

Appendix 1 - Answers to survey questions

Category	Question	Transport	General Development	Facilities	GI/BI/Landscape/Sustainability	Flooding	
Planning for a different future	What are your views on the opportunities and challenges that the Masterplan is seeking to respond to?	I have no issue at all with the general idea of this as I fully understand the need for new homes and work opportunities. As a resident of Culm Lea, I do however, have a problem with the additional traffic that this will create along Honiton Road towards the motorway which even now, if often queued way past Mole Valley. I therefore want to know what is going to happen around junction 28 to prevent the whole of Cullompton being totally gridlocked	Unless its for local people only, then it is a complete con trick. Saving the environment by building more housing? I think that is the thickest statement for a long time! And what is Mid Devon District Council doing getting involved when the area is under the jurisdiction of East Devon District Council?	Sustainability. All new buildings, regardless of who will own it, should be net zero for their whole life which includes being run by renewable energy. Facilities should be designed to complement Cullompton's existing facilities which serve the existing residents. It's short sighted to remove these so currently happy residents move out to better places. A hardstanding multi-use pitch would be good. We don't have anywhere kids can learn to ride their bikes, rollerblading, basketball etc. The skate park gets too busy for everyone.	For ancient or veteran trees (including those on the woodland boundary), the buffer zone should be at least 15 times larger than the diameter of the tree. The buffer zone should be 5 metres from the edge of the tree's canopy if that area is larger than 15 times the tree's diameter. This will create a minimum root protection area. Where assessment shows other impacts are likely to extend beyond this distance, the proposal is likely to need a larger buffer zone.	Point 3 is critical but the major issues will be a) surface water run-off from the massively increased paved areas - how will development mitigate against combined sewers being overloaded? b) have the Sud's schemes been definitively costed and who will manage the maintenance of these schemes once the development work has been created? c) has the high water table across the development site been fully recognised? d) has modelling been done to ensure that East Cullompton development doesn't create any "backing-up" issues for villages upstream (notably Kentsisbeare where there was a flood event in 2012? Points 4 and 5 are well made and hopefully the Connecting the Culm project will ensure that high quality nature-based solutions will be at the forefront of planning to ensure that flood-risk is properly mitigated across the whole development site but also in the River Ken.	
		All these changes would require a major change to the road network of the area. The main Honiton Road which runs through this site was not considered adequate for a recycle centre back in 2013, there is now more traffic flow and congestion on this road and the development is being allowed to start prior to any upgrade work to the road network. This will result in even more congestion particularly at J28 of the M5, with no promise of the road improvements actually being undertaken.	I think the key challenge that the plan needs to respond to is building a community that actually works, and sadly I can't see that at the moment. On the one hand it is meant to be part of Cullompton, and yet with the railway, motorway & river in between this simply will not happen.	Secondary Schools - I've seen in a couple of the new housing developments primary schools will be built but the secondary school is already over prescribed and where will these primary children go once, they are old enough? We already drive to Willand because the schools in Cullompton were over prescribed.	Denists - we haven't been able to get an appointment in over a year that's only going to get worse. Infrastructure - Personally I find it really hard to believe we've just been moved to three weekly refuse collections to 'aid recycling and reducing carbon foot print' more like we're putting in over 2k in houses and can't afford to collect anymore waste. If it really was about recycling, you'd collect it weekly like they do in West Devon where we moved back from in January. It would be nice to see a new recycling centre in the East Cullompton development where people could recycle cardboard, plastic, metal etc.	Your comments on 'movement of water on the site' 'utilising water courses' is quite comical. Have you seen the state of the local river in Cullompton? It is polluted and horrible. There is a real opportunity to build something which actually responds to the climate emergency and decreasing wildlife but this will take real guts to do. Every house would need to have renewable energy. Large areas around the site should be rewilded. Houses built using sustainable materials. Unfortunately most of these projects only care about making money and not achieving these things.	
		The plan to start the development around the Fordmore Farm development will encourage more traffic along the main Honiton route along with construction traffic - how is this planned on being dealt with?	At the same time the larger "new town" is being built without a central focus, and is in danger of just being urban sprawl extension. The absence of a clear focus/centre does not mean that people will go into Cullompton, but will simply drive into Exeter (or wherever they are working). As yet this village/town/extension doesn't know what it is, and being planned in two stages does not help.	Overall I'd like to see the reinstatement of the railway and expansion of motorway junction prior to any more developments along with the provision of a new secondary school and green spaces where you can actually walk the dogs off lead and the kids can play. We keep hearing about the jobs and great things the town will get from these developments but as far as I can see we get nothing. No new services, entertainment or resources are being provided for existing residents just ugly large developments of more houses for people to live in and to commute out of a dire boring commuter town with no real community.			
		I have concerns about the general infrastructure of the town and its current inability to fully support residents needs let alone adding more large developments.	Loss of a small semi-rural town - we were attracted to Cullompton because it was a small, quiet mid Devon town. It will no longer have that nice small communal atmosphere, it's already been over developed, and it feels like we're living in a monopoly board under the thumb of a thirsty development tycoon. So many natural habitats have been destroyed leaving the wildlife with only flood plains to live on and the landscape blighted by ugly new builds that aren't fit for purpose.	Horn Road is within Kentsisbeare Parish. Sports facilities should be within Cullompton. The boundary of Kentsisbeare Parish should be respected as per S14 of the Local Plan. The 20 minute principle is quoted but then not built into the plan- location of schools, commercial hub, social and care facilities.		There must be a green buffer zone to Kentsisbeare to ensure it maintains its identity as a village.	
