and Mid Devon have been in discussion with Network Rail about the possible re-opening of Cullompton and Wellington Stations but these talks are at an embryo stage. So MDDC don't keep on mentioning this because its light years away. The proposed closure of Old Hill Bridge will divert traffic back to the Honiton Road thus compounding the existing traffic problems. Recently I was in touch with the senior partner of one of the 2 doctors surgeries in Cullompton. He advised me that the 2 existing surgeries would just be able to absorb the extra numbers of population created by the houses to the north west of Cullompton but no more. More importantly he told me that both RD and E Exeter and Musgrove Park Taunton were at 99% capacity. It would appear that has not been taken into consideration at all. Last week on the local news, there was a reference to a town in Devon, Newton Poppleford being promised Doctors Surgeries by the developers when the new houses were built. The National Audit Office have produced a fairly damning document which highlights the contributions to infrastructure by developers reducing whilst their profits increased. I attach a copy of the whole document but below is a small section of it which speaks for itself. "For many years, the supply of new homes has failed to meet demand. From the flawed method for assessing the number of homes required, to the failure to ensure developers contribute fairly for infrastructure, it is clear the planning system is not working well. The government needs to take this much more seriously and ensure its new planning policies bring about the change that is needed." Amyas Morse, the head of the NAO, 8 February 2019 There are various references air pollution. As and when any building might start, Carbon Emissions from the machinery will go sky high whilst it is on going. That somewhat defeats the object. On looking at dictionary terminologies, this what came up: A GARDEN. A piece of ground adjoining a house in which grass, flowers or shrubs are grown. A VILLAGE. A group of houses or associated buildings, larger than a hamlet but smaller than a town. These are a contradiction in terms. A garden village is A TOWN. It is not a village. See above. This terminology was dreamed up by somebody sitting at a desk in a city, pinching the word Garden from the old Garden City concept and not knowing anything about rural life. They wanted the terminology to sound attractive to greedy landowners, developers, as well as to sound appealing to house buyers & to appease planners. It is a misleading terminology. In conclusion, I am still very surprised and disappointed that Mid Devon District Council even selected the Cullompton East Extension site which led onto the Garden Village in the first place. The 5000 houses are due to be located on a poor A road which will not be able to handle the extra traffic even with some 'possible' improvements. Also that it was endorsed by the MDDC Cabinet. Basically, both parties should be ashamed of themselves for doing this. I know that if ultimately by the time the provision of housing creeps nearer towards Kentisbeare, I will probably by then be 'pushing up daisies' and will be observing the carnage from the great brewery in the sky. I am expressing my concerns for the future of the village of Kentisbeare. Finally the words of William Blake in Jerusalem refer to 'England's green and pleasant land'. The Government and the planning dept of MDDC obviously do not agree with these sentiments.</p>	2/28/2019 4:21 PM
59	<p>Schools . Plan seems to show schools on the outskirts of the garden village. That would cause everyone to get in their cars and drive which would cause chaos twice a day. Surely more sensible closer to the centre or by the country park.</p>	2/28/2019 4:01 PM
60	<p>No further comments.</p>	2/28/2019 2:39 PM

Culm Garden Village Vision & Concept (amended version)

