

Appendix 1 Public consultation email responses

Transport	General Development	Infrastructure	Principle/Questions/Other	Wider Garden Village	Flooding	Env/GI/BI/Landscape	Facilities	Affordable Housing
There should be no further building in Cullompton at all until the relief road is built. This applies to all sites east and west. Cullompton town centre will die completely unless the relief road is built in the next few years	The effect of the plan should not detract from the viability and prosperity of Cullompton Town. It should also not have a detrimental effect on the rural nature of smaller communities nearby.	Increased demand placed on health and social care in the area. Have the GP practices/RDEH and local hospitals/ambulance services agreed that they can absorb the rising numbers of patients?	It is imperative that the village boundary is preserved as well as the appearance and character, although it appears on the map that the development proposal already encroaches into the Parish. The area on Kentisbeare side of the development should remain as agricultural land. Why the need for green spaces when there is prime agricultural land already. Why a garden village when there are tiny or no gardens?	Moving to the wider issue and 'potential areas of consideration' the map shows this passing over the boundary of Kentisbeare Parish, passing Horn Road and reaching Dead Lane. Many representations have been made that the development should be kept out of the Parish of Kentisbeare and that a natural gap be maintained at the Cullompton edge of the development (Buffer Zone) to preserve the nature and character of historic Parish. The scope is looking at putting large school(s) and sports facilities within Kentisbeare. Policy S14 of the local plan specifically protects the Parish (and other similar parishes) from development that does not preserve and where possibly enhance the character, appearance and biodiversity of the countryside...Policies will permit agricultural and other appropriate rural uses.		The use of high-grade agricultural land for housing. Open spaces are integrated into the plan but the rural nature of the east side of Cullompton will be lost forever.	Fordmore Farm is seen as a central hub for the Garden Village providing retail and other services. As mentioned above, the current access onto the A373 is poor. I would also like to question the effect on Cullompton shops and services of this 'out of town' development. Have the retailers in Cullompton been asked their views?	I do understand the pressure to provide more accommodation in the Southwest. BUT this should be affordable and include social housing with a firm commitment from any developers. They should be held accountable for promises that are made.
Extra traffic generated by even a small development feeding into the A373 from the M5 to Honiton. This is a very poor, narrow, and bendy road with the pinch point at the Junction 28 M5. Developing the Fordmore complex will compound the problems. Are there plans to have a filter system (like the entrance to Mole Valley Farmers) to reduce congestion as the complex grows?	East Cullompton and Cullompton being regarded as one: The East proposal significantly overshadows the old town in scale. There is nothing in the plan to make them interdependent. The lack of employment will stimulate out-commuting, increase carbon emissions and by its very existence will damage existing air quality, noise and dust.	I am led to believe from various conversations that the main infrastructure, relief road, motorway junction, new flood defences and station alone will cost in excess of £150 million pounds. That ignores upgrade to the A373 which is already struggling. All these and more are necessary even for the 2,500 houses- that is £60,000 extra cost per dwelling- is there no better way for MDDC to add houses to the district? What is the rationale for 5,000 houses- I have not seen any. Is it imply to spread this enormous cost out reducing it to £30,000 per house.	There is a huge mental health crisis in this country. This vast development with cramped and a lack of affordable housing (whatever that actually means) and with houses built before schools and health care it is a disaster in the making. People need space.	Page 51 of the SPD includes the statement that 'surrounding villages remain clearly separate from Cullompton in terms of identity and village setting'. Page 39 states the requirement of a 'green buffer with Kentisbeare' as a key finding from the Stage 1 consultation. However the map on Page 6 contradicts this by referring to it as a 'Potential Area of Consideration' which offers no guarantee that the area will be preserved from development.		Increase Biodiversity? Wildlife exists throughout the chosen area, from rabbits, deer, foxes and badgers to bats, owls, buzzards. That ignores the other fauna and flora that inhabit the fields, ditches and hedgerows that has evolved over centuries in harmony with man. Protect natural resources? You cannot protect what you destroy with concrete, tarmac, houses etc.	Other facilities seem likely to follow according to the East Cullompton Masterplan. As well as depleting Cullompton of leisure activities the relocation will affect the nature of nearby rural communities.	