		The motorway junctions - these cannot already support the growing traffic coming into what is a commuter town. Cullompton has excellent links to Exeter, Taunton and Bristol being on the M5 corridor. We live in Head Weir and have already seen a significant increase in traffic at peak times in the AM and PM where the cars queue well down Millennium Way and up into town and across the motorway bridge which makes it a nightmare to drive in and out of the town. The railway station could certainly relieve some of this but the need for expansion to the slip ways is inevitable. Sometimes you can queue for over 30 minutes just to get down the hill past the Weary Traveller.	Point 2 is critical but the delay to the "ring road" through the CCA fields and the lack of detailed costings (and options) for J28 make the whole connectivity piece incredibly difficult. Hopefully there will be more than one foot-crossing point in the scheme and hopefully one crossing which is pedestrian only.	Point 7 seems to allude to the development of the Fordmore site as a community mixed-use hub - this suggests a very strong developer-led bias - why would a significant community hub be sited at the east extremity of the proposed development? The current proposed "community hub" features look particularly weak in the current edition of the masterplan. Point 8 seems aspirational but difficult to deliver as the employment designated land in East Cullompton will inevitably become the focus for employment within the community of East Cullompton (the M5 and J28 being natural barriers).		Point 12 suggests the "need" for a water park (in what is already a rural area has somehow already been established and will therefore take effect - how has the "need" been determined?	
	Point 2 is critical but the delay to the "ring road" through the CCA fields and the lack of detailed costings (and options) for J28 make the whole connectivity piece incredibly difficult. Hopefully there will be more than one foot-crossing point in the scheme and hopefully one crossing which is pedestrian only.	I still think there are a number of "issues" with the updated masterplan and sometimes the constant re-iteration of an aspiration won't necessarily result in that aspiration coming into effect. For instance IF the East Cullompton development goes ahead I do NOT feel that there is a good chance of Cullompton and East Cullompton becoming one community and the M5 is a massive barrier to that aspiration. Indeed I think that in years to come East Cullompton is more likely to become like Cranbrook and people will be asking for a new town council for East Cullompton - and the long term projection of housing that might be built will only serve to reinforce this point.	Point 13 seems to go against the idea of creating community - surely the sports pitches should be in the centre of the community not at the eastern extremity - this suggests they are "placed" at the eastern extremity so further future development will surround them? Do the sports pitches encroach into Kentsisbeare parish and if they do then the "green buffer" promise is at best being diluted and probably ignored?	The adopted plan did not include any reference to a sports club 'to the east of Horn Road'. This goes over the Kentsisbeare Parish boundary and residents have already made clear their opposition to any encroachment into the parish. A desire not to have "a hard edge" to the end of the proposed Garden village should not include a blurring of boundaries and properly rural areas need to be preserved. Assurances were previously given that there would be a buffer area which would remain as agricultural land.			
	I would agree with a lot of the opportunities listed, but feel that this is going to be a very expensive development in which developers are going to have to fund large parts of the infrastructure. Infrastructure, in particular the Cullompton Town Centre Relief, changes to junction 28 and Honiton Road need to be addressed before any large scale development takes place. How will Mid Devon District Council get developers to fund infrastructure before large scale housing? If the costs are too high for developers will want change the housing density and cut corners on the environmental issues to make their profits.	Cullompton and any development East of Cullompton will never be one community - they are separated by a substantial river, an incredibly busy motorway and a high speed railway. Any redevelopment of the motorway junction and road network is already estimated as costing 100's of millions of pounds - this is not a responsible or acceptable use of public money - it will also add a huge amount onto the cost of every house. If by emphasising the movement of water through the site you mean - this is important because you are proposing to build on a flood plain - then this should be viewed as a massive no.. not an opportunity! If this is not what the question means then I have no idea what you mean. There is not meant to be development east of Horn Road, it is totally wrong - ignoring the views of the residents and breaking all trust with them - by proposing sports clubs in the area.	I assume the challenge will be to provide housing for local people however due to its proximity to M5 more people will relocate to the area already over populated for the amenities available. Our hospitals, doctors and dentists are already full to capacity who will provide healthcare with employees already leaving the profession due to low salaries etc.				
	I still think there are a number of "issues" with the updated masterplan and sometimes the constant re-iteration of an aspiration won't necessarily result in that aspiration coming into effect. For instance IF the East Cullompton development goes ahead I do NOT feel that there is a good chance of Cullompton and East Cullompton becoming one community and the M5 is a massive barrier to that aspiration. Indeed I think that in years to come East Cullompton is more likely to become like Cranbrook and people will be asking for a new town council for East Cullompton - and the long term projection of housing that might be built will only serve to reinforce this point.	Local homes for local families, not a second home owned place - our countryside is not for that.					