61	The lack of solid information surrounding the infrastructure and services improvements shows that there is no real plan to do these things. The record in Cullompton of keeping services and infrastructure abreast of development has been one of minimum effort and poor management. We cannot reply on a developer to spend the amount of money needed to improve these things to a standard of 15 years ago. Nor can we rely on Highways or MDDC who between them can't even afford to pick up litter along existing road verges.	2/28/2019 2:33 PM
62	Please reduce the whole scale of this project back to the original size of stage 1 any more than this will totally ruin this beautiful area for ever	2/28/2019 9:56 AM
63	The Community must come first, with park, sport facilities and transport links have to be essential, for the village to become a success.	2/28/2019 9:07 AM
64	I cannot understand how an area almost the same size as the existing town has been suggested for this unnecessary development. The towns transport infrastructure is so poor it is difficult to drive through it, let alone park conveniently to use the remaining shops. Much of what has been proposed, a new Railway station, a new motorway junction, greater community focus, employment opportunities and so on are needed now. Surely it makes sense to improve the infrastructure, amenities and services of the existing town, get it working well and profitably before considering any future development, especially one of this scale.	2/28/2019 3:11 AM
65	It looks to be well thought out. With the future in mind. Energy to feed the new community will become ever more expensive year on year it needs to be nearly self sufficient. If high quality employment could be attracted nearby it would be a winner.	2/27/2019 11:06 PM
66	Shame if it goes ahead as spoiling the countryside with traffic extra houses but few facilities.	2/27/2019 9:59 PM
67	Constant worry about increased traffic and noise	2/27/2019 9:57 PM
68	None	2/27/2019 9:34 PM
69	no	2/27/2019 9:19 PM
70	This document presupposes that this development is going ahead. It does not ask the question on whether local people are in agreement with a development in their area. 5000 additional homes in this area is excessive and there seems to be no justification offered. Mid-Devon is awash with development and there is concern on how will our emergency services, hospitals and other health care providers cope with all these additional residents. The A373 would need to have a significant upgrade all the way from Cullompton to Honiton. Crossing the motorway to get to and from Cullompton already suffers from delays and traffic forming long queues. Flooding is a big concern with regular extensive flooding of fields and roads occurring already. In 2012 many local properties in Cullompton and its surrounding villages also flooded. Employment is also a concern.	2/27/2019 9:17 PM
71	In depth work and assessment including direct consultation and communication with farmers and residents affected by the proposed development.	2/27/2019 8:36 PM
72	This document reads well and the vision it portrays is certainly positive on paper. However, there seems to be a contradiction throughout as to whether integration with Cullompton or separateness from it is the actual aim. It is difficult to see how this huge proposal will actually help Cullompton and it is interesting to note that there is NO guarantee a station would be included unless the garden village was created. Indeed the feasibility of reopening the station is not as yet established. Furthermore the HUGE issues around the road infrastructure approaching J28 on M5 has not been adequately addressed.	2/27/2019 7:05 PM
73	Nothing further on the document but concerns about a particular councillor who was very unprofessional during the consultation event on 16th February at Kentisbeare Village Hall. The addition to the search area, that now reaches the hamlet of Mutterton, is roughly the same as the area between phase 1 and Kentisbeare....this suggests to me that the reason for the change is the potential objections from Kentisbeare.	2/27/2019 1:54 PM
74	The garden village scheme looks to be excessively large as do the proposed Local Plan numbers for housing east of J28. there is real concern that the scheme will create another "Cranbrook" and with massive housing pressure on Exeter and the Greater Exeter Strategic Plan there is considerable fear that 1750 houses quickly become 5,000 and then a GESp allocation takes this to 8,500 and beyond. The green buffer and its agreed location are crucial to the definition of a boundary of this proposed development	2/27/2019 9:21 AM
75	Please ensure a big community centre is included that can be used as a place of worship as well. Thank you!	2/26/2019 10:56 PM
76	The document is asking us to comment on a done deal, it's not asking us if we won't the deal.	2/26/2019 9:18 PM

Culm Garden Village Vision & Concept (amended version)

77	The document gives the impression of a country area with pictures depicting people walking through fields within the development, the reality is that they would be walking under pylons next to housing. The issues of transport have not really been adequately considered along the already busy A373 and there is no indication of where the proposed additional 850 houses would be sited (is the siting of the sports grounds in the buffer zone there to set the precedent for further building into Kentisbeare Parish). Also employment opportunities appear to be based on start up units, care work and a hotel, with the hope that provision of a high speed internet connection would bring high paid skilled work to the area. This is a best optimistic and at worst unsustainable. I also don't feel that enough investigation has been done to the environmental impact this development will have on the surrounding area. There also does not appear to be any plans for increased sewage treatment when the existing plant is unable to cope as it is.	2/26/2019 8:26 PM
78	The proposed garden village is too expansive. And residents should have been asked whether or not they agreed to this development at all, not just what the end product might look like.	2/26/2019 7:29 PM
79	Local residents should be consulted about the Garden Village's creation and not just asked about its aesthetic appeal. It is a very large development and I feel strongly that it should not be made, and definitely not on the huge scale that is currently being propositioned.	2/26/2019 7:28 PM
80	It is too large and as a local resident I should have been asked if I wanted a garden village and not how it should look. I feel very angry about this.	2/26/2019 7:27 PM
81	The Garden Village seems excessively large, as does the allocation of housing to east Cullompton in the Local Plan. This consultation should be asking for local residents' views as to whether they want a Garden Village at all not presupposing their approval.	2/26/2019 7:26 PM
82	more consultation-we need extra homes but these should integrated into existing villages and towns to make them sustainable	2/26/2019 7:25 PM
83	The proposed size of the Garden Village is excessive and has not been consulted on properly. There is no evidence to support any of the vision it is a document of a glorious 'wouldn't it be nice to have..' There is nothing about the cost impact of all these benefits and the funding needed. The eventual cost for a home, the ratio of 1, 2 ,3 4 bedroom homes, of Affordable and Social homes, aged or disadvantaged dwellings, self-build, local small builder projects are not costed out. Your Planners confirmed at the public exhibition that Costing is in progress- that is to say- you have no idea, nothing to support the vision as viable economically. Q10: You have now published 3 separate sets of questions, one in the Vision Brochure, one on the Display panels and the third set as the on-line questionnaire/ handout. This is a poorly prepared and presented scheme with most people being disenfranchised by the complexity and inaccessibility of straightforward information. A total of 24 hours to view display panels and discuss issues with planners is totally inadequate. You mislead the public with your confident but unsupported wish list. For example, the station. I am one of many that try to travel by train as much as possible and would love a station close by. It will need to be accessible and provide either large a carpark or very frequent buses to tie in with train times. To be of real benefit it must provide main line services and not be just a commuter line to Exeter. You say it ...'is directly related to the delivery of the Garden Village' but there are many other factors before a new station can be added to the main line. You state it is ...a key part of the development strategy...but you have no control over it happening! Network Rail still said in January 'In answer to your question I can advise that currently, there are no plans or development in scope to re-open the station at Cullompton. Opening a new station will help existing Cullompton but will be inaccessible/inconvenient for people in the Culm project. The station cost in the local plan is unsupported and by looking at Network Rail figures grossly underestimated. Final points: There is no provision for a Recycling Centre, it should be local to Cullompton and The Garden project-perhaps on Kingsmill? Adequacy of water sources. Has a study been done since the DWI study of 2012 to ensure adequate volumes of water are available for the region to accommodate these projected housing plans? The document is a marketing masterclass work, worthy of Centre Parcs but would not cut the mustard as a plan in The Dragons Den. Would I invest- NO! Will you listen? Let us wait and see	2/26/2019 5:26 PM