Junction 28 is a major obstacle to the development east of the motorway. Apparently over 20 options are on the table!! NOTHING must happen until the Junction is improved AND the work completed. With the current economic position in the UK guaranteed funding could be hard to find.	And as for thinking of it as part of Cullompton joined together by the River Culm. It is not joined but divided by it, by the railway line and by the motor way that cuts through it. A footbridge or two, the little lane at Old Hill and the A373 are not going to unite the development with the town so acknowledge that and design accordingly.	Our second concern is infrastructure which has also previously been raised through consultation and discussion. This development should be planned and constructed responsibly. No development on this scale should be carried out without substantial infrastructure being delivered first. It is unthinkable to consider a development of this size without addressing this initially – we have many concerns, but in particular we would like to highlight the A373 as a major concern.	Yet again we are being asked our views on the expansion of Cullompton only for you to ignore them. With the relocation of Cullompton Cricket Club the Council has already broken its promise not to build within the parish of Kentisbeare, and that all community hubs should be within a 20 minute walk. The local community no longer trusts you to serve on our behalf. It has been proved time and time again that the Council has no control over the developers, so we all know that more than 1100 houses will be built before any improvements to Junction 28 are carried out and that a net zero loss of hedgerows within the marked area is a load of bull excrement. NO to 5000 houses on the east side of Cullompton.	We have two main concerns; the first of these being the green buffer zone between Horn Road and Dead Lane, which has repeatedly been referred to through consultation and various discussions including via the Parish Council. We respectfully ask that MDDC respect the wishes and concerns of the local community who have identified this area as an area of particular importance to them that should be protected to ensure that it cannot be developed. It should consist of perhaps tree planting and some walkways only.		We remain concerned at the potential for unavoidable damage to biodiversity and local landscape throughout the lifetime of this project.	If building starts at Fordmore before the M5 J28 is sorted and major improvements to the A373 are carried out, there will be terrible bottlenecks and accidents with unthinkable consequences for Kentisbeare which will be a rat run. With homes what about health care and school provision as these are already over subscribed as it is.	
Cullompton Town Centre currently is very deprived and despite best efforts appears to be in decline. The relocation of the Cricket Club from the town is a big mistake as residents will no longer have ease of access to the ground. They will have to travel by road to get to the new site (Kentisbeare Seconds?) – again the A373 will be affected / pollution increased.	To have a soft edge to the development and 'feather' it into open countryside begin that in Cullompton Parish and preserve the agricultural land that runs from the Parish boundary across Horn Road and Dead Lane to the village itself. There is significant wildlife, including deer, rabbits etc and historic biodiversity here that can blend with the new artificial edge of the proposed development.	Further development East of Cullompton requires underpinning by an infrastructure that is in place before any building commences. The current economic problems do not bode well for firm commitments for funding.	Really concerned to see from the recent Master Plan that you have now almost doubled the original footprint for the village and now included within the "potential area of consideration for wider Garden Village and Country Park" our property and other listed buildings not to mention wildlife areas that are of importance. I do not understand how a Council can railroad rules in terms of listed buildings and what assurances do we have in terms of a new build village being built in areas of importance with wildlife and listed buildings?	I would, whilst writing, like to reiterate strongly the view held by a majority in Kentisbeare and by our Parish Council that we do not wish the Kentisbeare Parish boundary to be breached. All development should remain on the Cullompton side of Horn Road, including the 'relocated' sports club.		Climate Emergency – we are in a time of crisis and unprecedented climate emergency – we are hurtling towards a future that if we do not change our ways will mean devastation for our world – how can we allow this to happen to our children and grandchildren – Preventing this and protecting our planet and all its inhabitants must be the very first consideration taken into account for every decision we make as a district, a community and as individuals – It is irresponsible beyond belief not to, and hopefully will soon be illegal too.	I just want the timing done correctly. Facilities and infrastructure first, development later. Fordmore is not a community hub. It is a private money making venture and should not be considered a focus at that end of the development.	

Transport	General Development	Infrastructure	Principle/Questions/Other	Wider Garden Village	Flooding	Env/GI/BI/Landscape	Facilities	Affordable Housing
