

## Appendix 1

### Tiverton EUE Area B Stage 2 Public Consultation Summary: Questionnaire, Letter and Email Responses

Questionnaire responses are summarised within Qs 1-9 below. Any non-questionnaire responses (i.e. letters/emails) are provided within the summary response to Q9 (which also includes general comments that were invited on the questionnaire at Q9).

#### Total Responses: 121 + 9 Post Deadline Closure

#### Question 1 – The Vision (Board 1 / Section 3/ 3A of the SPD)

(1a) How strongly do you agree with the vision for the new garden neighbourhood (count below)?

Strongly Object	Object	Neutral	Support	Strongly Support
7	5	17	10	3

(1b) If there is anything else missing from the above vision, please state:

No.	Key Theme(s)	Comment	Suggested response (n/c = no change)	SPD Section Amendments
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport / highways</li> </ul>	Continuous, uninterrupted, <b>traffic free cycleways</b> , from proposed area to Tiverton Centre.	n/c – Linkages already in Local Plan infrastructure requirements and upgrades associated with Area A.	-
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport / highways</li> </ul>	The proposed site would bring unacceptable and potentially dangerous levels of <b>traffic</b> through Tidcombe lane. The road is already overburdened with narrow pinch points at Tidcombe bridge and the entry / exit at Blundells school. Not to mention busy periods such as school start / finish at Tidcombe school.	n/c (Development Management issue for Transport Assessment - Already in P119.	-

3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Design/character</li> </ul>	Ridiculous how you can call a housing development as a garden neighbourhood - nothing further from the truth. The area should <b>be a protected conservation area</b> as part of the Grand Western Canal	n/c – Principle of development already established in Local Plan.	-
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport / highways</li> <li>Green infrastructure</li> </ul>	The impact assessment of vehicular access from <b>Follett Road</b> /Glebelands onto the new proposed country park	Remove car park at Follett Rd	P76, 92,99,100-105
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport / highways</li> </ul>	It is not clear regarding access via <b>Follett Road</b> , Glebelands is not fit for an increase in vehicles - this is a major lack of oversight in failing to address this at this stage.	Remove car park at Follett Rd	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Design</li> <li>Transport / highways</li> <li>Green infrastructure</li> </ul>	<b>Too many houses</b> with very little design appeal. not enough green spaces or cycle paths.	n/c – Final house no.s and house types will be determined at development management stage	-
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community facilities</li> </ul>	<b>Open children's play areas near houses. Access open</b> at all times.	n/c - will be determined at development management stage	-
8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ecology</li> </ul>	The <b>horses</b>	n/c (unless barge horses?) – see car park change	-
9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land-use</li> </ul>	Number of <b>houses should be cut by 1/3</b>	n/c - Local Plan already establishes no. but final house no.s and house types will be determined at development management stage	-
10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Housing tenure</li> </ul>	Where is the provision for <b>affordable housing</b> ?	Further clarification on tenure blind?	Text added p71
11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Green infrastructure</li> </ul>	Concern for how the <b>green infrastructure will be maintained and managed</b>	n/c – refer to section 6.5	-
12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land-use</li> </ul>	Location of <b>Gypsy and Travellers</b> site is not indicated	Further clarification on G&T site location? Wording needs to clarify requirement and location, and also note a DM matter for final location.	Edits P 70 71
13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Green infrastructure</li> </ul>	Protection of <b>existing hedgerows and trees</b> which should be immediately identified with TPOs to avoid any further damage by	n/c – Refer to section 6 (inc 6.5) – full management details to be agreed	-

		landowners. Management of the proposed Country Park going forward is unclear.	at development management stage.	
14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Green infrastructure</li> </ul>	Larger <b>open space</b> with buffer zones	n/c – Local plan policy requirements met and country park exceeds usual requirements	-
15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport / Highways</li> </ul>	<b>Road infrastructure</b> conservation and more importantly over intensification	n/c – Believe SPD strikes the balance	-
16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General</li> </ul>	It suggests there will be a <b>link to the Tidcombe Lane SSI</b> but does not explain this in any detail	Check link reference	P101 clarification of ecological links
17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General</li> </ul>	The board makes constant reference to "iving in the garden neighbourhood at Post Hill". This development is <b>NOT at Post Hill</b> . It is Area B, accessed from Area A. It has no boundary to Post Hill and should not be sold as such.	MDDC agree leave as referenced.	-
18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Green infrastructure</li> </ul>	Lots more <b>green space</b> , extra tree planting	n/c – Significant green infrastructure provided	-
19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Housing need</li> </ul>	Are these <b>houses actually needed</b> ? Will it address housing needs of mostly lower income local people?	n/c – Principle of development accepted in Local Plan. Development will include mix of unit sizes and tenures.	-
20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amenity</li> </ul>	The <b>height of the buildings closest to Mayfair</b> – view blocked?	AAM Check wording for amenity considerations. Check buffer zone (as per Area A).	P72 and 79-added ref to buffer, p82 for views
21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Town centre</li> </ul>	I am concerned that this development will diminish the role of the <b>town centre</b> as a focal point for retail and business	n/c (Area A DC requirement)	-
22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Town centre</li> <li>Transport / Highways</li> </ul>	Concerned about the <b>survival of the town centre, also the extra traffic</b> down Blundells Road from this estate.	n/c (as above)	-
23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ecology</li> <li>Character</li> </ul>	The vision should be to <b>keep as much of the canal area and area between the disused railway as it is</b> . The wildlife and beauty will be destroyed if we are allowing encroachment of people into all the fields.	n/c – The SPD seeks the establishment of the Country Park	-

24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General</li> </ul>	As a home owner in Post Hill the whole Tiverton EUE will have a life long massively negative impact on mine and my families quality of life so as a comment on the development in principle I strongly <b>oppose the whole scheme</b> . Taken out of the context of it ruining my life, the principles of the new garden neighbourhood are supportable, hence the 3 grade given. However its application in relation to the existing dwellings in Post hill is poor and shows little to no consideration for properties at the Manley lane end of the EUE.	Check amenity relationship point i.e. Development Managementstage consideration	P72 and 79- added ref to buffer, p82 for views
25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land use</li> </ul>	I <b>disagree strongly to the country park as part of this</b> . People have bought properties in a quiet area and now this will attract people and more youths and I don't like this in an elderly estate.	n/c – SPD seeks to establish country park as valuable community asset in line with Local Plan requirement. Future management to be determined at development management stage.	-

## Question 2- Development Concept (Board 2 / part 3.2 of the SPD)

(2a) Do you support the key development objectives as listed below?

	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral	Support	Strongly Support
Character	11	2	16	18	2
Urban design and placemaking	11	3	18	16	1
Movement, transport, connectivity	18	8	14	10	1

Landscape, open space and recreation	12	4	11	13	10
Housing mix	16	8	15	8	1
Employment facilities (area B)	13	8	14	11	4
Energy and resource efficiency	8	0	21	12	6

**(2b) If there is anything else missing from the above objectives, please state:**

No.	Key Theme(s)	Comment	Suggested Response	SPD Section Amendments
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land-use</li> </ul>	<b>Live-work accommodation.</b>	Check refs as LW should be encouraged in principle	Ref added P71 (see also 82)
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Housing</li> </ul>	<b>Gypsy pitches</b> close to existing housing will make these properties unfit for mortgages are intending compensating the property owners for the 40% loss in value. In addition to this time and time again you have been asked to decouple G&T pitches from housing when will you listen to the Inspectorate and your community on this issue!	n/c – value is not a material planning consideration	-
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport</li> </ul>	How the impact of <b>traffic</b> from area a to area b is misleading in my opinion. Where it implies there is no road link between area b and the country park and now this link will come from Follett Road there is no mention of this it seems to be hidden and feels somewhat underhand	Remove Follett Rd Car Park	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Employment</li> <li>Energy</li> </ul>	<b>Employment facilities</b> are so minimal they are hardly worth mentioning. As far as the last question about energy efficiency it depends on how far energy efficient principles are incorporated into each house.	The employment provision is aligned with the Local Plan requirement and will provide a meaningful contribution.	P71 clarification
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction</li> <li>Ecology</li> </ul>	Concerns about <b>construction and noise</b> impact on wildlife.	n/c – Construction management for development management stage	-
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport / Highways</li> </ul>	If the <b>link from Blundells Rd</b> to the link road is not implemented before the building, the existing residents will have suffered 5 – 10 years of builders, 20 tonne lorries go up and down Blundells Road through the School	n/c –Area A issue	-
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Phasing</li> <li>Layout</li> </ul>	<b>Links for Area A</b> should be in place before start of Area B. Fully support PV wherever possible. Traveller sites may be better placed nearer the Link Road for ease of access.	n/c - Area A issue	-

8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport / Highways</li> </ul>	<p>The SPD seems to be leaving an option open to <b>access Manley Lane through Hartnoll Farm</b>. This option would cause further unnecessary traffic issues at Post Hill, Manley Lane and potentially West Manley Lane. Certainty is required and access from Area B to Manley Lane should be ruled out with perhaps the exception of emergency vehicle access.</p>	<p>n/c – Clarification provided on plans to confirm no access via Manley Lane but potential indicative access through to Hartnoll Farm shown (see 2.4).</p>	-
9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implementation</li> <li>Transport / Highways</li> </ul>	<p>The key development objectives hinge on <b>collaboration from all landowners</b> in this complex landownership coming to an agreement. Will MDDC ultimately have to insist on <b>compulsory purchase of land</b> to fulfil their vision for the TUEU? One <b>access route for Area B still under consideration is via Manley Lane</b>. This surely will have a detrimental affect on the vision for a safe walking, cycling and running route linking West Manley Lane and the proposed Country Park, Railway Walk and Canal.</p>	<p>n/c (see P118 re landowners and above for access)</p>	-
10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sustainability / Infrastructure</li> </ul>	<p>Will all the housing be able to <b>plug in an electric car, will they all be given solar panels</b> to prepare for the ending of the gas supply and to be sustainable.....</p>	<p>n/c – See P57, and for formal consideration at development management stage</p>	-
11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General</li> </ul>	<p>The <b>Country Park</b> is much touted, but it is quite difficult to find any real details of what is being offered here, that we do not already have?</p>	<p>n/c – Refer to 4.5 but final details at development management stage</p>	-
12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sustainability / infrastructure</li> </ul>	<p>All houses should have <b>rainwater harvesting as standard Plus solar panels and ground source heating</b></p>	<p>Check ref/emphasis to sustainability – see P57 and P119 requirement for sustainability and energy statement at development management stage</p>	-
13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sustainability</li> <li>Design</li> </ul>	<p>Can we ensure the highest possible standards of <b>energy efficiency</b>, rather than minimum requirements? How can we know that the house designs won't be unnecessarily ugly ? Details make a huge difference, e.g. roof overhangs, window design &amp; finish.</p>	<p>As 12 above for energy. The SPD is not intended as a design code but MDDC has an adopted Design Guide for the EUE and is consulting on a new Design Guide so there will be design considerations at development management stage.</p>	-