84 Thank you for the comprehensive, glossy documents and exhibition about the proposals for the development of a Garden Village to the East of Cullompton. However there is not enough substance on which to form an opinion – there are too many “potentials” and woolly ideals. The proposals need to be pragmatic and realistic about what will be the outcomes of the development plus guarantees about the funding. Most of the pictures in the publicity material portray idyllic countryside and prime agricultural land that will be destroyed through the building of 5,000 houses with supporting infrastructure for an unknown number of people. I am privileged to have been able to enjoy this countryside but it is heartbreaking that it may be destroyed for future generations. I am 72 years old so a lot of the proposals would not be completed within my lifetime. But I consider it vital that I promote the quality of life of the community and protect the environment for future generations. I support the need for more affordable accommodation to buy or rent in Devon provided this is supported by credible research about the numbers required by the local population. It is important that there is sufficient accessible, appropriate employment nearby to support the people moving to the Village. It is also vital that there is a robust infrastructure to underpin a healthy, happy and thriving community – the essence of a Village. First I would like to refer to a quote from Cllr Richard Chesterton, Cabinet Member for Planning and Economic Regeneration These draft documents are the result of working with the Council's partner organisations and the local community to set a clear Vision for the garden village As a member of the local community in the Parish of Kentisbeare I would like to point out that the very first I heard about a Garden Village of 5,000 houses on my doorstep was through a local television report. This I consider a 'fait au complet' showing total disregard for consultation. Second I would like to quote from parts of the Sustainable Community Strategy for Mid Devon 2010 – 2015 and question what has improved since this strategy was published. I have highlighted some pertinent points and ask what has changed in the past 5 years. The population of Mid Devon, currently around 75,500, has grown by 20% over the last 20 years, and is expected to increase to over 89,700 by 2024. Much of this increase is due to inward migration from other parts of the UK. The largest increase is among those of retirement age. A significant proportion of young people move out of the area for education or work. The Black and Minority Ethnic population is estimated to be about 2 to 5% of the population with a significant number of migrant workers, mostly from Eastern Europe There are small areas where the air quality is poor, specifically in the Exeter Road area of Crediton, and parts of Cullompton. The residents of Mid Devon are generally healthier than the rest of the population in the UK. Life expectancy is higher than the national average both for men and women, and mortality rates for all major diseases are lower. However, there are pockets where life expectancy and mortality rates are considerably lower than would be expected. There is also a growing proportion of over 75s who will put increasing demands on health and social care services. Cullompton, with a population of 8,500, lies on the main transport corridor through Devon, with the M5 & mainline railway running close to the town. Its good road links makes it attractive to commuters and the base for a number of distribution businesses. However, to fully benefit from its strategic position the motorway junction needs to be improved and a mainline station reinstated. There has been considerable housing development over the last few years but without a corresponding improvement to infrastructure and community facilities. It has a historic centre with a number of notable buildings but the main shopping street has been particularly affected by the recent downturn in the economy. I understand the need for more affordable housing if it is supported by credible research in the area. I am however strongly opposed to many aspects in the Vision for the Culm Garden Village and its impact on Cullompton and the local communities. The potential impact of Brexit must be considered, for example the potential need for the UK to become more self-sufficient re home produced food. Once built on, there can be no return to prime 3a and 3b agricultural land. I would be much happier if the proposed Village were being built on brown field/derelict sites. The development of the Garden Village, despite the recognition of the need to minimise its impact, will necessarily result in more pollution from the loss of green fields and trees, an increase in traffic and the every daily living of 5000 households. The centre of Cullompton is already a hot spot for pollution causing associated health problems. Recent research has indicated a worrying decline in insect populations. Building on green fields will necessarily impact on wild life with the loss of well established hedgerows and the natural habitat of birds, insects and mammals. In conclusion, I cannot accept the credibility of most of the nebulous Visions and Concepts set out for the Culm Garden “Village” being built in a beautiful rural but isolated (re: transport, infrastructure, services and amenities) location. The proposal reminds me of the children's story about three little pigs and the houses that was made of straw or sticks. The lack of realistic assured infrastructures to support the development of this size will lead to disaster with Mid Devon District Council acting as the Big Bad Wolf who huffs and puffs.