<p>Currently there is a dire lack of public transport to and from Cullompton for the existing villages along the A373. Are there guarantees that there will be a frequent and regular bus service to support the development of East Cullompton with the Town and proposed railway station. Is there a firm commitment from the bus companies?</p>		<p>I continue to have major concerns about the viability of any large-scale development to the East of Cullompton. These are mainly related to the infrastructure required to support it.</p>	<p>I have lived happily in Kentisbeare for 30 years and it is so important to myself and other people in Kentisbeare to keep our village as it is and not have such a large number of houses built so close to Kentisbeare. I have taught at the school, helped at youth club, led a Sunday school for many years and now am a church and choir member. I dearly hope you will consider so many reasons for not building such a large development. The traffic going towards Cullompton and the motorway is already very heavy and frustrating. In addition flooding is already a real problem and with climate change and large scale building causing a quicker run off it can only get worse.</p>	<p>The Kentisbeare Parish boundary should be recognised and kept. The plans to build 5000 houses wipes out acres of prime agricultural land. Why? The Terminology 'Garden Village' is a contradiction in terms. I have looked up the definition of the word 'Garden'. A piece of ground adjoining a house in which flowers, grass and shrubs may be grown. A village definition is 'A group of houses and associated buildings, larger than a hamlet and smaller than a town, situated in a rural area'. What Mid Devon is wanting to do, is creating A TOWN.</p>		<p>During the recent building of the Persimmon Housing development on Willand Road, I witnessed the sad felling of an ancient oak tree (over 250 years old). Can you give an assurance that trees over 30 years old will be preserved and if not how many trees over 30 years old will be felled to make way for the new development?</p>	<p>Building a sense of community.... make it compact and village like.... 2500 houses is a significant town- a Cullompton for 10 years ago, Although Cullompton High St has struggled the town still boasts several Churches, 7+pubs, many cafes, restaurants and social clubs, 2 Doctors surgeries, 2 chemists, butchers and several convenience stores, Library, sports clubs, 2 supermarkets, schools and nurseries and more Hairdressers than I can count. To create a community you need all these things. They need to be accessible and designed to generate an identity. The plan does not do this- 2 small commercial hubs is poor thought. It is a town you are planning not a village so design accordingly.</p>	
<p>Do not allow the proposed amount of development until this junction on M5 is sorted or a new junction built with the finance guaranteed for same.</p>			<p>Every year costs rise and projects go unfunded-eg Relief road- and the project keeps getting bigger. It seems to have its own life, continually growing and getting further and further out of reach as costs rise. Surely it is time for a major rethink, especially as the country is virtually bankrupt.</p>	<p>I have to say that we are extremely disappointed that the plans now potentially involve developing across the Kentisbeare village boundary up to Dead lane. The consultant that was present repeated that they will only go up to dead lane if they need to and at the end of the day it's only an idea at this stage. Given that MDDC previously reassured villagers that they would not develop past the village boundary this reassurance appears not to be worth the paper that it is written on. My wife and I oppose these latest plans and MDDC should return to the original promise of any development to the east of Cullompton would be kept outside of Kentisbeare Parish and that the green buffer zone be placed to ensure that the village remains a village and no developments should encroach on it.</p>			<p>Please consider placing the school &amp; sports facilities at the heart of the east Cullompton development so that car travel is minimised outside of the development. I whole heartedly support the vision of making this new community sustainable with services but the school needs to be placed further towards Cullompton in the heart of the housing development, perhaps where local shops are planned</p>	
<p>Expecting people to walk or cycle is just not going to happen. Public transport is already unreliable with strikes as long as the unions have a say and always will be, so people will still rely on cars. To say otherwise is ideological at best. Cullompton railway station is a waste of money. Where will people leave cars in order to use to train?</p>			<p>There are still aspects that require a major degree of further attention, to name just two – flooding and infrastructure.</p>	<p>My main concern with the consultation is the new blurred zone of 'potential area for consideration' which directly crosses the parish of Kentisbeare boundary. I feel most residents of Kentisbeare would agree that this proposal threatens our rural way of life. MDDC have previously assured us of a green buffer zone in line with your rural areas policy. I feel this new proposal would contradict this previous assurance. 'all-through school' buildings with sports facilities, in my mind, do not constitute a green buffer zone, as substantial buildings, which are not agricultural will need to be erected. A large scale school will bring huge amounts of traffic, again contravening the very fabric of rural living. This also is not a development that will enhance the character, appearance or biodiversity of Kentisbeare village which is a contradiction to your rural areas policy. Also, this was not in the original adopted plan which again threatens trust between Kentisbeare residents and MDDC.</p>				
<p>The planning document should have a section that summaries the key conditions one of which is the need to complete the Relief Road first. The document and the presentation at Kentisbeare indicated that it was planned to slow the traffic on Honiton Road (A373). This A road is presumably to a greater or lesser extent subject to the rules from the Highways Authority not just MDDC so the options are very restricted. Currently it is quite common to see speeding cars along the road and not unusual to see overtaking taking place. With such flagrant breaking of the legislation you wonder if simple road markings (alligator marks, red road surface, repeater discs) will be heeded. One comment made was that the road appearance/width suggested that it was a fast road. Only physical restraints like "sleeping policeman" or chicanes are likely to work. Cullompton High Street has 20mph limit where the road is narrow but clearly this limit is often ignored.</p>			<p>It is not acceptable to plan developments that require millions of pounds spent on the increased use of motor vehicles. For this proposal to go ahead MDDC are spending £800K purely on a feasibility study to look at possibilities for increased traffic! Future M5 junctions are looking at costing over £100 million pounds! The Cullompton relief road is now being costed at £30K plus! This is not an acceptable use of vast sums of public money in these times of climate emergency. Our country and indeed our county are at breaking point financially – this is irresponsible beyond belief.</p>	<p>Why has the East Cullompton Extension been allowed to cross over into the Parish of Kentisbeare. If the unwanted extension is going to happen it should remain within the Cullompton boundary.</p>				