14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport / Highways</li> </ul>	<b>Width of roads, off road parking</b> – needs to be adequate to prevent congestion	n/c – Development management stage	-
15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land use</li> </ul>	I am profoundly against the inclusion of any <b>gypsy</b> element within the scheme	n/c – Requirement in Local Plan	-
16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land use</li> </ul>	Concerned about how the <b>employment land</b> will be used	n/c – clarified that B1 use	P54, 71
17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Housing demand</li> </ul>	Objective should be to ascertain <b>what housing is needed</b> after all properties in part a have been sold not before	n/c – not material planning issue	-
18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport / Highways</li> <li>Land use</li> <li>Employment land</li> </ul>	<p>The master planning in this latest area B detail when compared to previous documentation has fundamentally changed in relation to <b>location and scale of light industrial, Gypsy pitches and the now ambiguous commentary around forming new access to area B from Manley lane.</b></p> <p>To state the existing Mayfair, West Manley and Manley lanes will be protected from additional traffic but then to go on to say that additional access points would be beneficial if 3rd party land can be developed to facilitate it is alarming. We would <b>oppose in the strongest terms any developments that allowed any vehicle traffic into the T-EUE from Manley Lane, West Manley Lane and Mayfair.</b></p> <p>The <b>light industrial area</b> in area B phase 4 has increased in size and now directly abuts the last existing private dwelling on Manley Lane. It is also adjacent to the ambiguous additional Manley lane road access point described as 'illustrative'. To my mind having light industrial in this location will draw commercial traffic through the whole of phase B and past residential areas. This surely can't meet the development environmental aspirations for the ambience of the residential areas and so can only truly work if additional access is formed from Manley lane. Any adaptations to access for vehicles from Manley lane must be prohibited and strongly worded in this way in this and any future T-EUE.</p> <p>As strongly as I disagree with the phase 4 light industrial location I am also shocked and saddened that Gypsy pitches have also been located in this area.</p> <p>Again I disagree in the strongest terms that these pitches have been sighted in area B. To sight them so close to existing</p>	check ref to industrial is clear re office intentions and any further commentary on G&T location	B1 uses clarified P54,71

		<p>dwellings further destroys existing residents quality of life and the residual value of their properties.</p> <p>These 3 pitches must be moved away from existing dwellings.</p>		
19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land use</li> </ul>	<p>on the original consultation the <b>traveller pitches</b> were in part a but they have now moved and I don't feel it is appropriate so I object to them being here.</p>	n/c as above	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport / Highways</li> <li></li> </ul>	<p>The document <b>contradicts itself stating that no vehicular access (other than emergency vehicles) will be allowed access to Area B via Manley Lane/Post Hill junction and yet has plans for a main through road up to Manley Lane</b> and access should land purchase/submission be made by the landowner. The main through road is labelled in many figures as an additional main access to the site. Manley lane needs to be protected by ensuring at least 20metres from Manley Lane is a 'local street' with bollards to ensure it is only an emergency access as mentioned for Mayfair etc. Allowing a main thoroughfare access to Manley Lane will encourage the single track lane to be used as a very dangerous rat run and will work against the vision of the site making the lane unusable for pedestrians/cyclists due to danger from traffic. There are also a <b>disproportionate number of pedestrian/cycle access points to the north/Manley Lane corner of the site</b> when access should be encouraged lower down the lane so that quick access can be gained to the new and existing country park/cycle routes/canal paths/town access routes. The top part of the lane should have just one pedestrian/cycle access place and should be instead encouraged for use by those to the north of Post Hill Road not Area B as a safe access path to the forementioned routes. <b>More pedestrian/cycle access from Manley Lane to the new Country park and sports fields would instead be more beneficial.</b></p>	<p>Check scope / response for pedest/cycle routes links. Check arrow to Hartnoll Fm and making sure clear.</p>	<p>We want to make sure that there is a permeable network of routes for pedestrians and cyclists so we have not reduced the number of access points.</p> <p>P60 and p68 – edits to key/colours to help clarity on Manley Lane/Hartnoll Farm access</p>



### Question 3- The Masterplan (Board 3 / Section 4 of the SPD)

(3a) The masterplan provides guidance on a number of principles. Do you agree that these principles should take priority in future decision making as the development comes forward?

	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral	Support	Strongly Support
Responding to surrounding area	7	4	11	13	13
Working with landscape features	5	0	6	13	25
Establishing a country park	12	1	6	10	22
Connected & permeable lanes and streets	9	2	12	16	10
A collection of neighbourhoods and places	10	2	16	14	6
A network of open spaces	7	2	7	13	20
A sustainable settlement	8	0	10	14	17

(3b) Do you feel that anything is missing from the above elements?

No.	Key Theme(s)	Comment	Suggested Response	SPD Section Amendments
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Energy</li> </ul>	Centralised <b>energy</b> system, CHP, heat grids etc.	n/c – see sustainability and energy requirements in SPD. Final details for development management stage. Centralised energy not being provided in area A so unlikely for B.	-
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport / highways</li> </ul>	Yes the <b>car park</b> , do not agree with where it is located and the negative impact this will have on our lovely neighbourhood. It's not just the passing of cars through our road it's all the overflow parking which will inevitably occur and we will have cars parked all along our street, making it more dangerous for walkers, cyclists and children who actually live here	Assume Follett Rd CP – remove CP	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport highways</li> <li>Character / landscape</li> </ul>	Yes the <b>car park</b> and the effects it will have on the Glebelands area and the canal.	Remove Follett Rd CP	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99

4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Connectivity</li> </ul>	Better <b>connection walk/cycle</b> to Tiverton and to Halberton to connect other local built up areas. People want to travel out, not just within the development.	n/c – wider strategy with Area A	-
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land use</li> </ul>	The <b>extent and size</b> of the development	n/c – already established in Local Plan	-
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport / highways</li> </ul>	Easy <b>pedestrian/cycle access</b> to the school to avoid use of cars	n/c – as above	-
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maintenance</li> </ul>	It is unclear who would be responsible for the creating of the <b>Country Park</b> and it's subsequent upkeep. To protect the Country Park and the vision for recreation, the <b>MDDC should reconfirm their position that West Manley Lane becomes the southern boundary</b> with no housing development south of West Manley Lane.	n/c – See commentary in section 6 on management and future development management issue. WML boundary already established.	-
8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport / highways</li> </ul>	How will these people travel to work and connect to rail and bus services - is there planning for an <b>off road cycle way to Tiverton Parkway</b> . How will the scheme ensure that in concreting over large quantities of land, <b>water run off</b> into local streams does not lead to flooding of areas downstream.	n/c – wider transport linkages for Local Plan / Transport Plan. Flood and drainage details at development management stage	-
9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General</li> </ul>	Board 3 is ambiguous. The asterisk at <b>Manley Lane is of concern. How does this red dot differ from all the other "no vehicular access" red dots? What is meant by "illustrative". Access to Area B is via Area A.</b> It was agreed many years ago.	n/c (check clarity)	P60 and p68 – edits to key/colours to help clarity on Manley Lane/Hartnoll Farm access
10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sustainability</li> </ul>	<b>Green technology</b> for heating and water usage as standard, plus solar power generation and storage mandatory on every house	n/c – see above references to sustainability (also note SPD cannot create new policy requirements beyond Local Plan).	-
11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Green infrastructure</li> </ul>	Large <b>trees &amp; hedgerows</b> MUST be kept, not only if convenient. Trees need a very large protected area for roots. Old hedgerows may need proper restoration, and new hedgerows planted between housing blocks.	n/c- green infrastructure is key to the proposed SPD.	-
12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Phasing</li> </ul>	<b>Timing</b> – will Area A be completed before developing Area B?	n/c – unknown but not for SPD to address	-
13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land use</li> </ul>	There is no need for a <b>country park</b> - the fields and areas that are to be developed into this country park should be	n/c- country park is a Local Plan requirement and will create a	-

		left as fields and not have walkways for people to traipse across areas that are currently inaccessible - this current inaccessibility is what allows the wildlife to thrive. Build the houses but please do not make pathways and cycle paths for the owners of these houses to have access to the canal across the few fields that will be left	community asset for existing and future community	
14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ecology</li> </ul>	the <b>country park</b> plan looks like it will allow people to walk all over the land between the housing estate and the canal, disturbing all the wildlife	n/c – management regime to be agreed	-
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	I fundamentally agree that any master planning should be fully considerate and protect the lives, homes and environment of existing residents. This however has not been applied to the <b>residents of Mayfair, post hill and particularly Manley Lane</b> . For the points raise on the earlier questions I feel the planning has fundamentally failed in this respect.	n/c – further clarification on amenity with existing residential properties has been added as per Area A approach.	-
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land use</li> </ul>	I am strongly against the <b>country park</b> , I don't think this is needed as we have the canal. The fields are all going to become a country park and cause further traffic. The poor animals, insects and creatures should be entitled to their home and should not be disrupted for a country park for people. Parks for children are acceptable and football pitches further up but I do not agree with a country park. The disused railway to the canal is a lovely place and should not be accessed.	n/c- country park is a Local Plan requirement and will create a community asset for existing and future community	-
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Highways / Transport</li> </ul>	Again <b>why does board 3 contradict itself again by saying Manley Lane will not be used for access but illustrating it having main road access</b> . Why has it not been removed from the illustrations if it will not go ahead?	n/c (check clarity)	P60 and p68 – edits to key/colours to help clarity on Manley Lane/Hartnoll Farm access

## Question 4 – Land Use and the Amount of Development (Board 4 / Section 4.2 of the SPD)

(4a) Do you agree with the key land use principles underpinning the masterplan?

	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral	Support	Strongly Support
Residential-led land use	11	1	16	14	8
Built development only north of West Manley Lane	8	2	8	13	19
Inclusion of small clusters of employment use	11	6	15	13	5
Centrally located open space	5	0	10	19	15
Accessible allotments	6	0	9	18	16
Location/provision of sports pitches	6	1	12	14	16

(4b) Are there any other land use principles which you feel should be included?  
Are there principles which you feel should be excluded?

No.	Key Theme(s)	Comment	Suggested Response	SPD Section Amendments
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport / highways</li> </ul>	<b>Traffic free cycleways</b> that take priority over roads. <b>EV charging</b> infrastructure.	n/c – as above	-
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tourism</li> </ul>	<b>Grand Western Canal visitors and that conservation area will plummet</b> if this development goes ahead	n/c – as above	-
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport / highways</li> </ul>	Again <b>car parking</b> , not a lot and this will result in overspill parking on roads, around Follett road and also on the new roads in Area B	n/c – car park now removed	See references above
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport / highways</li> </ul>	Car parking - really should have really been thought through - <b>we should be encouraging people not to use vehicles</b> and to walk/cycle - also the <b>impact on the surrounding area</b> doesn't appear to have even been considered	n/c – as above	-
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land use</li> </ul>	The main worry I see is we are using easily and cheaply accessible land which <b>should being used for farming as it is now</b> . This is agricultural country and I am disappointed that landowners feel able to let houses be built on arable pasture land which at	n/c – principle of development established in Local Plan	-

		present supports sheep & cows. With Brexit and other irritations we all need the green spaces and farms that we can get		
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General</li> </ul>	New <b>Country Park would be a real asset</b> to Tiverton as well as new residents	n/c	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General</li> </ul>	<p>MDDC accept that the main obstacle to Area B development is the landowners not collaborating. <b>How far will MDDC go to compulsory purchase and protect the GI Country Park as envisaged?</b></p> <p>To protect the Country Park as envisioned in the SPD, <b>MDDC should reconfirm their position that West Manley Lane becomes the southern boundary</b> with no housing development south of West Manley Lane. Refer to APP/Y1138/W/19/3239009 and the Planning Inspectorate's dismissal but with comment that 'mixed use development' is possible south of West Manley Lane</p>	<p>n/c - No further comment on CPO at this stage.</p> <p>WML boundary established for the EUE in this SPD, any future speculative applications beyond this boundary will be subject to development management process</p>	-
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General</li> </ul>	<p>The decision for no housing and development south of West Manley Lane taken previously by MDDC becomes unclear when the recent Planning Inspectorate of land at NGR SS984 125(APP/Y1138/W/19/3239009 feels that this site is open to 'mixed use development'. <b>Further clarification is required on 'mixed use development'</b></p>	<p>n/c</p> <p>AY - Consider clarification as 6 above.</p>	
8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Green infrastructure</li> <li>Maintenance</li> </ul>	How many <b>allotments</b> are being made available and who will run them. How will the <b>county park be funded</b> . You say it will be run by an independent organisation..... will it be funded by a annual charge to the residents of the new homes.	n/c – see references to allotments in green spaces P97. Future management in section 6 and further details at development management stage.	
9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Green infrastructure</li> </ul>	There do not appear to many <b>green area and play spaces on the plan</b> . Coloured light grey in the key but hardly any on the board, as far as I can see.	Check key	See figure 30 for clarity