2/26/2019 5:16 PM

85 I would be concerned about building anywhere near 440 kV transmission lines, or encouraging people to use the area near them as 'green' spaces.

2/26/2019 5:11 PM

Culm Garden Village Vision & Concept (amended version)

86	<p>Have you ever read 'Devon Housing Needs Evidence 2018', published September, 2018 by the CPRE? We wish to object to the proposals for the following reasons: i) Density - Taken together with the recent development of a "new town" at Cranbrook/Sky Park in East Devon; the crazy recent building at Pinhoe on the north-eastern outskirts of Exeter; the nigh on doubling of Tiverton in the last twenty years; and Cullompton has had several new housing estates too in the same time (also you are proposing 105 homes at Siskin Chase) I ask if we have not had enough development in our back yard already, and am surprised that you at Mid Devon District Council still think we need more? It doesn't seem fair to me. ii) Roads!!! I am skeptical that a new relief road will be sufficient to cope with the volume of traffic Cullompton already gets at peak period, but after 2,500 to 5,000 extra homes with an average of two cars per home .. I shudder to think what will happen when the M5 is closed at junction 28, which happens with an unfortunate regularity. The A373 Cullompton to Honiton road (which barely warrants A-road status) is overstretched, and at Broadhembury Hill, it narrows drastically. I have lost count of how many times I have had to wait there for two lorries etc to pass each other, or suchlike hold up, which soon creates a large tail back. I, like many others, use this road daily for work/school and am constantly surprised to meet heavy goods vehicles (sometimes with trailers as big again attached!) coming along it. Signs warning lorry drivers to go another way are by and large ignored. Your publicity picture even shows an articulated lorry travelling along it! It also is a frequent target for EDDC resurfacing works which close the road, creating problems in the lanes, which those not used to, then drive along too fast. My husband was hit in a head on collision at one of these times. To widen the road would be to destroy the natural beauty of the area (Hembury Hill is in the Blackdowns AONB). The B3181 also suffers from congestion when M5 closed, as traffic endeavours to find alternative routes to/from Exeter and beyond. iii) Doctors/hospitals. You regularly have to wait three weeks for a doctors appointment in Cullompton as things stand. With 2,500 to 5,000 homes the existing provision won't cope as is, and you need to sort this out before you build your houses, not as an after thought. If the plan was to develop Cullompton massively all along, you should have built a hospital long ago. RD&E hospital is already overstretched, and Ottery, Tiverton and Honiton hospitals have reduced their services and it seems they are always looking to cut services, not expand, for lack of funds. iv) Work. Kingsmill estate extensions won't make much of a difference to the work prospects of those who live in this new development. If the thought is to get them working at the new junction 27 M5 "Eden Westwood" development, then you are building a camp for workers, and you are then creating you own need for houses. Local wages won't cover the cost of the houses that the property developers will mostly want to build. v) Environment. You'll be destroying a good part of Devon forever, with no undoing the damage once it is done. Housing estates are not what anyone wants to see when they come to Devon. They banner at the head of the Chief Executive of MDDC's (Mr Walford's) twitter page shows green fields, not houses. Ironically, you have a beautiful photograph of a green landscape on the front cover of your plans, but it is this very thing you are seeking to destroy by building this very large development all over it. No amount of "garden village" posturing is an improvement on the green fields and trees themselves. vi) The impact on wildlife. Humans and wildlife do not mix that well (other than rats, see Cranbrook). vii) Local need. Whilst there may be a need for a modest amount of affordable/starter homes for young local people and families in the area (I can't envisage more than 200 required in Cullompton), I refuse to believe that on a local level there is any demand for what you are proposing, and can only see that the true intent is to entice buyers in from outside of the west country, one way or another. I fail to see how this will genuinely "drive growth and improve the economy for our residents and businesses" (S. Walford) assuming of course the interests of money are always to be the over-riding ones (radix malorum est cupiditas).</p>	2/26/2019 5:03 PM
87	I think the garden village is a splendid project to help rejuvenate the town of Cullompton.	2/26/2019 4:43 PM
88	You have planned this as you would like it. It does not matter what Kentisbear want. This just going through the motions.	2/26/2019 4:40 PM
89	The vast size of the proposal. Garden Village is much too big and should be reduced in size.	2/26/2019 4:27 PM
90	Whole of garden village needs to be quality. Need lots of cul de sacs. Need lots of bungalows mixed in with family houses. So different age groups live next door. Road network is key not just J28 but all the little lanes need widening and upgrading. Need to look at RNIB building guide and design council wheelchair access guide. Also look at disabled ramblers and DCAF. RNIB building sight A handbook of building and interior design solutions to include the needs of visually impaired people ESN1-85878-074-8	2/26/2019 3:42 PM
91	No other comments.	2/26/2019 10:03 AM