Priorities for growing Cullompton	What are your thoughts on the idea of encouraging more people to walk, cycle and use public transport and providing day to day services and facilities as part of a 20 minute place?	Yes I totally agree but in the winter, walking and cycling are never going to be a feasible option for most people and public transport is ridiculously expensive and again, in winter, it's not much fun hanging around for buses.	Building 2,000 Homes ie extra 6,000 people will not help people walk cycle and use public transport. If you want set up a new cycle track then go ahead but without the extra homes.	The current schooling is already struggling to cope with the existing local population. This new development will definitely need a new primary school to absorb the extra demand. Also, the College Surgery in Cullompton is at capacity. What are the plans for expanding the local medical and dental services?	The Woodland Trust is supportive of sustainable travel. However, it is important that the routes chosen for these networks do not harm irreplaceable habitat or woodland creation sites.		
		After building the inner relief road please pedestrianise Fore Street except for buses and make it one way and re open the railway station with room on trains for bikes.	It's a nice idea... but I don't think it will draw people into Cullompton. People may walk within East Cullompton, but I fear will drive into "old" Cullompton, if they come in at all.	I currently live in Nightingale Lawns and have things within a 20 minute walk. Yet soon I will have to drive to access things like the rugby club so it's all hypocritical. Lots of positive publicity but overall for the people from all of Cullompton, there will be no reduction in travelling time to access facilities. Just new houses near facilities and old ones losing them. Yet the new houses are still too far away from the high street so no-one will have everything now.	Great, please reduce development on the floodplain and above net biodiversity gain + recovery		
		A 20 min cycle is quite far. Encouraging more people to cycle and walk is a must but it must be combined with infrastructure which is fit for purpose. Pavements along quiet roads which are nice to walk on, cycle lanes where the cyclist has priority over cars, undercover storage for bikes at key locations.	20 minutes in principle but not in the plan. Covering agricultural land with houses does not 'reverse the decline in wildlife'. Building 5000 houses does not satisfy 'One urgent priority is the need to move away from places that rely so heavily on people out-commuting by private car each day. It stimulates it!	Admirable, you just have to ensure adequate facilities are provided			
		Encouraging less reliance on the car would be a good thing if public transport was provided and an affordable cost, the reduction in the size of roads will create the same issues of inability for buses, ambulances, emergency vehicles etc to access the site, as seen on numerous developments in the area.	As residents within the delightful village of 'Kentsisbeare' we currently enjoy the well-being factor favouring walking cycling, good air quality, low night-time light pollution and surrounding farmland. We do not need a few minutes walk to a park or greenspace with water course as existing natural habitats offer contact with nature. Existing lanes and public footpaths already characterise this area. Protection of the vegetation and local habitats will not be possible if there are to be thousands of additional homes/work units/ schools. Increase in human habitation will impact on the transport pollution, noise and crime levels within the area.	The concept of 20 minute place is a good aspiration - developing the infrastructure so that people don't use the A377 is absolutely crucial. However the current construct seems to have very peripheral community hub designations so where will the "heart" of East Cullompton actually be as Mole Valley and the designated employment space seem to be geographically central but very unlikely to deliver community "heart"			
		It's a great idea in principle but not so practical when you have young children that can't walk far or people with disabilities that may need access to a car/ specialist transport. I would still need a car to commute to places of work but I would walk around town but again if I need to do a full supermarket shop lugging it home isn't practical or if I was to buy something heavy and cumbersome and had to transport it home	I think it is a marketing gimmick - most of the facilities being planned on the edge of the housing development the chances of residents walking or cycling is very remote - any public transport will take many years - the station we are told will have no parking but will be a considerable distance for most residents - and we are told trains only running every couple of hours.				
		Anything that encourages using public transportation and alternatives to cars is very welcome	Excellent idea. But not easy to get to the railway station from the garden village. The development should be located on the west side of the motorway adjacent to the railway station at junction 27, and use the east side of junction 27 for industrial. From there, people could easily walk and cycle to parkway. It's not too late to change the plan!				
	Considering how busy the M5 is currently, I can't see that people won't have the choice but to walk/cycle however the Honiton Road will also be over stretched so safe I don't think so! Public transport how long will it take to open a station at Cullompton and is it really viable?						

Category	Question	Transport	General Development	Facilities	GI/BI/Landscape/Sustainability	Flooding	
Priorities for growing Cullompton	Do you agree with the current vision and key principles set out under Planet, People and Place?	I don't necessarily believe that treating Cullompton and East Cullompton as one place will necessarily reduce out commuting or reduce carbon emissions. People will travel out of the area to seek, high skilled, high paid jobs if they cannot be found or developed in Cullompton. On the upside if Cullompton becomes a destination town people will travel in. Village scale for housing, yes, but don't like the idea of compact (could be interpreted as high density).	I think much of it sounds good on paper, making it a reality is a different matter! I expect Cranbrook sounded good on paper!! I see little as yet to foster any sense of community? Are you in conversation with the local church, as they are key community builders?	I agree with the principles but Cullompton shouldn't be developed to the detriment of existing residents. Losing the cricket club and rugby club to the new development in East Cullompton is pointless when they're so well established. There are plenty of houses available nearby should people wish to live near them.	I agree we need more housing, but the infrastructure needs to grow with it. The planet and nature needs to be taken into account to, I agree. Please, please, can all the new housing have solar panels fitted as they have been built? I honestly cannot understand why this is not been done as standard on ALL new housing built in the UK. This alone would get us to Carbon Zero so much quicker.	This site also has a high tendency to flood which will only increase as our climate warms.	