10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Green infrastructure</li> </ul>	Wildlife conservation areas and meadow land to <b>encourage bees</b>	Add ref to insects/bees	Added to text on country park pages 101 and 105
11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Green infrastructure</li> </ul>	Tall trees need to be planted so that a hillside full of houses is not visible from railway line, canal, or new country park.	n/c	
12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Employment</li> <li>Land use</li> </ul>	<p>What kind of <b>employment</b> is proposed within development? Noisy polluting businesses should be avoided.</p> <p>More thought needed for <b>off road parking</b> to avoid congestion – as on roads in Moorhayes.</p>	Clarification added as above	P54,71
13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Employment</li> </ul>	<b>Agriculture</b> might be nice	n/c – not in Local Plan	-
14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Town Centre</li> <li>Land use</li> </ul>	With the imminent loss of retail uses in the traditional town centre, <b>employment uses should be directed to the centre of Tiverton</b> in order to ensure the Town retains its vitality, so residential friendly employment uses should be excluded from the EUE in order to protect the town.	n/c – contrary to Local Plan requirement for EUE	-
15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Phasing</li> <li>Land use</li> </ul>	<p><b>Too many houses</b> - they need to be built in stages and sold and filled Before next stage is considered.</p> <p>traveller pitches are shown below south side of blundells road on this board. <b>Traveller pitches</b> should not be here.</p>	n/c – Housing no.s and G&T pitches set in Local Plan	-
16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land use</li> <li>Transport / traffic</li> </ul>	The area of land between West Manley land and the canal should not have public access and should be left as it currently is. There should not be a <b>car park at Follett Road</b> , as this is a residential estate and further car travel should not be being encouraged, esp along tidcombe lane and onto the Glebelands Estate. There are a large number of elderly and vulnerable residents so further traffic is not wise.	Remove Follett Rd car park	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99
17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land use</li> </ul>	I support the integration of commercial opportunities into large scale developments like	Clarification provided on B1 uses	P54,71

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Employment land</li> </ul>	<p>this. <b>However confirmation of the class of commercial is fundamental.</b> In the area adjacent to Manley Lane in phase 4, class B1a and B1b would be acceptable, anything more industrial i.e. B1c to Class B2 onward, would certainly not be acceptable. The light industrial development in the Hartnoll Business Centre on the East side of Manley lane is loud and intrusive already, any addition to this would be unwelcome and wildly unfair on the existing residents at the East end of Post hill / Manley lane.</p>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land use</li> </ul>	<p>I don't have an overall issue with the <b>pitches and parks</b> so long as they remain as they have suggested. The roads are sufficient for the <b>traffic</b> from manley lane area and even if diverting the traffic through the estate, this is nothing but frustrating for local areas.</p>	n/c	-
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land use</li> <li>• Highways / Transport</li> <li>• Employment</li> </ul>	<p>The provision of 5 <b>gypsy/traveller sites</b> was supposed to go to the north of Post Hill in Area A next to the A361 away from current/future residents whilst still being a part of TUE with good access. Why have 3 of these sites suddenly and unexpectedly appeared in Area B? It is not good placement to encourage a traveller site or employment space where access is through the entirety of lower Area A and Area B. The placement of the employment and traveller sites were placed much more favourably in Area A. If they must be in Area B it would be better placed on the border with Area A to reduced to road travel.</p> <p>With regards to the <b>5,000sqm of employment space</b> provision not fulfilled by Area A, whilst the masterplan has been generated Hartnoll Business Park has greatly expanded (and will no doubt continue to expand despite it's location being outside the border for the local plan) and has met</p>	n/c – clarification on G&T pitches, employment and access provided above	P54,71

		the needs of the local plan with regards to this provision therefore negating the need for further employment in Area B. Putting employment space next to Manley Lane encourages access to the lane and it becoming a rat run.		
--	--	--	--	--

### Question 5 – Movement and Connections (Board 5 / Section 3C of the SPD)

(5a) The new garden neighbourhood will have a network of roads, lanes, cycle and footpaths connecting to the existing and proposed areas of development. Do you agree with the stated key principles for these routes and connections?

	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral	Support	Strongly Support
No vehicular access from West Manley Lane, Manley Lane or Mayfair	5	1	5	8	31
Main street will transverse the site east-west, providing access to area A	9	1	10	17	13
Network of green routes	9	0	8	16	17
Loop street will provide connections between neighbourhoods	7	1	12	21	5
Local streets provide access to individual properties	7	1	9	22	6



Retain existing trees / hedgerows (ecology)	4	0	1	5	40
---	---	---	---	---	----

(5b) Are there any other movement principles which you feel should be included? Are there principles which you feel should be excluded?

No.	Key Theme(s)	Comment	Suggested Response	SPD Section Amendments
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Landscaping</li> <li>Transport / Highways</li> </ul>	<b>Rather then say "every effort" just say they "will" be retained, get that written in to policy, because otherwise developers will find a way around it.</b> I know this because I have done it on their behalf. Traffic free cycleways that take priority over roads.	n/c - SPD 1.2 'Purpose & Role' already states <i>The main objective of the document is to set out the key principles that planning applications will need to have regard to if they are to be considered acceptable by Mid Devon District Council (MDDC).</i> Other references are made throughout to 'should' which should be considered sufficient.	-
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport / Highways</li> </ul>	what's is going to be done to deter / reduce <b>traffic on Tidcombe Lane? And what is going to done to safeguard pedestrians at Tidcombe bridge?</b>	n/c – Detail for transport Assessment at development management stage although removal of Follett Rd car park will assist.	As above
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport / Highways</li> </ul>	Again <b>vehicular access to the country park</b> , you are just removing one problem of access from area b and moving it to Glebelands but just not making this very clear at all as the focus is on access of the residential area of area b	- Remove Follett Rd CP and check key colour to make clear no road access into Countrypark.	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport / Highways</li> </ul>	<b>Access via Follett Road</b> is not clear in the proposal- there is a lot of ambiguity in this - access via here should be out of scope as it is not viable - this will cause extra traffic which Glebelands is not able to cope with and also extra pollution to the area - which long term will affect the canal and surrounding land.	Remove Follett Rd CP	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ecology</li> </ul>	Where will the <b>wildlife</b> live?	n/c – Biodiversity enhancement and 'net gain' is an expectation	-

			of planning policy for determination at development stage.	
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport / highways</li> </ul>	Avoid increase in <b>traffic</b> on Tidcombe Lane	n/c – response above	-
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Green infrastructure</li> </ul>	<b>Leave it alone.</b> We already have the canal as a nature reserve and walks – winter grazing for our beautiful horses.	n/c – response above	-
8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport / Highways</li> </ul>	<b>Easy school pedestrian access</b> and realisation that some people will be inclined to drive anyway. Should some parking be considered?	n/c (School in Area A)	-
9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport / Highways</li> </ul>	<p>With increased walkers/cyclists/families enjoying access to the Country Park through and along <b>West Manley Lane, would it not be in the interests/safety of residents and visitors that the lane becomes an official shared lane?</b></p> <p>It should be made clear that <b>no access to the sports area (vehicular or pedestrian) from West Manley Lane</b> and that ancient hedgerows remain in place.</p>	Check reference to potential for WML to be shared –DCC has previously promoted Quiet Lanes across the county. WML is by its nature a shared facility with low vehicle speeds due to its geometry – no issue with making this clearer (e.g. via 'gateway' features) if needed. A Traffic Regulation Order (access only) and reduced speed limit would also be options if so required.	New text added p69 on features to clarify 'shared lane'
10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General</li> </ul>	To protect the Country Park as envisioned in the SPD, MDDC should reconfirm their position that <b>West Manley Lane becomes the southern boundary with no housing</b> development south of West Manley Lane. This needs clarification following the recent planning inspectorates comments NGR SS984 125 (APP/Y1138/W/19/3239009)	n/c – response above	-
11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport / Highways</li> </ul>	With the increased use of West Manley Lane as a recreational route to the proposed Country Park should this now become an <b>official shared lane</b> ? Vehicular use	AAM - As above	New text added p69 on features to clarify 'shared lane'

		of this narrow lane will have to be restricted as, without damaging the listed hedgerows and trees, there are very safe passing places.		
12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport / Highways</li> </ul>	Will there be <b>cycle ways separate from motor traffic</b> allowing people to get to town	n/c – response above	-
13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport / Highways</li> </ul>	<b>No vehicular access provided to the site either temporary or otherwise from Post Hill or Hartnoll Business Centre</b> , ever - even if land outside the scope of this consultation, becomes available. If a property on Post Hill were to become available, no access for construction should ever come via this area. Access for construction of ALL properties on Area B must be via Area A.	n/c – response above	-
14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport / Highways</li> </ul>	<b>Main route must be big enough for buses. Off road parking must be realistic</b> - most houses will have one car per adult. Visitors need off road parking. It must be easy for all households to <b>charge electric vehicles</b> .	n/c – details for development management stage	-
15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport / Highways</li> </ul>	<b>Dedicated cycle lanes</b> kept apart from footpaths / pedestrian lanes	n/c – as above	-
16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport / Highways</li> </ul>	Exclusion of these will put pressure on the perceived need to provide access from Follett Road. This applies particularly to the proposed country park. In view of the well-documented problems attending Tidcombe Lane etc. <b>Follett Road access should be denied</b> .	Remove Follett Rd CP	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99
17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport / Highways</li> </ul>	The concepts of <b>shared space and low speed characteristics should not be used to justify limited space for vehicular access and movement</b> - the ideology of low car dependency runs the risk of congestion for and frustration between the future residential occupiers. <b>The protection of the settlement limit along Manley Lane appears to be an obstacle to bringing in a vehicular route from the Hartnoll Farm direction. I question whether this principle is worthy of retention given that Hartnoll Farm has been allowed to transform from a farm diversification project to a fully fledged edge of town</b>	n/c – Not for SPD to redefine settlement boundaries.	-