Culm Garden Village Vision & Concept (amended version)

92	The proposed garden village is far too big for the local rural communities of Cullompton and Kentisbeare to absorb. Key areas to be first addressed include, the existing congested road network around Cullompton. The existing flooding issues. Ways to build and with reduced or alternative travel issues being addressed. The proposal should be phased, monitored in all respects and then further developed with the outcome of a review of the previous phases being considered. Architecture and quality of build should be carefully considered as to the affordability and green credentials for the developments. The impact upon the local surrounding area including Horn Road and Kentisbeare should be considered and the local residents given serious consideration with their thoughts and wishes taken into account. The document is large very professionally prepared but the pictures and much of the script does not reflect at all Cullompton and Kentisbeare.	2/25/2019 11:23 PM
93	Make the roads wide, use angled parking	2/24/2019 8:21 PM
94	no	2/24/2019 5:49 PM
95	The principles outlined are excellent, but Vision and Concept documents should outline the vision of the goals and the concepts of how to achieve them. To my knowledge you have listed every positive community trait possible. They are wonderful goals but can you produce a balanced assessment of how these goals will be achieved, a cost benefit analysis, an evaluation of local needs. It appears that you are plastering over current issues which will, in the long run, insure the failure of any new community.	2/24/2019 4:56 PM
96	The vision and concept should be: build as few houses as possible. There is nothing good or "green" about building on a greenfield site that already is a much needed buffer between Cullompton and Kentisbeare.	2/24/2019 4:43 PM
97	The proposed village is excessively large and will not be sustainable in terms of jobs.	2/24/2019 3:26 PM
98	There has been totally inadequate consultation with local communities and residents. The concept is flawed in both its need, concentration and given its reliance on enormous and complex infrastructural improvements represents very poor value for money.	2/24/2019 3:09 PM
99	The Garden Village is too big and the consultation should be asking if we want it and not how we want it to look.	2/24/2019 11:35 AM
100	A great way forward to provide much needed housing and amenities for the regeneration of the Cullompton area which has already outgrown the facilities available currently.	2/24/2019 10:12 AM
101	No	2/24/2019 1:38 AM
102	What a sad environment to leave to our descendants. Concrete and cosmetic countryside.	2/22/2019 8:19 PM
103	The Vision and Principles are laudable, but obviously a lot more detail will need to be worked up before there can be confidence in it becoming a reality. There is a serious risk of noble concepts being progressively eroded and watered down - it has happened all too often before. Need to start serious thinking now about delivery mechanisms, including legal provisions, to ensure the excellent aspirations are realised.	2/22/2019 6:20 PM
104	Horn road cannot currently safely cope with the volume of traffic. A HGV haulage and maintenance yard is at the northern end and adjacent in Long Drag there is a milk processing depot with high volumes of large tankers continuously using Horn road. A number of other businesses on Long Drag are accessed, via Horn road, by HGV's and delivery vehicles. In addition Horn road is used as a 'Rat Run', to avoid Cullompton, by commuters and parents conveying school age children. All of these compete for space with residents and large agricultural vehicles sharing the road. Consequently the road surface and verges are deteriorating. The addition of Educational, Sports, Commercial or Residential traffic to this unsuitable unclassified road will inevitably cause more damage, delay and safety issues. Despite noble intentions and aspirational concepts the reality is convenience and self interest determines how people choose to use road networks. I know from experience gained in professional employment and places of residence, that unless educational and recreational facilities are central to housing (not peripheral) a consequential increase in motor vehicle traffic and a vast car parking capacity increase will result. Is the Buffer zone going to be turned into car parking by default? Will common local speculation be realised whereby the Buffer zone will be disregarded and become the default location for multiple sports facilities (Rugby, County Cricket Ground, Football Stadium or any other type of sports activity) accordingly Buffer zone status is meaningless as each will require structures and infrastructures of their own. Nowhere have I seen reference to commensurate need for vastly increased emergency services. Has this been scoped, planned and costed? Why has this not been documented.	2/21/2019 8:43 PM