		No, when you are prioritising building on green field sites, I could never consider it Planet first, it's more like Pawning the Planet for Profit.		Build a sense of community and sense of belonging around existing activities and uses and around the new village centres. Make them pedestrian-friendly and keep them largely traffic-free. There are no village centres. A village is perhaps 1,000-2,000 people with a hub of shop(s), school, religious buildings, social meeting premises. Where are they all?	I fail to understand how developing this quantity of green field land will encourage and sustain wildlife, with the removal of trees, hedgerows and open quiet spaces, not to mention the removal of vegetation, flowers and berries. I would also like to see developers providing solar panels to ALL buildings as standard practice along with the highest standards of house insulation etc.	Transform water management and habitat creation in this part of the Culm Valley to reduce flooding, increase biodiversity and to make water and wildlife central to day-to-day life in East Cullompton. Not demonstrated by the plan. Wildlife will be driven away and the only water in day to day life will be flooding.	
		The principles are fine but are not delivered by the plan. It is a case of window dressing and hiding the true nature of the plan. Regard Cullompton and East Cullompton as one place, make them interdependent and mutually supportive. This will strengthen the local economy, making the town more resilient. It will reduce out-commuting, reduce carbon emissions, improve air quality and reduce noise and dust. The plan is far larger than Old Cullompton with less facilities. Neither the existing or the new show any scope for interdependency. Offer choice and make better homes and workplaces that are flexible and adaptable for changing lifestyles. Build sociable streets and rural lanes that encourage neighbourliness, outdoor living and outdoor play. Make sure everyone is within a few minutes walk of a park or a greenspace or the opportunity to follow or cross a watercourse. This is not supported in the plan. Make it compact and village-scale, combining well-crafted buildings and spaces that are pedestrian-friendly. Make it safe by reducing traffic speeds to 20mph or lower. Bring the scale of infrastructure down with narrower streets and spaces, something more in keeping with a village character. Bring the rural character of East Cullompton alive by incorporating existing rural tracks, the hedgerows and the mature Oak trees that characterise this area. Make the active travel and bus routes between East Cullompton and the town into green lanes that are rural in character. The A373? A Green Lane. Celebrate the presence of water and the crossing of, or the following of, watercourses part of the experience of daily life, such as the route to school or the workplace, or the journey to and from the new station or to the local shops. Nice prose, eloquent dream but really?			I think the principles described in Planet, People and Place are all very laudable but my confidence in these principles actually being delivered is extremely low. Will all housing units be EPC A rated, will developers be mandated to fit solar PV, solar thermal and ASHP or GSHP in every house unit? Will building regulations be changed to ensure that developers deliver this climate critical change to how houses are being built? Combine locally-sourced clean energy with reduced energy demand and energy-efficient, durable and adaptable buildings. Where is this locally sourced energy coming from? Protect natural resources, including existing vegetation and local soils and local habitats. Reconnect and strengthen local landscapes and increase woodland cover. You cannot protect what you destroy only the margins that are left. Use innovative and modern methods of construction to minimise waste and reduce pollution. Improve human health and well-being by favouring walking and cycling over other modes, improving air and water quality and improving contact with nature. Favouring is a human choice not something you can plot. Building footpaths not roads makes it happen. How does being in the middle of 5000 houses improve contact with nature? One finds nature where humans have not developed.		
		In the current United Kingdom climate, whereupon the cost of living is rising and the availability of numerous food products being affected by trade prices, surely it is more important to retain our farmland (especially in counties/farming areas like Devon) and think about growing more of our own produce to help people, place and planet. Focusing on the town of Cullompton and looking at ways forward to improve the High Street trade should be the first priority before considering the removal of farmland for the possible influx of thousands of additional people! One reason Devon is such a successful tourist focused county is because of the rural areas that attract people during their recreational pursuits, which will be in question should more built up areas evolve mirroring the downfall of some other counties.			Not sure that I could see much evidence, oh yeas some solar panels - however, who cares about our planet let alone country? Our reservoirs are at an all time low - gas and electricity in short supply, yes earth/air heat pumps will aid this crisis but hardly affordable, home prices will be high and with current mortgage rates once again raises the question who will buy these properties. I agree but am concerned that they will not be fully met. The planet section needs to be more radical.		
		No - to all of them - the development will be deeply damaging to the planet and the people in this area of Mid Devon - "Protect natural resources, including existing vegetation and local soils and local habitats. Reconnect and strengthen local landscapes and increase woodland cover." - by building 5000 houses???? That is not possible! This is not a village it is a town - and it will bring to the area at least 10,000 people and nearly as many cars - the pollution and disruption caused by this can in no way be seen as helping health. Most of these new residents will have to travel to work - it is the wrong development in the wrong place and totally wrong for the planet.					