		<p><b>business centre, and should perhaps now be brought within a redefined town settlement limit.</b></p> <p>Having decided that no vehicular access should be provided from West Manley Lane, Manley Lane and Mayfair, a decision reinforced by officers at a recent EUE consultation event, it seems strange that the issue continues to form part of this consultation.</p>		
18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access</li> </ul>	<p>There should be <b>no connectivity through Mayfair</b>. The Mayfair settlement should not be subject to any access, walking or cycling route.</p>	n/c – there is no reasonable case to prevent walk/cycle/emergency access here. Knock-down bollards or similar would ensure emergency-only access by motor vehicles.	-
19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic / Highways</li> </ul>	<p><b>Traffic calming should not be by using narrow roads and parked cars.</b> Houses should have sufficient off street parking.</p> <p>The decision of the Council for no vehicular access from West Manley Lane, Manley Lane and Mayfair should be honoured and should NOT be queried again. The concept of respecting existing houses/settlements should be applied.</p>	n/c – as above	-
20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access</li> </ul>	<p><b>I do not think that there should be pedestrian or cycle access through the existing Mayfair area.</b></p>	n/c – as above	-
21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access</li> <li>Ecology</li> </ul>	<p>There <b>should not be paths down to the canal</b> - suitable sports facilities and green areas should be provided within the housing estate. Encouraging more cycling next down towards the canal will spoil the canal nature reserve. <b>The canal and fields between the disused railway should be left as they are</b>. Once people arrive at the disused railway area they can access the canal as people do now - leaving plenty of inaccessible areas for wildlife to thrive</p>	n/c – as above	-
22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access</li> <li>Ecology</li> </ul>	<p>There <b>should not be paths and board walks through the area of land from West Manley lane to the Canal</b>, apart from the original disused railway cycle and footpath. This land esp between the disused railway and the</p>	n/c – as above	-

		canal should be an area without public access as it is now, which will allow the wildlife to thrive		
23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Green infrastructure</li> <li>Traffic / highways</li> </ul>	For the reasons described already i strongly support maintaining Manley Lane and its hedgerows in its current form, however the <b>ambiguous additional comments on ideally improving access to the East of the EUE from Manley lane are unsettling and should be removed from the plan entirely</b> . There can be no additional traffic on these lanes and there can be no widening or adaptation to create access. This needs to be stated as a 'red line' in the EUE master plan.	Check wording	Add wording about third party land being required p69
24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ecology</li> <li>Housing demand</li> <li>Green infrastructure</li> </ul>	dont do anything to impact the <b>canal</b> or our environment in which our animal and insects should be allowed to remain. Stop building more houses that are not required. So many unsold houses and now a load more. <b>Stop building on any field,</b>	n/c – as above	-
25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	The Main Street should not extend to the border with Manley Lane but stop halfway or two thirds of the way through Area B making the areas next to Manley Lane local streets to <b>discourage vehicular movement to Manley Lane.</b>	n/c – as above (no access proposed to Manley Lane)	-

### Question 6- Landscape, Open Space and Recreation (Board 6 / Section 5.4 of the SPD/ section 5.4).

(6a) The Area B masterplan provides significant open space and green infrastructure including the country park. Do you agree with the landscape principles as set out?

	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral	Support	Strongly Support
Streets and open space will need to respect existing landscaping	3	0	4	8	35

A network of new open space to connect houses and neighbourhoods	8	1	8	16	17
Different spaces should incorporate play space, allotments, sports and Country Park	10	1	6	14	19
Country park will be a community resource for the eastern urban extension and will benefit from agreed management plan	13	0	6	11	20

**(6b) Are there any other open space principles which you feel should be included? Are there principles which you feel should be excluded?**

No.	Key Theme(s)	Comment	Suggested Response	SPD Section Amendments
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport / Highways</li> </ul>	<b>Traffic free cycleways</b> through open spaces.	n/c – as above	-
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport / highways</li> </ul>	<b>Parking and access</b> issues	n/c – as above	-
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport / highways</li> </ul>	Parking & access issues via <b>Follett Road</b> should be clearly addressed. Great to have a country park but we should encourage people not to use cars etc. Extra cars/ vehicles will have an adverse effect on the area, this will devalue the Glebelands area and will just end up being like the rest of Tiverton. this is a massive oversight and should have been addressed before.	Remove Follett Rd CP	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General</li> </ul>	I don't think any of the proposals are necessary	n/c	-
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport / Highways</li> </ul>	The proposed <b>car park</b> at the end of Follett for access to the Country Park will lead to increased traffic in Tidcombe, Glebelands. The centre of uses could mean additional car parking in road's around the area and these roads are too short and narrow. The occupants of the Glebelands will not benefit from the proposal.	Remove Follett Rd CP	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99

6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport / Highways</li> <li>Layout</li> </ul>	The idea of <b>entrances and car parks</b> (number and location)	Remove Follett Rd CP	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overdevelopment</li> </ul>	This is a sensitive area. One of Tiverton's best amenities is the <b>G.W Canal</b> and is enjoyed by hundreds of walkers, cyclists & dogs, as well as the occasional long boat. I fear that this development with so many people will ruin that peace forever.	n/c	-
8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General</li> </ul>	It is essential that <b>developers are obliged/forced to follow the MDDC vision</b> for what has the potential to be an example of good planning for other Councils.	n/c – agreed and SPD seeks to ensure this is possible through development management stages	-
9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport / Highways</li> </ul>	No specific detail concerning <b>Follett Road Carpark</b> . How many spaces proposed? Is it intended to be a chargeable car park? Has any consideration been given to visitor parking in Rippon Close, Ryder Close, top end Follett Road and the impact that any additional parking may cause existing residents?	Remove Follett Rd CP	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99
10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Green infrastructure</li> </ul>	The <b>management of the Country Park</b> needs further thinking and structure within the SPD	n/c – as above	-
11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Green infrastructure</li> </ul>	Maintaining the <b>existing ancient Hedgerows</b> are often mentioned in the SPD and will be an important part of the garden vision of the architects. We have already seen what unscrupulous landowners have done in the last 3 years to Area B. <b>MDDC should consider immediate TPOs or the equivalent to protect these important green assets</b>	n/c – MDDC have looked at previously	
12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Management / maintenance</li> </ul>	Who will manage this <b>country park</b> ? Tiverton cannot manage what it has got let alone adding to it rubbish and dog mess everywhere as well as racing vehicles and no police or council reps available?	n/c – as above	-
13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maintenance</li> </ul>	<b>As above</b> how will all this be maintained and funded....it should not be an additional Annual charge for householders on top of their council tax and funding needs to be sustainable	n/c – as above	-

14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Green infrastructure / landscaping</li> </ul>	<b>Wild meadow</b> with natural flowers, rather than tended borders and manicured grass	n/c (checked correct emphasis)	-
15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maintenance</li> </ul>	Who will <b>pay for maintenance</b> ? What's is best practice for future maintenance?	n/c – as above	-
16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Green infrastructure</li> <li>Transport/ Highways</li> </ul>	<p><b>Tree planting</b> is important for the future of the planet and our wellbeing.</p> <p><b>Parking spaces for disabled close to school</b> and leisure facilities in Area A.</p>	n/c – agreed maximum new trees expected. Parking in area A	-
17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport / highways</li> </ul>	Given the delightful nature of this development and its vaunted desirability, the <b>country park is superfluous</b> . No provision seems to have been given to car parking at the park. <b>Follett rd access is a non-starter</b> . There is no obvious reason why the existing car park at Manley Lane could not be expanded.	Remove Follett Rd CP	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99
18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amenity</li> </ul>	<b>Public open space is no substitute for private gardens</b> of a modest size, as the social distancing rules associated with <b>Covid 19</b> have just demonstrated, so should not be promoted as an acceptable alternative to private green space.	n/c - both to be provided	-
19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land use</li> <li>Transport / Highways</li> <li>Ecology</li> <li>Maintenance</li> </ul>	<p>The <b>area between the disused railway and the canal should be left as it is</b> - the areas should not have pathways and cycleways. This will cause problems for wildlife in this area - there will Be noise and litter. The canal is a beautiful country park already and the areas that cannot be publicly accessed are full of wildlife because if this reason.</p> <p>Please do not turn these fields into an area where people will be traipsing all over these areas</p> <p>Play areas and sports areas and allotments look ideally places near to the new housing estate</p>	Remove Follett Rd CP	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99



		<p>This board shows a car park and entrance to the proposed new country park with a picnic area too. there should <b>not be a car park at the end of follett road - nor a picnic area.</b> there is a narrow road to access the glebelands estate and the estate is a generally quiet estate made up of bungalows with a number of elderly people with, some with disabilities and using mobility scooters.</p> <p>You should not be Encouraging people to drive into the estate !</p> <p>Who would be managing the car park ?</p> <p>Who would be dealing with problems?</p> <p>There is no need for any access to the country park - the current steps to the canal are sufficient. The loop walk along canal and Back along the disused is ideal.</p> <p>There is no need for more parking - other parking is already available</p> <p>This is the only entrance to the new park that is right by houses. The other entrances are not in residential areas.</p>		
20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land use</li> <li>Access</li> </ul>	<p><b>Park areas within the housing development should have good access to the rest of the development.</b></p> <p>There should <b>not be pathways and cycle paths over the areas of lands that are currently fields between the disused railway areas and the canal.</b> there does not need to be any further pathways to connect the new estate and housing to the canal. They can access by Manley lane or via the disused railway.</p>	n/c – as above, access to country park will require careful balance and management of access	-
21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land use</li> </ul>	<p><b>stop with the country park.</b> We don't need a country park. We have knightshayes and the canal and beautiful places to walk. Stop thinking you are doing right by the people and start thinking of the environment. There is a green by the houses for a community play area. The allotment breeds insects</p>	n/c – as above	-

		so a great idea, never enough of that. The country park is my main issue here. The existing cycle way on the disused can be used and the canal are sufficient		
<b>Question 7- Built Character (Board 7 / Section 5.1-5.3 of SPD)</b>				
<b>(7a) The masterplan provides detailed guidance on house types, density and street types. Do you agree with the proposed approach?</b>				
<b>Strongly Object</b>	<b>Object</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Support</b>	<b>Strongly Support</b>
13	4	24	7	1
<b>(7b) Are there any other built character principles which you feel should be included? Are there principles which you feel should be excluded?</b>				
<b>No.</b>	<b>Key Theme(s)</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Suggested Change</b>	<b>SPD Section Amendments</b>
1	• Design	Tidcombe lane is not sufficient for additional travel from either ends. This is going to be a logistical nightmare for one bus stop, it is good for kids to see variety in built environment. see <b>"BRE Innovation Park"</b> for ideas. Planning incentives for <b>zero carbon homes</b> . do not have an informal play area, leave the wildlife alone. <del>Why not allow some innovative designs, it is good for kids to see variety in built environment. see "BRE Innovation Park" for ideas. Planning incentives for zero carbon homes.</del>	n/c – the SPD cannot go beyond existing policy requirements but can provide aspirational wishes.	Ref to zero carbon homes aspiration added to 3.3.7
2	• Housing type	only a couple of <b>Gypsy and Traveller</b> pitches, leave them alone. The picnic area will encourage	n/c – as above	-
3	• Transport	More cars covering up Tidcombe lane should not be put near an elderly residential area. The paths and	n/c – as above	-
4	• Housing type	<b>Bungalows</b> for the people necessary from the canal.	n/c – the SPD refers to a mix of house types and tenures	-
5	• Transport / highways	Provision of sufficient <b>off-road parking</b>	n/c – as above	-
6	• Housing height • Design	<b>No more than 2 storey houses</b>	n/c – as above	-
7	• Sustainability	As above, these plans need to feble to the commitment of <b>Tiverton to becoming carbon neutral</b>	n/c – as above	-
8	• Design	<b>Render with pale paint becomes unmaintainable.</b> It soon is stained or covered in algae, then scaffolding required to paint it, which nobody can afford.	n/c – detailed point for development management stage	-
9	• Design	<b>Lower rooflines close to the Mayfair</b> boundary so as not to block the view from existing properties	See above for clarification on amenity (note blocking of views is not a material planning consideration).	Edits to page P72, 79and p82

10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Density</li> </ul>	think <b>50 dwelling per ha is too high</b> and is at odds with the vision of a 'garden neighbourhood'.	n/c	
11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Design</li> </ul>	<b>Varied house design and character, not just another bland estate.</b>	Consider ref	See page 77
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Design</li> <li>Building Heights</li> </ul>	<b>Areas HE7 and HE8 should be restricted to no taller than 2 storeys</b> to protect the lane and prevent property towering over the lane and blocking existing property views. <b>Employment should be restricted to 2 storey height</b> irrelevant of whether the top floor(s) are residential.	Consider ref where adjoining existing to residential amenity	Edits to page P72, 79and p82

### Question 8 – Delivery and Phasing (Board 8 / Section 6).

(8a) The Delivery and Phasing of the development will take place over a significant period of time. Do you agree with the indicative phasing arrangements?