Culm Garden Village Vision & Concept (amended version)

105	I start from the position of being very happy for this garden village never to be built. However I understand that additional housing is required. If it is built then let us make certain that the end product is something that will make us all proud of what has been created to the extent that we all want to claim ownership of the result. It would be an enormous missed opportunity if the Culm Valley Garden Village turns out, in the end, to be just another functional but run of the mill housing estate the likes of which can already be seen in too many parts of England. Go Devon!	2/20/2019 5:14 PM
106	Yes, it does not ask us if we want it and many people do not. You will create a monster and ruin the very things that people love about Devon.	2/20/2019 4:09 PM
107	We are writing to express our grave concerns over the proposals for a Garden Village of some 5,000 houses to be known as Culm Garden Village. What truly appalls us is that at no stage in the present consultation has there been an opportunity to say whether we agree with such a development in the first place. The consultation questionnaires from MDDC seem to assume that it is a done deal, and has more the appearance of a tick box exercise than any true desire for real consultation. The size of the development is far too large, overbearing, and will swamp the district. As two doctors with experience of both local GP practices and especially the RD&E hospital in Exeter, we are particularly concerned about the provision of healthcare. The RD&E is already on the verge of being overwhelmed, and an additional 7,000 homes (with 14,000-28,000 inhabitants) will tip the service into total collapse. There has been no mention anywhere of how this might be addressed, and no plans or intentions of increasing hospital facilities at this end of the County. Finally, the pictures of rolling green hills and verdant fields as portrayed in the Consultation Document shows not what will be treasured and preserved, but what will be lost under a mountain of bricks and concrete.	2/20/2019 2:02 PM
108	The traffic between Kentisbeare and Cullompton is already a problem trying to get into Cullompton eg for a doctors appointment etc. It seems a very unsuitable area for gypsies and travelers. There is no need for this and no such areas exist at the moment.	2/20/2019 1:42 PM
109	See other questionnaire submitted.	2/20/2019 1:18 PM
110	Obviously a great deal of thought and work gone into this. Please be pragmatic about types of employment - broad - there will still be private ownership of cars, etc. Don't delude yourselves that all industry will be low carbon and smart.	2/20/2019 1:15 PM
111	Do we need these houses? Do we need so many houses? Why do we need NW development too? Traffic is a serious concern. Traffic in Cullompton creates a health concern - bad air pollution. Where are these people going to work? Cullompton will die!	2/20/2019 1:04 PM
112	The proposed garden village should be used to enhance facilities for those living in Cullompton and the surrounding area, and the village should not be started until the infrastructure is complete and the motorway junction is improved.	2/20/2019 6:17 AM
113	Before anything is built the problems with Junction 28 M5 must be addressed along with access to Cullompton.	2/20/2019 12:33 AM
114	2 points. Kentisbeare to remain separate. I have no other objection to plan in the parish of cullompton as long as the m5 junction is sorted and greatly improved before a single new house is approved	2/19/2019 10:46 PM
115	I feel this new town is way too big for Cullompton. I am not opposed to some houses being build as I understand the need for this but this is too many houses for here, the current resources and proposals don't seem enough for the number of people. I am also concerned as to who will live in these houses - people from where? We moved to Devon because of its ruralness which is its identity. This plan is not in keeping with Devon's villages and market towns and would be better placed near a larger town/city.	2/19/2019 6:42 PM
116	designed to look good but little consideration for the immense adverse impact on the countryside, neighbouring villages and the local towns.	2/19/2019 6:39 PM
117	I think this is a splendid idea to rejuvenate the town of Cullompton	2/19/2019 12:49 PM
118	I think the garden village is a splendid idea to rejuvenate the town of Cullompton	2/19/2019 12:25 PM
119	I sincerely hope this project will go ahead to rejuvenate the town of Cullompton	2/19/2019 11:49 AM
120	Keep pushing, don't slack! This is needed and should be embraced by all.	2/18/2019 9:40 PM
121	No	2/18/2019 3:08 PM

Culm Garden Village Vision & Concept (amended version)