		It is exactly that, a vision. Like all visions it seeks to create something new and 'wonderful'. Phrases like 'celebrating the presence of water' ignores the realities of rural mud and the other joys of country living. What will be created will be a form of 'sanitised' country living with artificial 'village centres' where actual 'contact with nature' may or may not be a part of daily life. All very admirable.					
East Cullompton Masterplan	What are your views on the masterplan for East Cullompton and the locations of development, open spaces, streets and facilities that are shown?	You still have one major arterial road? How will a huge back up of Honiton Road traffic go?	Complete and Utter Madness. East Devon will end up looking like the West Midlands.	Where are the promised sports facilities within this development?	Preserve the green farmland to the east to create a natural and embedded agricultural buffer zone		
		NONE of this should be built until the traffic issues are resolved. New houses are already being built on the other side of the motorway, and how the roads are going to cope is anyone's guess. I believe there should be a complete moratorium on any new houses until the motorway junction is sorted, the town centre bypass is built, and the railway station reopened.	Initially, Kentsbeare Parish Council boundary had the likelihood of a green buffer zone to limit building lines. However, it would appear that the prospect of a school and other facilities is now encroaching within the boundary and extending up to Dead Lane Cross. How are the Council allowed to extend within the boundary?	The development looks good but it should be additional to the existing facilities in Cullompton and not replacing them. People should be encouraged to be outdoors in all weathers. We need more facilities suitable for use through the winter e.g. hard standing playgrounds/multi use pitches, undercover picnic areas and seating etc.	It's an outrage that so much green space is being given over to housing developments when there is a desperate need to protect against loss of habitat. Over 60 percent of the UK's wildlife biodiversity has been lost and its because of developments like this. This is just propaganda and buzz words designed to lull the public into the weak belief that this is somehow environmentally friendly and not destroying countless eco-systems.		
		How will the additional traffic be managed? A new motorway junction is required under Local Plan Policy but it is impossible to see how this will be afforded for such a small number of houses and Highways England has confirmed it would not fund under RIS because it's not providing a strategic benefit but just supporting the CGV housing estate. Is a garden village actually a garden village if it can only be made to work by such heavy reliance non the motorway?	Move it all to the west side of Junction 27 before it's too late.	The primary school has been allocated a space next to the main road this is a dangerous area for young children to be especially early in the morning at commuting time. It will also cause more congestion at drop off and pick up times along an already over used road. There is no allocation for a secondary school is this going to be added in an expansion program to an already large development? I can see no allocation for a doctors surgery or dentist, there are currently not enough of these services in Cullompton and the surrounding areas how is this to be addressed?			
		Where is employment development in EC and CGV going to go? Over 80% of working people currently commute out and without significant employment development at Cullompton an even higher percentage will need to commute out - by car, as you can't walk or cycle down the M5 and the alternative routes are largely unsafe for cyclists or people on linked trips taking their children to school and carrying on to work. When is the modelling work showing what is needed going to be publicly available? Rumours are circling that MDDC is trying to achieve what they need by shifting people out of their cars but this is totally unrealistic given how reliant the existing settlement at Cullompton is on private car travel. Highways England have been banging on about needing assessment and significant funding to cope with the predicted traffic but this does not seem to be acknowledged or accepted by MDDC. When are we going to have proper commitment to delivery the road improvements that they say will be needed?					
		Road crossings, are they footbridges? The A373 is already experiencing serious overloading and needs careful consideration.	I don't have the internet, so only saw the plans and can't say that they were that enlightening except that this masterplan is eating up all of our lovely countryside. The reason people like to visit our lovely country. Do we really need this 'master plan' - I think not.	Primary school location not at the centre of community			
		No planned expansion of the motorway junctions is also a poor oversight and Stagecoach can't even provide buses to Exeter anymore so are they really going to cover these new routes?	It all looks great. A good balance of areas. As long as the housing development has adequate parking for at least two vehicles per house.	My overall view of this development is that East Cullompton will become a separate community from the existing town of Cullompton and all the connectivity promised will NOT deliver a single community or growth for the existing town. With respect to the current masterplan the main weakness is the lack of a real community hub at the centre of the proposed development with 3 small hubs being in peripheral locations.			
Primary school is off Honiton Road which will increase traffic and congestion along Honiton Road as will the primary and secondary streets exiting onto Honiton Road. The location of the school is not central to the development and will not encourage those living further away to walk. They will use a car.		I am sorry to be negative again - but the attached map is almost impossible to decipher - all I can see is that the mixed community hubs appear to be on the edge of the proposed development which is a strange place to put a hub! Aren't hubs usually in the middle??? Could you explain please!					