Strongly Object	Object	Neutral	Support	Strongly Support
10	4	24	5	4

(8b) Are there any other comments on the delivery and phasing section you wish to make?

No.	Key Theme(s)	Comment	Suggested Change	SPD Section Amendments
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General</li> </ul>	Building works will destroy the local area as will the development generally	n/c	-
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community facilities</li> </ul>	There should be a provision for <b>secondary education</b> as well as primary	n/c – No on site requirement in Local Plan but planning obligations to be determined during development management	-
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Environment</li> </ul>	My only concern is the <b>environmental impact - the extra pollution with all vehicles</b> this would have.	n/c	-
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	There are not enough words to explain how dreadful this will be	n/c	-
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Open space</li> <li>Community facilities</li> <li>Transport</li> </ul>	Make <b>open spaces, play spaces available now</b> . Nothing on Braid Park side. What does this neighbourhood do for children, sports pavilion? Open slip road / bridge to join A361 now!	n/c – see significant green and play infrastructure provision	-

6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Phasing</li> </ul>	The <b>Country Park should be begun</b> well before the 1250 houses are completed- that could easily be 4,000 new residents. It is actually a selling point for developers.	n/c – see phasing	-
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General</li> <li>Highways / transport</li> </ul>	Money should go to fixing pavements in our town and roads by Blundells School	n/c – not a matter for this SPD	-
8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Housing prices</li> </ul>	I hope I will not see the value of my house decrease too far.	n/c – not a material planning consideration	
9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land use</li> </ul>	Dialogue box on board 8 makes reference to provision of <b>Gypsy and Traveller site</b> . No detail is given on any of the previous boards. Most importantly it's location in relation to existing properties and those proposed new build properties. Suspect this was deliberately hidden away in the last board as it is a very contentious issue.	n/c – see reference to clarifications above	As above
10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Phasing</li> </ul>	There are several references to bringing forward <b>Area B to coincide with Area A development. This should be resisted</b> as it will lead to piecemeal and opportunistic development	n/c – as above	-
11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction / Phasing</li> </ul>	<b>Reconciled meadows</b> has been going on for 7years ! So what hope has this got	n/c – not relevant for this SPD	-
12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Phasing</li> </ul>	The <b>country park elements should be completed first</b> , to ensure that they are not lost in the future	n/c – see phasing	-
13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Phasing</li> </ul>	<b>Area B is to be built after Area A.</b> Infrastructure and access from Area A must proceed Area B. The frustrations of land in Area A, owned by Chettiscombe Trust being released too slowly for the liking of the planning department and the owners of land in Area B, are not to take precedence over that overriding principle. Construction of even the smallest amount of houses in Area B cannot begin until the access road via Area A is ready.	n/c – see phasing	-

14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport / Highways</li> </ul>	Open up that new access road from the a361	n/c – Area A issue	-
15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Phasing</li> </ul>	The <b>SPD remains a little vague on whether Area B can be developed at the same time as parts of Area A.</b> I believe it is imperative that the access from Area A is established and the connection with the A361 completed before development of Area B can commence.	n/c – see phasing P113	-
16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Phasing</li> </ul>	<b>Area B must not start until the access through A has been provided</b> to prevent significant extra traffic through Blundells Road and Halberton	n/c – as above	-
17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Phasing</li> </ul>	There should be consideration as to what should be built, once assessment has been made on the success of Area A building works. <b>The building of Area B should not be assumed - if properties are not sold in Area A</b> , or it becomes noticeable that other facilities are needed, then the plans for Area B should be looked at.	n/c – not relevant for this SPD	-
18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Phasing</li> </ul>	As a resident adjacent to the phase 4 area of Area B I have no idea when and for how long we will have to live with the constant challenge of battling to protect our property, livelihoods and lifestyles. I have no idea if and when the development will reach the Manley lane boundary. Having this hanging over you head day in day out is unfair and unhealthy. <b>More clarity is required on timescales.</b>	n/c – timescales ultimately depend on the market and developer interest so cannot be defined in the SPD.	-
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Phasing</li> </ul>	<b>Why is Area B even being looked at when Area A isn't even built or sold.</b> How do you know the needs of Tiverton without having first completed Area A.	n/c – as above	-
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>			

**Question 9- Do you have any other comments you would like to make on the Area B Supplementary Planning Document? (NB ALSO INCLUDES NON QUESTIONNAIRE 'LETTER / GENERAL COMMENT' RESPONSES).**

No. / stakeholder	Key Theme(s)	Comment	Suggested Response	SPD Section Amendments
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community facilities</li> </ul>	There does not appear to be any <b>Primary Health Care Provision (GP surgery)</b> . The surgeries in Tiverton are already very stretched. Where will people who live in the EUE be expected to register with a GP?	n/c – Allocated site subject lengthy Plan formulation, consultation and public examination. NHS England will be aware of the expected increase in population and will accordingly seek contributions at the application stage	-
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport / highways</li> </ul>	I strongly oppose to the impact this will have on the Glebelands area. The roads are not wide enough now for residents to access via Tidecombe lane and this will only exasperate the issue with the <b>car park</b> of the country park.	Remove Follett Rd CP	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport / highways</li> </ul>	The Glebelands area is a lovely place to live and this will significantly impact this nice quiet neighbourhood, I don't oppose to the principle of the park but I really don't want to loose our <b>lovely field with the barge companies horses</b> , and suddenly find our quiet, safe road is just a pass though to the country park with many people parking their cars all along Follet road and surrounding roads when the <b>car park</b> is full.	Remove Follett Rd CP	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport / highways</li> <li>Environment</li> </ul>	I strongly oppose the proposed <b>county park car parking</b> which will sit at the end of Follett Road. This will have a significant impact on the local area, this will degrade the area of Glebelands. I believe we should be	Remove Follett Rd CP	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of

		encouraging people not to use vehicles and a car park is not the answer. This is going to increase carbon emissions/ pollution and also if you look at the other canal car parks these are always full so would mean the overflow of cars onto Follett Road and Glebelands would happen regularly- this surely goes against the whole point are making a 'green space'.		new CP at p76 and p99
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General</li> </ul>	I strongly oppose	n/c	
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Green infrastructure</li> <li>Transport / Highways</li> </ul>	<p>I'm pleased to see that earlier promises made, to keep the area south of <b>West Manley Lane as green infrastructure, totally free of housing development</b>, appear to be being kept. If there is any proposal to change this policy, please record my wish to be notified immediately.</p> <p>In principal, the idea of creating a "parkland" south of the railway walk and around the canal, with a boardwalk and hides for wildlife viewing, is a good way of protecting that area from future housing development. However, this must under <b>no circumstances lead to further additional traffic in the Tidcombe and Glebelands area</b>. Congestion in Tidcombe Lane is already a serious issue, and will become more so, when the rest of the TEUE is developed, residents pour down Post Hill heading for Tesco and Lidl, and are tempted to use Tidcombe Lane as a rat-run, to avoid congestion in Blundell's Road.</p> <p>Residents of Canal Hill and the houses at the south end of Tidcombe Lane, when returning down the A361 from trips away or daily commutes, will also use the new A361 exit by Braid Park, and then Tidcombe Lane, rather than their current route from the presently existing exit and on up Canal Hill. Therefore any additional use of Tidcombe Lane is to</p>	Remove Follett Rd CP	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99

		<p>be discouraged. Making it one-way is not the answer, as that would unacceptably penalise residents currently living north of Tidcombe bridge, and lead to greater use of Canal Hill, or worse still, Ford Road. Devon Highways has already gone on record as stating that Canal Hill traffic is at full capacity.</p> <p>Therefore I wish you to record my strong objection to the proposal to site a <b>carpark in the field beyond the end of Follett Road</b>. Even though the current proposal is just for 8 cars, that would encourage constant traffic at all times of day along Tidcombe Lane and Glebelands Road. Of course, 8 car-spaces may also only be the "thin end of the wedge", leading to later, even more unacceptable expansion. I believe that pedestrian and cyclist access from Manley Lane and the canal or railway walk would be perfectly adequate. Further car journeys in this area, and their accompanying pollution, should not be encouraged.</p>		
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transport / Highways</li> </ul>	Do not want a lot of extra <b>traffic</b> in our normally quiet streets	n/c	
8 Agent for Sweet Meadow owner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Housing supply</li> <li>• Density</li> <li>• Housing delivery</li> <li>• Green infrastructure</li> </ul>	My client welcomes the publication of the Draft Masterplan and is aware of the issues facing the Council with regards to the delivery of development at Cullompton and the importance of Area B of the EUE being brought forward to help ensure delivery in the early years of the LPR. Our client has previously made it clear that he is willing to bring his land forward for housing to make a contribution to delivery within the District and to meet the objectives of the EUE allocation to deliver 1,550 – 2,000 homes. It is therefore his hope that the Masterplan can be progressed in a timely manner.	n/c – Development boundaries are already defined. Any landowner discussions should be dealt with by land equalisation or other suggestions as set out within section 6 of the SPD. Housing densities will be considered in detail at development management stage.	-



		<p>However, we would caution the Council with regards to the reliance on the Draft Masterplan to deliver the housing numbers anticipated. We note that the Area A masterplan envisaged the combined Area A and B of the EUE would deliver circa 1,488 units, with 553 falling in Area B. <b>The Draft Masterplan envisages 684 units will instead be provided in Area B, which relies on an average density of 35 units per hectare. Whilst it is accepted that densities can vary significantly and such a density may be achievable our view is this is too high an average to be relied on.</b></p> <p>Whilst the Draft Masterplan evidences that circa 1,000 have outline consent on Area A it also notes only 248 have reserved matters consent. It is of note that the site which has RM approval for 248, was actually approved for 330 units at the outline stage. This site has come forward at a density of 23 units per hectare. Whilst it is accepted it is a sweeping assumption, it is not implausible that the remainder of Area A will deliver 25% less units than the outline numbers would suggest final delivery may be closer to 750 dwellings. This evidence also brings into question whether the Council can rely on area B to be developed at 35 units per hectare on average. In any event it is clear the EUE will not deliver anything close to the upper threshold of 2,000 homes.</p> <p><b>On this basis we believe that the Council need to consider revising the Draft Masterplan to allow for residential development on any areas of land within the Draft Masterplan area that are not shown for other uses.</b></p> <p>It may even be the case that the Council have to consider reducing areas shown for other uses to allow greater housing delivery.</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>With regards to the <b>Sweet Meadow land</b> this is not shown for any form of development but it lies on the edge of an area being proposed for housing development at a density of circa 25 dwellings per hectare. This looser form of development reflects the existing character of the area which comprises detached and semi-detached homes. <b>We see no reason why at least the eastern part of our client's land should not be incorporated within this development area.</b></p> <p><b>Should the Council not consider it appropriate to specifically show the Sweet Meadow land as being part of the housing area we advocate it remaining as 'white land' and not specifically shown for any form of development or other use.</b> In particular, we would make it clear that given the existing development on the site and the location north of East Manley Lane it would not be appropriate for it to be shown as being part of the green infrastructure that is shown within the Masterplan.</p>		
<b>9 Horse Barge Owners</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land-use</li> <li>• Economy</li> </ul>	<p>Refers to email dated 1<sup>st</sup> April.</p> <p><b>We Strongly Object to the proposed change of use (with in Public-Consultation-Tiverton-Eastern-Urban-Extension-eue-Area-b-Masterplan) of land that we are currently using for grazing our heavy horses (that pull the barge)</b> Marked on the plan below in RED.</p> <p><b>We formally Request that the land we currently use (marked in Red on the plan above) Remains as Pastureland.</b></p> <p>As a family business we are so very reliant on local fields within walking distance of the horse-drawn barge operation (We are one of the last "Horse-Drawn Barges in the United Kingdom) should this land be taken from</p>	Remove Follett Rd CP and amend drawings to show pastureland	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99