122	the whole scale of the development is significantly larger than the local communities (including Cullompton) can absorb and will be damaging to character of all the surrounding villages (Kentisbeare and Bradfield in particular). The development should be halted unless and until the local communities affected give consent to it progressing. Should the MDDC ignore this requirement, it should be built on a much smaller scale	2/18/2019 1:42 PM
123	It is very hard as a lay person to really understand what this document means and how it will affect local people.	2/18/2019 10:54 AM
124	No need has been proven for the scheme and it will simply create more traffic congestion and put even more pressure on a town centre and infrastructure that cannot cope as it is.	2/16/2019 5:06 PM
125	The M5 acts as a buffer between Cullompton and the garden village. As it stands we need proper road and pedestrian access. This will not happen unless J28 is sorted out properly. A new junction between Cullompton and Broadclyst is needed.	2/14/2019 3:51 PM
126	well thought through master plan.	2/14/2019 11:45 AM
127	OK as far as it goes, but there needs to be a lot more detail added before a proper public consultation so that we are commenting on facts rather than vague ideals.	2/14/2019 10:43 AM
128	we need it for the future	2/13/2019 5:07 PM
129	No	2/13/2019 5:02 PM
130	No additional comments.	2/13/2019 3:50 PM
131	I find it hard to believe that this development is even being considered. There's no jobs in the area so everyone will have to commute, more traffic on the roads	2/13/2019 1:59 PM
132	Please proof read more carefully!	2/12/2019 5:24 PM
133	The challenge will be taking this beautiful brochure and the high ideals and seeing if they survive the developers! The people of Cullompton have been up for development as long as the infrastructure is delivered. Bus/train/motorway cannot be aspirations but must be a reality. Space required in centre for a church/community building as developers build buildings, but who will build community?	2/12/2019 5:15 PM
134	Large concern that existing Cullompton supermarkets will not have capacity for additional population. Parking at Aldi already v difficult at most times leading to road being blocked. I live in Bradninch and shop at Aldi so I do not have to go through Cullompton to Tesco. Make sure route to motorway works for those coming from Bradninch, Silverton etc.	2/12/2019 2:02 PM
135	The country needs houses. The youth of today cannot live up to the 60s, 70s surge of being home owners. Let's get on with it in the Garden Village style.	2/12/2019 1:51 PM
136	no	2/11/2019 8:12 PM
137	Why can't I answer all the questions in the document? This questionnaire only allows for some to be answered. I found the figures to be misleading - especially the actual planned extent of development. If development is to be staged, which it appears if a proportion of the houses are to be delivered by 2033, it needs to be clear what aspects of the proposals will be developed at what stage. Will we have houses and no facilities? What consultation has been undertaken with Network Rail and how receptive are they? Aspirations for a railway station are wonderful, but meaningless unless Network Rail are on board. What do they see as essential before they commit the finance to redevelop the railway station? Schooling and catchment areas is a huge issue. You need to be clear what provision is planned and where. The information is conflicting on this and not reassuring. The separation between Kentisbeare and Cullompton needs to be respected. That includes being aware of the Kentisbeare Parish boundary and the school catchment areas. Development to the east of Horns Road is basically in Kentisbeare and has implications locally.	2/11/2019 5:33 PM
138	No	2/11/2019 4:07 PM
139	None	2/11/2019 2:01 PM
140	It's a bit optimistic, wishy-washy and vague. More details needed	2/10/2019 7:37 PM
141	No	2/10/2019 6:59 PM
142	Do the job well not a cheap load of rubbish.	2/10/2019 3:45 PM
143	a buffer between culm garden village and kentisbeare and new roads to the m5 to reduce traffic congestion	2/9/2019 12:47 AM

Culm Garden Village Vision & Concept (amended version)