Category	Question	Transport	General Development	Facilities	GI/BI/Landscape/Sustainability	Flooding
Activity & Landscape	Do you agree with the approach of the masterplan to seek to build on activities already taking place including an expansion around Fordmore Farm for the principal community hub?	Again, where will all the extra Cullompton bound traffic go?	The local community especially the Kentisbeare community have already specified the need for a buffer zone between Horn Road and Dead Lane; by pushing development of a community hub that far down the Honiton Road, the boundaries further east of the development will encroach on the Kentisbeare parish. Community wishes should be respected once they have been sought.	You're not building on activities already taking place, you're moving the activities from Cullompton into this new development e.g. cricket and rugby. There is no improvement overall. In fact, it will be worse for many people. It's a waste of money to just move things already in Cullompton. Money should be spent on the things we need but don't have or need more of e.g. places to go in bad weather, primary and secondary schools, NHS dentists, WIFI hotspots, homeless shelter etc. Not sure, just labelling it as a community hub doesn't really explain its benefits, a lot of these places are built then sit empty because the public don't use them. It would be good to have open playing fields and premises that charities can use to host events and community projects such as fetes and book fairs.		
		No, I feel that the location for a school (s) is dangerous due to proximity to the particular Honiton to Cullompton Road.	If the street view picture above is an illustration of the type of buildings that will be put there they are totally out of keeping with a rural settlement, the area looks soulless, yet another development of modern buildings with no variety in features. I like the idea of the green spaces within the streets but who is going to maintain them in times of more and more Council spending cuts are residents going to have to pay a maintenance charge to keep the area look at its best?	That depends hugely in what else is going to go in there (as yet this seems very vague?). Will there be some form of shared community centre/facility? Shared with school, possibly health, possibly church? What will make it the centre? How will the Honiton Road be managed there?		
		Fordmore Farm is at the extreme edge of the plan, its access to the A373 is an accident waiting to happen without serious remodelling so no I disagree.	It would seem that the family ownership of 'Fordmore Farm' has already been forward planning with the anticipation of thousands of homes. Infrastructure on Honiton Road is and will struggle with the extension of their business. Not least thinking about the properties nearby that must be feeling the increase in traffic noise/pollution.	There is a farm shop at Junction 27 already. Fordmore Farm is on the very edge of the development and on the busy A373 - is new not yet established - wrong place		
			No - I do not agree that the expansion around Fordmore Farm as the principal community hub is a good idea. This is at the eastern fringe of the proposed development and it smacks of two issues: a) this development is being developer led (by key land holders) - not community led and b) if Fordmore is developed then there is already a strong assumption that there will be further future development to the east and eventually Kentisbeare will be "lost" as an independent and thriving village (just look at what Cranbrook has done to its surrounding area)	Once again, the question is access. The sure what the community hub includes - who will use it. Agree on seeking to build on activities already taking place but don't agree that Fordmore Farm should be a principal community hub as it's not central to the main housing development.		
				Impressed by the 'foresight' of those who bought Fordmore Farm.		
What are your views on the way the masterplan proposes to deliver green and open spaces across the site and the emphasis on including water a key feature?		Realistically, the landscape already offers immense 'well-being' to existing locals and the masterplan is just a way of trying to describe the already beautiful landscape in a different way! Green spaces exist but the difference will be that there will be 'brick built spaces attached to smaller green zones'.	Green and open are good but adequate facilities must be there too. Water feature is 'nice and fanciful' but irrelevant and costly to maintain	The country park is 'potential'. It probably won't happen so shouldn't be included when considering green and open spaces. As long as houses, buildings etc have enough parking and roads are straight and easy to cross, it will be lovely to visit. You can't walk far in Cullompton without coming across a stream. That's nothing new or special. Where is the renewable energy? Where is the innovation to be a sustainable development?		
		Do you know I think it's all pie in the sky and at the end of the day greed. That would appear to be the way the world sadly is.		This is an excellent aspiration. The Woodland Trust encourages councils to require new developments to have 30% tree cover. Existing trees should be retained wherever possible. Water is an important habitat, but ecology should be looked at holistically, and trees provide important shade to water for invertebrates and fish. Wildflowers and Trees are important for many invertebrates which support other biodiversity and pollination.		
		None of it has any substance so hard to comment.		I think that you would need to make the green space larger to make up for the style of housing planned		
				The green spaces are all at the perimeter of what looks like a huge housing estate. No view on the water. These need to be more than just "the only way to use floodplain and land under pylons" which it feels like they are at the moment? This is at minimal cost to constructors who cannot use this land anyway.		
				No. It would be nice to see the inclusion of some allotments or community gardens or orchards where people could grow their own food to sustain their families rather than relying on imported goods from the supermarket. Better dog walking parks could also be provided as public safe green spaces where dogs can be walked safely. More hedges and mature trees could be saved and included. What protections will there be to ensure these aren't wiped out in future expansions? The more open space the better however I do suspect that the green spaces will be areas that can't be built on and the waterways will be the flood prevention areas and rivers unless I am just being cynical.		
				Outdoor space is so important and brings communities together.		
				The planning of green and open spaces is good but the proposal for a country water park in what is already a pretty rural area looks a bit weird. If the emphasis is on flood mitigation then this should be honestly portrayed. Has a demand study been undertaken for the proposed water park? Will this inevitably attract significant visitor numbers and put strain on the minor roads in the proposed country park area? Including water seems sensible, given the amount of it in the area. Likewise green spaces.		