Transport	General Development	Infrastructure	Principle/Questions/Other	Wider Garden Village	Flooding	Env/GI/BI/Landscape	Facilities	Affordable Housing
<p>A relief road starting just east of 29 Honiton Road and went close behind the houses to get to what was described as a south facing half junction with M5 to allow residents to easily go to Exeter. This relief road has been erased from the plan and the only place on this revision of the plans where such a road can be placed is significantly to the south of the original route. Please consider reinstating the original routing. Mention was made at Kentisbeare of the possibility of a similar relief road but to the north. A detailed traffic survey needs to be done to show if the traffic from the Garden Village will go to Exeter or Taunton.</p>			<p>It is not acceptable to build on flood plains – this becomes even more important as the climate crisis hits. It is not acceptable to build acres of housing estates on agricultural land that is and will be desperately needed to grow crops and graze animals. It is not acceptable to build houses in areas where residents need to use cars to travel to work. It is not acceptable to allow development to be decided and influenced by the profit aspirations of landowners and developers. It has never been acceptable to ignore the needs of existing residents (of all species) and their communities when planning future development. Yet this plan proposed by Mid Devon District Council is based on doing all of the above. Surely Mid Devon District Council have a duty of care to their residents – surely they have a basic and unavoidable responsibility to 'do no harm'.</p>					
<p>Favouring walking and cycling, how do you propose to do that? There is nothing in the plan to stimulate that. It is a human choice how to travel and regrettably the majority will choose vehicles over effort every time unless you make the development traffic free - which you are clearly not</p>			<p>From the very first suggestion of development East of Cullompton the needs and views of the rural residents in the area have been ignored –Policy S14 in the local plan – under the heading Development – promised to 'preserve and where possible enhance the character, appearance and the biodiversity of the countryside'. Policies will 'permit agricultural and other appropriate rural uses'. – Kentisbeare is particularly named as one of the areas given this protection and assurance. However at the very first point in the process this was ignored – with permission given to Cullompton Cricket Club to be relocated within the parish of Kentisbeare and continues to be ignored with 'potential areas of consideration' reaching well into the heart of the parish – None of this is in the adopted plan and all of it goes against the overriding view of the residents that a Green Buffer area would exist on the Cullompton side of the Parish boundary and that development should be kept outside of the parish.</p>					
<p>The Railway Station would be good, but if the plan (as I was told at the Kentisbeare pop-up) is for a Metro linking Tiverton, Wellington, Cullompton and Exeter every 2 hours it is not going to contribute much to the carbon footprint of Old Cullompton, evolving Cullompton and East Cullompton.</p>			<p>IF – we cannot stop the initial development East of Cullompton – then we can and should demand that you STOP! Stop at the parish boundary between Cullompton and Kentisbeare – respect our community and leave a buffer zone on the Cullompton side of the boundary. Stop breaking your commitment to preserve our community and environment. START respecting our communities, our environment and our children.</p>					
<p>The thought of 5000 houses being built off the A373 is quite frightening. The A373 as we all know, is a very poor 'A' road which should in fact be a 'B'. So why would anybody want to consider building this amount of houses off it. As and when any form of building might take place on the A373, it is inevitable, there will be traffic lights involved. The A373, especially at peak hours gets very clogged up particularly near the M5 junction. With traffic lights on this road, this traffic problem would get very much worse. To avoid the traffic lights, motorists are going to take to the narrow lanes nearby to get to their destinations. It is highly likely that they will drive faster than they should and accidents are inevitable. The whole concept has not been thought through properly by Mid Devon Planning Dept and members of the Council.</p>			<p>I wish to object in the strongest possible terms to the above application relating to the development land for the Culm Garden Village - In particular, on the land that is within Kentisbeare Parish Boundary. You are already utilising over 700 acres of rural land to build the new Culm Garden Village, so the idea of allowing you to allocate a further 170 acres of "all through school" is both against what was promised and undemocratic. Any proposed schools, for the new Culm Village, should be sited within your originally proposed landbank and not merely "sneaking" it into Kentisbeare Parish.</p>					

Transport	General Development	Infrastructure	Principle/Questions/Other	Wider Garden Village	Flooding	Env/GI/BI/Landscape	Facilities	Affordable Housing
<p>Will you (can you) please give assurance to occupants of Greenhouse Gardens, that the road passing through Greenhouse Gardens will NOT be used for access to the building site? Also, that this road should be barred to the contractors. The road is already insufficient for current needs, let alone perhaps 100 additional cars using the road for parking during the day, and perhaps overnight. Access to the building site should be via the road leading directly to the site from the A373, and building work should not even be started until improvement of the A373/J27 of M5 access is improved. If this request is ignored, not only will the brick road leading into Greenhouse Gardens be destroyed through overuse by heavy delivery vehicles, but the safety of children playing outside their homes will become an unsafe area.</p>								