144	No	2/8/2019 9:51 PM
145	Nobody asked any of us if it was actually wanted. Also, will how many rented properties will be offered to big cities such as Birmingham, Manchester, London etc.	2/8/2019 8:34 PM
146	No	2/8/2019 8:18 PM
147	No	2/8/2019 8:11 PM
148	no	2/8/2019 5:58 PM
149	My concerns are provision of sports facilities. All the existing clubs will need to expand. I have a large family and affordable housing is important to us Access to the motorway has been inadequate for years. There must be substantial improvements Please pedestrianise the high street	2/8/2019 5:02 PM
150	Don't agree with housing	2/8/2019 4:31 PM
151	please remember where we are ie green space in devon and the things that made cullompton great, ie good sporting facilities.	2/8/2019 4:09 PM
152	You must improve the roads around the entire area, not just J28	2/8/2019 4:00 PM
153	the whole concept is ludicrous	2/8/2019 3:30 PM
154	Land needs to be provided for Sports Facilities, a lot of the current sports pitches and in particular the Rugby Club are gradually being surrounded with new houses giving no opportunity of expanding what is a growing Grassroots club.	2/8/2019 3:20 PM
155	PLANNING SHOULD BE REFUSED	2/8/2019 3:03 PM
156	There is nothing about upgrading the road networks or new schools or new doctors and dentists. Just how wonderful it will be. It is a great Marketing tool but lacks any detail.	2/8/2019 12:58 PM
157	This seems a very good idea. I support it and the aims outlined to achieve it. I hope it will lessen the impact of planning applications to build more houses in more rural areas like the Upper Culm Valley where there are very limited opportunities for employment, which have a bigger environmental impact locally and globally.	2/8/2019 12:35 PM
158	No thank you.	2/8/2019 12:26 PM
159	no	2/8/2019 11:31 AM
160	I am definitely in favour of the new development in its proposed location. Highway links to the M5 and Cullompton need to be included. The construction of the railway station is essential and should be implemented before any development takes place, as with the highway links	2/8/2019 11:18 AM
161	Foot bridge to new rail station, massive improvement to J28. GET ON WITH IT!	2/8/2019 10:42 AM
162	It is the obvious place for future development, given the narrow town streets. Access to the M5 or Honiton are straightforward.	2/8/2019 10:19 AM
163	I think the whole document could be more a little easier to understand and less flowery, yes the environment, countryside and green issues are important but these are issues that can only be resolved after development. What will the effect be on local transport, our current terrible road infrastructure that can't cope, our lack of parking? How are we going to help encourage our ever decreasing town centre amenities by making it more pedestrian and traffic friendly?	2/8/2019 10:18 AM
164	No	2/8/2019 10:15 AM
165	The whole idea of the plan needs to be scrapped, but of course as with most local authority's plans, this is not a consultation, it just makes it look like people have had their say when really those at the top have already made the decisions and are just going through the motions for legality..	2/8/2019 12:27 AM
166	No, if you have managed to read this far you will know that I have absolutely no support for any garden village at all. unless there is a guaranteed new motorway junction to allow all the new residence access to Exeter where they will all be working	2/7/2019 8:29 PM
167	No.	2/7/2019 8:16 PM
168	No	2/7/2019 6:36 PM
169	How about actually asking people if they want it rather than asking how they want it?!	2/7/2019 2:49 PM

Culm Garden Village Vision & Concept (amended version)

170	I repeat the lack of access which is bad enough already. The motorway junction is already inadequate and there is always a queue into the centre of Cullompton. Also there are plans to also close the small bridge from Cullompton to Mutterton making the existing road even more congested.	2/7/2019 1:59 PM
171	No	2/6/2019 2:59 PM
172	As I've already made clear I think creating a community spirit will be a challenge and one which should be prioritised.	2/6/2019 11:13 AM
173	The so-called garden village should be consigned to the bin.	2/6/2019 8:57 AM
174	Good document.	2/5/2019 8:47 PM
175	The proposed size of the Garden Village is excessive and has not been consulted on properly. It is another example of Mid Devon District Council wanting to shovel through more with a complete disregard of local people	2/4/2019 6:39 PM
176	The concept is admirable, but runs the real risk of being a blight rather than a blessing on account of its sheer size. Furthermore, the surrounding infrastructure is totally inadequate, including the A373 which is bound to have to carry more traffic, is already dangerous and is difficult/expensive to improve.	2/4/2019 3:30 PM
177	This looks really exciting and, so long as it helps to improve road and rail access into Exeter and Taunton, will be really beneficial to Cullompton	2/3/2019 4:23 PM
178	It is a chronic waste of public time and money. This is a project that is only wanted by councillors, officials and developers. It is of no benefit to local residents.	2/3/2019 2:58 PM
179	I think that if the project is to go ahead it should be focused on sustainable development as the loss of green land is not only a blow to local farmers but will also increase pressures on local services and jobs. Some of the natural beauty of the area will be lost and it could result in increased flood risks if not carried out in ways to accommodate for this	2/2/2019 2:43 PM
180	Put more emphasis into ways that the new development can benefit the existing community.	2/1/2019 1:42 PM
181	Yes. This has the potential to be fabulous but you have to take your lead from the name GARDEN. Biodiversity, lots of allotments, wildlife led, community spaces which teach, unite communities, help the environment and help with mental wellbeing at all ages from school kids who should be learning how to grow their own right the way through to OAPs with dementia who would benefit from sensory gardens.	1/31/2019 5:24 PM
182	I'm very excited about the self build plots and the things that will come with this area for the residents and families.	1/30/2019 4:44 PM