				Really good, blue health (Exeter uni) has been proven		
Mobility, placemaking and other	Do you agree with how the SPD proposes to approach transport and mobility including crossing of the M5, local streets, changes to Honiton Road, public transport and emphasising active travel options?	NO NO NO, if the required changes to the only route across the motorway and junction 28 improvements are left until after all these houses are built, it will never be done!! Improvements to Honiton Road towards Fordmore will be pointless if you still have the total bottleneck approaching junction 28. Any further development is dependent on a new J28 extension, as outlined by the inspector, therefore it is fanciful to be pursuing these options until the precise nature of this junction has been agreed.	It seems foolish to start building without having first sorted some of the major infrastructure questions? The danger is you end up with another Swallow way (complete disaster!) Public transport and active routes may be desired, but are they realistic? Too many houses are built with not enough parking space (to encourage other means of travel), and all it results in is too many cars parked in dangerous places! There needs to be a balance of ideals and realism. Maybe the planners need to be forced to live in the new community! To ensure they don't just produce something great in theory and then just walk away!	Using the Fordmore Farm area as a site of development at the edge of the area will encourage too much development down the Honiton Road, the main community hub should be in the centre of the development not at the edge.		
		Great idea but would be better to improve the existing Cullompton area. We have just lost our bus service to Exeter and now need to walk to the main road to catch it. Not a problem for us but it will be for many people. Why can't the money be split so the existing parts of Cullompton and the new areas can all be like this plan? No doubt the reality will be like the new part of Swallow Way/Kingfisher Reach. Cars parked all over the sides of the road and difficult to cross in places with poor visibility and kerbs strangely high sometimes.	At west junction 27 there would be no need to cross the M5.			
		It is difficult to tell at this stage. The cycling routes need to be planned with public consultation. Bike lanes are often poorly planned and will be essential in encouraging sustainable travel. How long would it take for people to cross the M5 by foot? Is this actually realistic?	I think the planners have fallen into the trap of trying to rejuvenate Cullompton by building a new town next to it. The town council certainly wants this. If the objective is to create more housing and a true garden village, then Cullompton is the wrong location. It's so ironic that JN 27 just up the road is crying out for it.			
		Honiton Road is not a suitable place for development of this kind and would need significant updating before the plan should even be considered. Public transport staffing would also make the public transport plans not viable. There aren't enough public transport staff in more suburban towns and cities let alone in this proposed area.				
		I feel that the road network needs to be improved prior to any construction.				
		No the Junct 28 access has yet to be decided is vague and its the most important access. Many people will commute out of the town, its vital to put provisions in for that. Who will pay for the maintenance of these cycle routes and new roads when Mid Devon Council can't even afford to upkeep the existing ones they have?				
		Expansion of Junction 27, with the train service, petrol station already in situ would make more sense instead of changes to the Honiton Road. References to enhancing public transport and enhancing travel options sounds great, but realistically people enjoy the benefit of privacy, comfort, accessibility of their own vehicles especially in the current climate with covid19.				
		The key issues are and will remain as: 1 the Cullompton Relief road, 2 The J28 amendments to enable good traffic flows at ALL times, 3 the major improvements needed to A377 through the whole proposed development (but equally importantly further to the east and right through to Dulverton as a minimum). If these are NOT delivered East Cullompton simply will not work.				
		Agree extra crossings and access to M5 required for both cars and pedestrian travel. Public transport needs to be cost effective, reliable and convenient. If there is good and effective public transport. I don't see the need for car clubs.				

Category	Question	Transport	General Development	Facilities	GI/BI/Landscape/Sustainability	Flooding	
Mobility, placemaking and other	Do you agree with how the SPD proposes to approach transport and mobility including crossing of the M5, local streets, changes to Honiton Road, public transport and emphasising active travel options?	Given that the proposal is to turn what is currently a rural, agricultural area into a semi-urban (suburban?) area, the approach to transport seems sensible. A lot will depend on the way J28 is dealt with. It should definitely allow for increased access northwards as well as southwards; the original proposals did not appear to allow for this.					
		The crossing the M5 is as it is now, inadequate. Changes to Honiton Road are vague and stop abruptly at Fordmore Farm, leaving traffic beyond that point in an even worse state. Increased traffic will flow towards Honiton as well, even without the obvious deadlock that will grow at J28 There is only so much you can do to provide access to the M5, widen the Honiton Road, considering the huge amount of extra transport - not only cars but delivery lorries etc. Do you feel it is satisfactory Cullompton as a town will cease to exist. Once accident/ incident on the M5 will totally bring Devon to a standstill.					
What are your views on the placemaking aspirations and design requirements which will seek to shape the type of place that East Cullompton will become?	No issues with the development, just the roads		Focus on ways to encourage people to visit Cullompton town centre and improve the business aspect of the town to appreciate in the way Honiton is so highly regarded. Use the un-occupied premises within the town for business and residential purposes. I don't understand what 'place making aspirations' means. The design requirements look fine within the boundaries but more consideration needs to be given to the areas that exist outside of the immediate boundary areas.	I think the current masterplan is "skewed" with no heart to the proposed development and this has been replaced by the idea of 3 small community hub areas the most significant of which is on the eastern fringe (Fordmore) and suggestions that sports pitches should be developed on the eastern fringe as well - why are the sports pitches and the community hub not being centred around the proposed site for the school?	I don't really understand this question as you are using strange language choices. It would be great to make this an eco development showcasing the regions commitment to net zero with the majority of houses having solar panels and renewable energy. It would also be good to have space allocated to self builds as this allows people to build houses shaped around their needs not those of big developers.		