		<p>us through planning or a change of use we would be unable to look after the horses locally, this would in turn jeopardise the future viability of the horse-drawn barge as a whole.</p> <p>Should we be unable to continue trading, it would have a devastating negative economic impact not just for DCC and the Canal but for tourism within Tiverton Mid Devon as the horse-drawn barge has become a unique selling point for the Mid Devon area in tourism terms.</p>		
10 National Grid	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General</li> </ul>	We have reviewed the above document and can confirm that <b>National Grid</b> has no comments to make in response to this consultation.	n/c	-
11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport / Highways</li> </ul>	<p>I am writing to raise my concerns about a proposal to have a <b>car park</b> at the end of Follett Road, Glebelands. There are many issues with this including:</p> <p>Extra traffic on Glebelands and Tidcombe Lane which won't cope with this.</p> <p>Pupils from Tidcombe Primary School will be put at greater risk when using Tidcombe Lane.</p> <p>Access to Glebelands Road from Tidcombe Lane via Blundells Road needs great care to negotiate safely, so with extra traffic will be a high risk area.</p> <p>Residents on Glebelands will be put at risk when crossing busy roads, including elderly, children and disabled.</p> <p>The car park will be quite isolated, so could become a meeting place for various unsavoury activities.</p> <p>Glebelands will suffer with litter.</p> <p>The <b>barge horses use</b> the field over the winter, so where could they go?</p> <p>It will create noise on a peaceful semi rural housing estate, disturbing residents and wildlife.</p> <p>It does not make sense to have a car park at the end of a housing estate.</p>	Remove Follett Rd CP	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99

		Please put these objections on file regarding this proposal.		
12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Flooding</li> </ul>	I think the sloping land and its tendency to pour <b>flood water</b> onto Manley lane is not a good site for building	n/c – development management stage will require confirmation of drainage strategy and betterment of existing run off rates.	-
13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Delivery</li> </ul>	We applaud the proposals but feel we would all have wasted our time if developers are not bound by MDDC's overall plan and attempt to downgrade your vision	n/c	-
14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Delivery</li> </ul>	Whilst I did not attend the consultation meeting I would like some idea of <b>timescale for the development phases</b> . Again I can see no reference in any of the boards of a possible / proposed starting dates	n/c – as above	
15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Green infrastructure</li> </ul>	The consultants should be congratulated on developing a masterplan for Area B that <b>addresses many of the concerns of local residents</b> . The idea of a country park as the GI linking the Canal, disused railway walk, open spaces and natural habitats demonstrates forward thinking	n/c	-
16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Phasing</li> <li>Transport / highways</li> </ul>	It is imperative that the full Two-Way <b>Junction on the A361 is completed</b> at an early stage, as the left in/left out junction would be inadequate to reduce further traffic/pollution pressure on the existing road through Blundell's School, leading to the Horsdon Roundabout. I reiterate my opposition to any alternative access to Area B being provided through Hartnoll Farm	n/c – Area A issue for A361.	-
17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Flooding</li> <li>General</li> </ul>	Overall Area B SPD shows vision and addresses issues raised by local residents. At this stage there is <b>little reference to the engineering work, mains drainage and the annual flooding of areas</b> within Area B. Local residents would welcome more clarity on this point in due course.	n/c – for development management stage	-

18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport / Highways</li> </ul>	<p><b>Vehicular Access to Country Park</b></p> <p>We note that it is proposed that vehicular access to the country park be in part through the Glebelands Estate to a car park at the end of Follett Road. This has been the subject of considerable concern in the estate. We declare an interest, we are residents.</p> <p>The concerns relate mainly to increased traffic through Tidcombe Lane and the estate itself:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tidcombe lane: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>between Blundell's Road and the roundabout that leads to Tidcombe Walk is effectively largely single-lane with passing places</li> <li>has difficult sight-lines between Glebelands Road and Marina Drive</li> <li>is frequently very busy – especially close to the beginning and end of the school day, particularly in the vicinity of Marina Drive</li> </ul> </li> <li>The Glebelands estate is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>served by one access point, that is from Tidcombe Lane – a T junction. This has been the location of a number of "near misses"</li> <li>accessed through Glebelands Road. Residents do park in the highway – for entirely understandable reasons. This too means that the road will often only allow vehicular passage in one direction</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>We are of the view that vehicular access to the park would best be provided from other points – ideally seeking to minimise the number of residential properties affected by increased traffic flow.</p>	Remove Follett Rd CP	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99
----	--	--	----------------------	---

19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land use</li> </ul>	<p>The other proposal concerns the application to build a totally unnecessary <b>car park</b> in the field at the end of Follett Road.</p> <p>This field is currently the home of the horses that do a wonderful job pulling barge loads of paying tourists along the canal, tourists that bring a lot of welcome cash in to the area. Where would these magnificent creatures go?</p> <p>There is also the unwelcome effect associated with either of the above proposals of countless more vehicles using Tidcombe Lane and the surrounding residential roads which are populated by a great number of folk of retirement age.</p>	Remove Follett Road car park	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99
20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport / highways</li> </ul>	<p>Although to a person not familiar with <b>Tidcombe Lane and Glebelands</b> this may appear to be a good idea, to anyone living in or regularly visiting the area it would be a nightmare. All the estate roads are narrow and full of parked cars. Tidcombe Lane is one track and causes many passing problems at present , which would be exacerbated by any additional traffic, unless the long promised traffic calming scheme was carried out.</p>	Remove Follett Road car park	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99
21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land use</li> <li>Transport / highways</li> </ul>	<p>With reference to the recent consultation held in Phoenix House, I am writing to ask why you have Planned to put a <b>car parking area</b> in the Paddock Field?</p> <p>This is used by the Shire Horses of Grand Western Canal so we can't have cars or vehicles in this field.</p> <p>We are mainly senior citizens who live on this estate and would not welcome extra traffic.</p> <p>There are parking spaces at Manley Bridge (often not used).</p>	Remove Follett Road car park	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99

		This is not in full view of the canal, would it not be more sensible to extend this area?		
22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land use</li> <li>Transport / highways</li> </ul>	<p>The Paddock is used by the Tiverton <b>Barge Horses and would therefore be inappropriate for parking</b>. The gate has to be kept locked at all times. This field has the special properties and nutrients which makes it good for horses.</p> <p>We are very concerned about extra traffic. Glebelands Road is very congested now with the bus having great difficulty getting through.</p> <p>We all know from past meetings and consultations that Tidcombe Lane cannot accommodate more vehicle traffic as is the case with Canal Hill. Tidcombe Lane is constantly used by Blundell's school children. Because of the state of the road being full of potholes, many people cut through Tidcome Lane and go down Canal Hill. We note some of those potholes have been filled but won't last.</p> <p>Visitors to the Horse Drawn Barge want to see fields and Devon countryside – not a car park.</p> <p>It is not plausible to sight it here. May we suggest that the Car Park at Manley bridge which lays back slightly from the canal and is therefore less intrusive be extended to take some extra cars. If you really feel it necessary. The benefit of this is that cars already access this via Blundells Road and Manley Lane with no need to go down Tidcombe Lane and through the Glebelands housing estate.</p>	Remove Follett Road car park	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99
23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land use</li> <li>Transport / highways</li> </ul>	<p>Dear Sirs</p> <p>I am writing to advise you of the following: -</p>	Remove Follett Road car park	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Green infrastructure</li> </ul>	<p>I take my daily walk along the Tiverton Canal and come off at Follett Road. I always go along to the field at the end of the road to see the barge horses, who have been kept here for many, many years.</p> <p>It has been brought to my notice by a neighbour that the Council are thinking of replacing the field for a <b>car park</b>. This really cannot happen. Seeing the horses there and being able to talk to them is good for my well being and mental health.</p> <p>The garage which operates through the holiday period is always busy and people come by the coach load for the trip along the canal. They want to see the green structure not car parks.</p> <p>I cannot believe that the Council are thinking of doing this. Surely there must be other places where a car park could be put. This would make Tidcombe Lane and Follett Road extremely busy and would make the bus route more difficult than it already is.</p> <p>Devon is already losing so much of its green spaces so I urge you all to think long and hard about this as it would be detrimental to a lot of people and also the beautiful shire horses.</p>		new CP at p76 and p99
24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land use</li> <li>Transport / highways</li> <li>Green infrastructure</li> </ul>	<p>Dear Planning Section</p> <p>I was dismayed to hear of plans to put a <b>car parking</b> in the Paddock Field and wonder if you are aware that this is used by the Tiverton Barge Horses. The gates are always locked so how would this work. You can't have cars coming and going near horses.</p> <p>We are an elderly community here on the Glebelands estate and do not want extra traffic coming and going.</p>	Remove Follett Road car park	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99



		<p>It just doesn't make sense to think of directing traffic through a housing estate.</p> <p>What seems a better idea is to enlarge the car park (which is never full) at Manley Lane. This is not on view from the Canal and the traffic wouldn't need to go through our housing estate but could go direct from Blundell's Road and straight down Manley Lane. This makes most sense.</p>		
25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land use</li> <li>• Transport / highways</li> <li>• Green infrastructure</li> </ul>	<p>Dear Planning Dept</p> <p>I am astonished to learn that part of the Paddock Field has been designated for a <b>Car Park</b>. The gate is always locked because the Tiverton Shire Horses who pull the Barge along our canal stay in this field. It is completely unnecessary to have a car park here.</p> <p>The Paddock is at the end of the Glebelands housing estate and residents will not take kindly to having any extra traffic coming through an already very congested Glebelands Road. I would also add that the majority of residents are senior citizens.</p> <p>The Council have already agreed that Tidcombe Lane and Canal Hill cannot take any more traffic. The Blundell's school children use Tidcombe lane all the time and local residents are very mindful of this, but there is already extra traffic with people coming of Blundell's road, because of the potholes and going down Tidcombe Lane and onto Canal Hill.</p> <p>If you deem it necessary for extra parking then site it at Manley Lane Car Park which won't spoil the view from the canal and can be accessed from Blundell's Road and then directly onto Manley Lane. This car park is seldom full and could easily be extended.</p>	Remove Follett Road car park	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99

26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land use</li> <li>• Transport / highways</li> </ul>	<p>Dear Sir</p> <p>With reference to the Planning Department's proposal for a car park at the end of <b>Follett Road</b> and a bridge to be constructed over the canal to link up with the Tidcombe Hall development, we wish to register out objection to these proposals in the strongest of terms. Our reasons are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The extra volume of traffic which this would create, to the already severely congested roadways i.e the Tidcombe Lane and Glebelands areas, bearing in mind the proposed building of 168 new homes.</li> <li>2. The congestion created by Tidcombe School because of parents dropping off and collecting children would be exacerbated by the extra traffic you are proposing</li> </ol> <p>Adding this new volume of traffic would cause gridlock to the area.</p> <p>We also feel that with the extra volume of traffic and the parking that this would incur, our local bus service would have even more difficulty in being able to provide the current service.</p> <p>If anyone at the Council has tried to drive through Tidcombe Lane and not had to negotiate the bus, parked cars, refuse collections, delivery vans and vehicles coming from Canal Hill including articulated lorries, using Tidcombe Lane as a short cut to Halberton, then they have been extremely fortunate. The current plans would cause gridlock and danger to pedestrians.</p>	Remove Follett Road car park	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99
----	--	--	------------------------------	---

		<p>Finally, unfortunately car parks in open spaces take on a completely different connotation at night becoming havens for boy racers which means the roads become speed tracks. There is also the worry that drug dealing could become an issue.</p> <p>We therefore submit this letter as our strong objection to these proposals.</p>		
27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land use</li> <li>• Transport / highways</li> <li>• Green infrastructure</li> </ul>	<p>Dear Sir/Madam</p> <p>With reference to the proposed <b>car park</b> at the end of the Glebelands Estate, I would like to oppose this planning.</p> <p>For 45 years this estate has been a beautifully kept area of Tiverton. The people that live here take pride in their gardens and hoes and there is already enough vehicles parked along Glebelands Road so all traffic would be single file along the bottom of the road.</p> <p>The horses that spend the winter months in the field would have to be put to other fields. The barge is a good source of tourism and people come from far and wide, I feel we need to look after the few things that bring people to our town to enjoy the beautiful canal bank.</p> <p>We already have a nature garden that people can enjoy walking from the basin or from Halberton.</p> <p>This money proposed would be spent better in other places i.e the pavements in bad need of repair. I have tripped many a time or trod on one side to end up with a shoe full of water.</p>	Remove Follett Road car park	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99

		<p>The pot holes by Blundells School catch me out quite often and the suspensions on our cars are well damaged.</p> <p>Please leave our quiet unspoilt estate alone and concentrate on bigger matters in hand and leave the horses to graze where they are safe.</p>		
28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land use</li> <li>Transport / highways</li> </ul>	<p>My wife and I object to any plans that would increase the volume of traffic in Tidcombe Lane. It was not designed for the modern motor car, let alone buses, and this is exacerbated by cars parking, with the occupants seeking access to the canal, or are parents of children at Tidcombe Primary school.</p> <p>The horse drawn barge is a significant attraction to the Grand Western canal and the horses need somewhere to be when they are not working. The suggestion that their field could be turned into a <b>car park</b> is not acceptable.</p>	Remove Follett Road car park	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99
29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land use</li> <li>Transport / highways</li> </ul>	<p>This will mean a lot of extra traffic, the roads on the estate are quite narrow and Glebelands Rd has a lot of parked cars. There is a blind land with a guide dog who lives on this estate and I fear for her safety with extra cars.</p> <p>Will there be a change for parking and who will be responsible for upkeep etc?</p> <p>There could be overnight parking so who would be responsible for check this?</p> <p>A <b>car park</b> 'out of town' will be used for drug abuse as is the car park in Manley Lane</p> <p>The Barge is a popular Tourist Attraction but with a car park one side and Tidcombe Hall development and the</p>	Remove Follett Road car park	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99

		<p>other there will not be much countryside to travel through.</p> <p>I strongly object to this plan.</p>		
30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land use</li> <li>Transport / highways</li> </ul>	<p>Dear Sirs</p> <p>We thoroughly disagree with the proposal to put a <b>car park</b> in Follett Road in an area which is already a hazard due to parents parking twice a day with their children attending the school.</p> <p>Also Tidcombe Lane is a driving nightmare at times with the number of vehicles using it.</p> <p>As for the proposed bridge for the Tidcombe Hall development. Have you witnessed the amount of water that soaks down from the estate and crosses the road?</p> <p>We await hearing that the above has been cancelled.</p>	Remove Follett Road car park	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99
31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land use</li> <li>Transport / highways</li> <li>Sustainability / environment</li> </ul>	<p>I am writing to object to the above proposal which I understand is being discussed on 20 April. I believe this is for people who wish to access the canal. Glebelands Estate was never built with heavy traffic in mind and it seems ludicrous to place a <b>car park</b> where one has to navigate round small estate roads, causing excess noise and pollution at a time when we should be thinking "green". The extra stress it will put on Tidcombe Lane is a real concern. It was difficult enough on a temporary basis when work was taking place on Canal Hill, but to increase the traffic there on a permanent basis would be ridiculous – an accident waiting to happen! It has to be remembered that there is an ageing population in this area and a primary school too and also a promise made some years ago by the Council that they would not give more access on to Tidcombe Lane and Canal Hill.</p>	Remove Follett Road car park	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99

32	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land use</li> <li>Transport / highways</li> </ul>	<p>Dear Sir/Madam</p> <p>I wish to protest the plans to put a <b>car park</b> in the field at the end of Follett Rd, Glebelands, this would put extra traffic on Tidcombe Lane and our roads on the estate, not to mention the problems with the people who would be using the car park at night. Please think again.</p>	Remove Follett Road car park	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99
33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land use</li> <li>Transport / highways</li> </ul>	<p>Dear Sirs</p> <p>I am writing to object to the planning of a car park at the end of Follet Road. I can see many problems: 1) traffic along Tidcombe Lane which is already a nightmare at times. 2) traffic along Glebelands Road and Follett Road which at times gets congested.</p> <p>Also I can see these roads becoming dangerous with all the expected extra traffic. Evenings would also be problematic with joyriders riding around the car park once word gets around. Also most of the residents on this estate are retired and some are elderly and vulnerable. I worry for myself and my neighbours safety and peace of mind especially in the evenings if this plan goes through.</p>	Remove Follett Road car park	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99
34	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land use</li> <li>Transport / highways</li> <li>Green infrastructure</li> </ul>	<p>Dear Sirs</p> <p>I am writing this letter to place an objection against the proposal to build a car park in the field at the end of Follett Road in Tiverton.</p> <p>I know that the current owner wants this meadow to be kept as open land and that they currently allow the barge horse to graze on the meadow during the close season of the horse drawn barge.</p> <p>I am totally against the idea of a car park as the residents of Glebelands Estate are mainly elderly and</p>	Remove Follett Road car park	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99

		<p>retired and chose to live in this area for the peace and quiet in currently enjoys. There is no through road in the estate at the moment, which allows the estate to remain quiet. If there were to be a car park at the end of Follett Road it would become a thoroughfare for all and sundry.</p> <p>Therefore please accept this letter as my absolute non-acceptance of any proposed work to change any of our estate to suit planning ideas.</p>		
35	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land use</li> <li>• Transport / highways</li> <li>• Green infrastructure</li> </ul>	<p>Dear Planning Department</p> <p>I am writing to you because I am very concerned to hear that there are proposals to put a car park in the Paddock Field.</p> <p>To access this you would have to come up Tidcombe Lane and through Glebelands Road which is very congested now, then up Follet Road to the Paddock, in other words right through the estate. This is not acceptable. The residents are predominantly senior citizens – we have a blind lady and several mobility scooter users. This is the wrong place to put a car park.</p> <p>The paddock is next to the canal which now has Country park status. Once you get past the houses, the rest must remain as green fields. We get considerably large amounts of visitors to the canal and taking a trip on the Horse Drawn Barge and they won't want to see ruined with more houses and car parks. Nor to anymore building. The Council have agreed that Tidcombe Lane and Canal Hill cannot take any more traffic.</p> <p>There's space at Manley Lane Car Park which could easily be made bigger. There's a huge area of rubbish which could be cleared to extend this car park and</p>	Remove Follett Road car park	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99

		then it would not be necessary to go through our housing estate.		
<b>36</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land use</li> <li>• Transport / highways</li> <li>• Sustainability</li> </ul>	<p>I have been informed by neighbours that there is a proposal to turn the field at the end of Follet Rd into a car park with access from Tidcombe Lane through the Glebelands Estate. As a resident of this estate, I feel I should have been given formal notice of exactly what would be involved in such a development.</p> <p>Unfortunately I was unable to attend the meeting owing to a prior engagement. The only notice we received of this meeting was from neighbours. I understand that some 20 or so years ago the council agreed with local residents that there should be no new accesses to Tidcombe Lane and Canal Hill. There has been a huge increase in traffic in that time, it will be even worse when all the new estates in this area are occupied. At a time when there is so much concern about global warming the council should be thinking how car use could be reduced and planning for a much cleaner and more frequent public transport.</p> <p>The second aspect of this development is the difficulty residents will have in getting through Tidcombe lane, which is already a nightmare for drivers and pedestrians alike. The planners must be aware that there are no footpaths. Blundell's pupils must cross between boarding houses and playing fields. There is a primary school, to which parents bring their children by car because it is not safe for them to walk.</p> <p>We are filled with apprehension at the thought of all the extra vehicles going to and fro along the narrow streets of the Glebelands estate. We like living here and pay our council tax to do so. Many residents are elderly, some blind and or infirm, they feel that have earned some peace and quiet and clean air.</p>	Remove Follett Road Car park	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99



		I ask the Planning department to think again and find some better solutions.		
<b>37</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land use</li> <li>Transport / highways</li> </ul>	<p>We are writing today to vehemently object to the plans to put a car park in the field at the end of Follett Road.</p> <p>Firstly the entry point in all these schemes is Tidcombe Lane, then Glebelands Road,</p> <p>Both are very narrow and not suitable for large numbers of extra cars. In Glebelands Road in particular, four side roads emerge onto it and because residents park in the road, there is very little space for other residents or the bus to use.</p> <p>There have been any number of prangs where motorists emerging from Follett Road, Polwhele and Rayer Roads and St Lawrence Close have turned left – straight into the path of an oncoming vehicle. The estate just can't take any more vehicles.</p> <p>Not only that but we understand that the field was left in perpetuity for the barge horses to over-winter. Where would they go?</p> <p>It appears the planning dept has mooted the idea of a new bridge of the canal as a means for exit traffic to link up with the Tidcombe Hall planning application.</p> <p>We are also strongly opposed to this for exactly the same reasons... too much extra traffic on roads that were not built for it. Not only that, the Manley Lane car park is now awash with boy facers and discarded drugs and needles which residents pick up every day so that canal walkers and pets are not injured. Surely the same</p>	Remove Follett Road Car park	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99

		<p>thing would happen at the end of Follett Road... in an area predominantly populated by elderly residents?</p> <p>Wasn't the canal deemed a Country Park some years ago? Surely that means that no new buildings should be built along its banks leaving existing fields either side?</p> <p>Just because farm land and fields are there, doesn't mean you have to build new houses on every part of it. Surely common sense comes into agreeing planning applications? Walkers from Tiverton and further afield have long enjoyed the peace and tranquillity of walking alongside our beautiful canal. Can't we keep it that way?</p> <p>Approval has already been given for over 2,000 new houses in the EUE development... that's probably an extra 5,000 cars minimum along Blundells Road! Members of the Planning Committee may not live in Tiverton and have to cope with the chaos this brings, but WE do!</p> <p>Not every piece of land is suitable for development approval and these two schemes should not be allowed to go ahead. I hope you will ACTUALLY listen to residents' views over this.</p>		
38	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land use</li> <li>• Transport / highways</li> <li>• Green infrastructure</li> </ul>	<p>I am writing to express concern over the above proposal. I am lucky to live in an area of green space, especially bordering the canal. This area is a beautiful spot and is visited by many exactly for these reasons, adding a car park is not going to appeal to most who enjoy walking along this part of the canal. The last thing they will want to look at is another grey concrete car park! Most people/tourists park at the basin which is surely what we want and to encourage so that they use</p>	Remove Follett Road Car park	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99