	Having the road through the developments with the school is not a safe placing		Placemaking' is a term I had not heard of until reading this document. CNU (Congress for the New Urbanism), whose mission is to champion 'walkable urbanism', defines it as, "the process of creating quality places that people want to live, work, play, and learn in. Great. Some of us felt that we had found that place in the existing rural environment and that it did not need re-making. Given that it apparently is to be re-made the aspirations sound suitably aspirational. Shame you won't listen to existing residents.		Why is it a potential country park? Surely with significant new builds the country park is more than essential not potential. The green space hub towards Cullompton side is not large enough		
	I am not sure that Mobility hubs will be successful in a rural setting where public transport is limited to non-existent.		A lot of this sounds good... but!... Nothing higher than 3 stories please				
Do you have any other comments regarding the East Cullompton Masterplan SPD?	Train station is ESSENTIAL		The sustainability of people, planet and place beyond the immediate boundaries of the plan needs to be borne in mind; placing such an emphasis on development at the boundaries is going to impede on existing sustained communities. The proposal to include 'a minimum of 10 gypsy sites' seems unviable. Is this the entire gypsy population of Devon? How many homes per site?	Existing facilities should be maintained for existing residents. New facilities should be added to cater for increased number of residents.	Development should be lower carbon, buildings should use renewable energy sources, more thought for enjoying these spaces in bad weather and looking after under privileged people e.g. homeless shelter, halfway house etc.		
	I think the train station is the only sensible option of the whole plan		Should be scrapped. Assess the exact requirement for the needs of local people of East Devon only and build accordingly 200 to 300 at most.	To me it still lacks a centre, and is housing rather than a community.			
			In a time where people can't even afford to heat their own houses is it really the time to be building new unaffordable housing? What guarantees will there be to ensure that the local housing needs are met prior to new people migrating to the town? Many of our friends and family can't make it onto the property ladder as they can't secure mortgages or afford to live so why build houses when they are still forced to live with older family members and can never hope to buy one? Our old house was subject to a covenant that ensured that only people who have lived in Devon for at least three years could purchase it which gave us our first chance to get on the ladder when we were piped to the post for so many other properties, if there is to be development at least let it benefit local people directly.	What infrastructure will be put in place, before the housing, nurseries, schools, doctors, surgeries, dentists, hospitals. Where will be all the recycling-refuse be deposits, hopefully these will be all taken into consideration before the masses arrive.			
			Building more houses/works units/ schools etc is not progress! It keeps the building industry in business provides short-term job options but does have a long term effect on the existing residents within an area, who have already chosen to live in a place that does not have a large town, city population.				
			As previously. This is a development for future generations and I welcome it.				
			I have a very strong view that NO further development east of the motorway should take place until the Cullompton relief road and J28 are properly sorted out and delivered				
What are your thoughts on how Section 5.6 of the Masterplan SPD sets out an overall approach to the timing and delivery of the development and its related facilities and infrastructure. Do you agree with the early phases forming around proposed community hubs?	Cannot see how the development will work before the road network is improved		As previously stated this development is dependent upon the road network and upgrade and no development should take place until this has been resolved. The real need in the community is affordable housing for people on low incomes this needs to be a priority over community hubs that won't be used until the development is nearing completion. But you're not listening to the community of Cullompton. It's just all so hypocritical.	No - the community hubs are far too far from the core of the proposed development and are instead at the boundaries.			
	Again... I believe nothing should be done until the motorway junction is sorted and bypass built. Then the plan needs to be clear that this is part of the Garden Village... so it's a proper full plan, NOT two different things		Hopefully it will never be built. Yes, need to make sure that this is not a building site for the next 10 years.		The community hubs - ford more farm shop is currently the right size for the roadside it is situated at. A		
	Infrastructure needs attention first and not the likelihood of some properties being built before the Honiton Road is re-landscaped.		Infrastructure before housing development.		No, no more houses should be built in Cullompton till we start to see some of this new infrastructure - e.g. schools, dentists, doctors first then your community hubs.		
					I do not agree with the early phases forming around the proposed community hubs as I strongly believe that although Fordmore is a good site it is NOT central to the development and it strongly suggests that there will be further development to the east. The focus should be on delivering community assets (sports fields, community buildings, shops, doctors etc.) around the proposed school and more at the heart of the proposed community. I accept that there will be development at some stage but the current SPD is full of poor compromises which strongly suggest that the developers and land holders have the "whip hand" and the community is not being listened to		
					I don't really understand why it would be helpful to start development near to a farm shop on a busy A road?? - I presume this is because it suits the land owner and the developer. - It will certainly not allow the residents to walk to school, doctor or supermarket... and I am sure it will be many years before anyone will sensibly consider cycling on the A373.		
Question or query			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.			During the recent building of the Persimmon Housing development on Willard 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?	
			Is the East of Cullompton development dependent on the town centre relief road? ie if the relief road cannot be built for whatever reason, does this mean the East of Cullompton development (and the Garden Village) cannot be built?				