		<p>this space to entice them into the town and use the Barge and café.</p> <p>The space proposed is currently used by the Barge horses which is a local attraction in itself and is I'm sure very useful for the owners as it is not too far for them to come and look after them. There is already plenty of space for locals to park, if they wish to go for a walk along this stretch of the canal and for all the new housing that is being built it would surely be better to encourage them to walk here rather than bring their cars.</p> <p>I feel there is too much development being proposed for this end of town and am concerned about the environmental impact.</p>		
39	•	<p>Dear Sirs,</p> <p>I am not in favour of creating a car park at the end of Follett Rd.</p> <p>Tidcombe Hall Development, if it is approved, will already bring more stressful traffic to this area and Tidcombe Lane has no pavements for pedestrians or to help protect children accessing the nearby school.</p> <p>Please reconsider. Lives will be put at risk.</p>	Remove Follett Road Car park	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99
40	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Phasing</li> <li>• Transport / Infrastructure</li> </ul>	<p>Having reread your reply to me on the 30th of March, I would like you to explain how <b>area B can be developed before any infrastructure has been completed in area A.</b> Your letter confirmed that area B may be developed first if you can find an alternative access to this land and avoid access through area A.</p> <p>This means that area A may not be developed for the foreseeable future or until Chettiscombe trust releases the land.</p>	n/c – see development phasing and infrastructure within section 6.	-

		<p>It was not long ago your department was actively encouraging an access through Mayfair, which luckily our council rejected. Your letter confirms you are still looking for an alternative access.</p> <p>Does this mean that the developers of area B will not need to contribute anything towards the needed infrastructure costs proposed for the new junction or roads, cycle routes, the school or "village centre" etc. ?</p> <p>If so, we could have almost 1000 houses built in area B and Braids Park without any significant infrastructure even having started.</p> <p>Since the present restrictions have been in force, my wife and I have been walking to tiverton from Mayfair and I can tell you that even with the much reduced traffic it is quite frightening. <b>The pavement is in places too narrow to walk together.</b> We have met other families walking and we have to walk in the road to pass each other.</p> <p>We tried cycling and that is worse! <b>The cycle lane starts approximately 100 yards from Mayfair and ends before Tidcombe lane.</b></p> <p>This cycle lane is only 3ft wide , so narrow that it is almost impossible to stay in it.</p> <p>Speaking to fellow walkers and cyclists, every single one has commented how dangerous it is to use this road.</p> <p>There is of course, no provision for cyclists to return home.</p> <p><b>You stated that there will be no cycle lane before all the houses are built.</b></p> <p>How can you, a qualified planner even consider building 1 more house with no regard for for the safety of pedestrians and cyclists ?</p> <p>At the very least, <b>a purpose built pedestrian and cycle lane needs to be in operation before any more houses are built.</b></p>		
--	--	---	--	--

		Your planning office needs this to be challenged properly in open debate.		
41	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land use</li> <li>• Transport / highways</li> <li>• Green infrastructure</li> </ul>	<p>Dear Sirs,</p> <p>With respect to your plans to develop <b>Tidcombe Hall</b>.</p> <p>I have been a resident of Tidcombe Lane for most of my life. The development of extra housing would add considerably to the amount of traffic using the lane. It is already very dangerous for my 2 children to walk twice a day to school.</p> <p>It is already regrettably used as a short cut to gain access to Newts hill and Cullompton. An increase in more vehicles would make any pedestrian activity in the Lane impossible. Particularly with the climate change situation we should not be encouraging an increase in traffic but assisting local residents to walk or cycle safely. The plans to calm the traffic are just going to brush over the problem without actually solving anything.</p> <p>With regards to the proposal of a <b>car park</b> at the end of Follett road. This would have a huge impact on the already over busy Tidcombe Lane. There is already a very well situated car park at the Tiverton end of the basin. This has good road access and any increase of use would not reduce the enhancement of the canal or local residential area in any way. Why increase the traffic to two different parts of the canal when there is already a perfectly adequate site being used.</p> <p>The benefits of The Grand Western Canal to Tiverton are huge. Local people and visitors come to enjoy the rural and beautiful aspects of it. More car parks and housing</p>	Remove Follett Road Car park	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99

		would only detract from its appeal and reduce the visitor numbers.		
<b>42</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transport / highways</li> <li>• Inclusive development</li> </ul>	<p>-Consideration of <b>bus routes</b> and narrow lanes</p> <p>-Consideration of services and facilities</p> <p>-seeking to ensure the <b>needs of the elderly</b> are considered</p> <p>-need to seek sensible, safe and emotive ideas rather than sophisticated and supersonic</p> <p>-need to consider <b>affordable housing</b> for the young</p> <p>-inclusive development for all age groups</p>	Check ref to meeting needs of all ages	Reference added 3.3.5 P52
<b>43</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land use</li> <li>• Transport / highways</li> <li>• Green infrastructure</li> <li>• Tourism</li> </ul>	<p>I am writing with reference to your proposal to designate a <b>car park</b> area in the field at the end of Follett Road... presumably for locals and visitors wishing to use the Canal tow path for the very special unspoilt walks available which combine the lovely open Devonshire countryside alongside the peaceful wildlife status of the Canal... Surely there are enough entries onto the Canal area already and so why would you want to spoil this beautiful area with yet more traffic – especially the use of Tidcombe land which is already a bottle-neck.</p> <p>Combine this with the most shocking thought of the building of residential properties in the Tidcombe Hall Development which would be an ABSOLUTE CRIME – touching the soul of the Town of Tiverton – as this would take away, forever, open country walking alongside our canal until Manley Bridge is almost reached. How could you take this joy away for the majority walkers who would be unable to manage the distance which would then be necessary to reach open countryside??</p> <p>With the horrors we are all living with in these unprecedented times I would have certainly thought that you – the decision makers – have the courage – so</p>	Remove Follett Road Car park	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99

		strongly needed – to say no to any plans to build up any further canal-side areas so that both today's and future generations are able to enjoy this unique area without the encroachment by roads and buildings. Please, I beg you, deeply consider the implications of the decisions you are soon to make – make the wrong one and you would spoil Tiverton forever		
44	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land use</li> <li>Transport / highways</li> <li>Green infrastructure</li> <li>Tourism</li> </ul>	<p>I cannot believe that when consultants were asked to set out some proposals for facilities / uses for green infrastructure that forms area B of the Eastern Urban Extension that certain criteria weren't set out by the planning department such as:</p> <p>Any <b>car parking</b> in the field at the end of Follett Road to give access to the country park should not be allowed to happen. This would have a massive impact yet again on the Tidcombe Lane / Glebelands area especially if the Tidcombe Hall estate is allowed to progress, with the extra amount of traffic and the safety issues that already exist.</p> <p>Just as worrying is the fact that the paddock where the car park would be is privately owned and used by the <b>Tiverton Canal Barge Company</b>. Do you propose to put a compulsory purchase order on it to form the car parking area for 8000 Cars. I think not. I'm also very concerned for the future of the Barge. If the paddock is taken away there is no other field in walking distance from the canal basin and of the right size to graze 3 horses. Would it be the end of one of the biggest and best tourist attractions in Devon. I urge you to reconsider the whole idea of using any land that would have an impact on traffic, safety &amp; Tiverton Barge.</p>	Remove Follett Road Car park	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99
45	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land use</li> <li>Transport / highways</li> </ul>	Dear Sirs	Remove Follett Road Car park	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green infrastructure</li> <li>• Ecology</li> </ul>	<p>It seems to us that the Planning Department are intent on destroying all the natural habitats around Tiverton – the Tidcombe Hall proposals being the latest.</p> <p>We strongly object to the destruction of these natural areas – particularly when they will increase traffic flow in Tidcombe Lane and also onto the Glebelands Estate – were people already come to park their cars for canal &amp; railway line dog walking. Building <b>car parks</b> on green spaces, when the national strategy is to reduce Co2 emissions, cannot be acceptable, particularly when adverse effects to the planet, people and wildlife are so serious.</p>		new CP at p76 and p99
46	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land use</li> <li>• Transport / highways</li> </ul>	<p>As I am a resident living on the Glebelands Estate I wish to strongly object to the proposed Tidcombe Hall developments. The <b>barge horses</b> used on the canal add greatly to the tourism of Tiverton and if moved away from their winter field would be a great loss solely for a car park. Tidcombe Lane is only a narrow lane and just manages presently time traffic if everyone drives sensibly. Getting out onto Blundells Road causes delays and can be risky. Adding even more traffic would be foolhardy, possible causing fatalities to Tidcombe Lane pedestrians.</p>	Remove Follett Road Car park	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99
47	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land use</li> <li>• Transport / highways</li> </ul>	<p>Dear Sir</p> <p>I wish to place on record my objection to the above application.</p> <p>There are presently enough <b>car parks</b> available at the basin end of the Canal.</p> <p>Road Access to Follett road is via Glebelands Road and Tidcombe Lane. Both are not suitable for any more additional traffic due to parked cars. On Glebelands Road there is only room for 1 car to drive down from</p>	Remove Follett Road Car park	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99



		<p>Polwhele Road to Follet Road due to cars parked on the lower side.</p> <p>Tidcombe Lane is narrow, both ways from the end of Glebelands Road with a narrow bridge that is partially unsighted when driving from the Blundell's end to the top of Tidcombe Lane.</p> <p>It is also very narrow at the Blundell's end and 2 cars can only just squeeze past each other at very slow speed. Lorries cause problems as cars must reverse to allow them to come down or go up Tidcombe Lane.</p> <p>This I believe is already noted on the Council's records as both roads are unsuitable for any additional traffic.</p> <p>There is also the question of use of the proposed car park for purposes other than what it is intended for. By that I understand that the small car park at Manley bridge is being used at night by those who take prohibited substances and then discard their needles. I am sure that if this application was to be passed a similar thing would happen. This is at the end of a road that is predominantly lived in by retired people.</p> <p>I also understand that there is some talk about installing a footbridge over the canal to the proposed development of 100+ houses around the old Marie Curie Building at the top of Tidcombe Lane. This would spoil a part of the Country Park (a well-used amenity) as it would be in almost open countryside.</p> <p>Whilst writing I would also like my objection to the development of 100+ houses on the old Marie Curie site. This is on the same traffic-based objection as previously alluded regarding Tidcombe Lane.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

48	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overdevelopment</li> </ul>	This area of land should not be <b>overdeveloped</b>	n/c – as above	-
49	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developer contributions</li> </ul>	Exactly how much <b>106 Agreement</b> money is the developer paying the Council and where is this money being spent?	n/c – See section 6 for requirements, the final levels will be set at development management stage	-
50	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Facilities / services</li> <li>Employment</li> <li>Transport / highways</li> <li>Overdevelopment</li> </ul>	Where will people <b>shop</b> .... will they all travel in their cars along Blundells Rd to Tesco etc where will they <b>work</b> and how will they travel to work. What will happen to all the tractor <b>traffic</b> to the biodigester..... will there be a limit to the relentless <b>growth of the bio digester which does not sit easily with the garden development aspirations in these plans..</b>	n/c – this is an issue for the EUE as a whole and Area A includes the potential neighbourhood centre.	-
51	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport / highways</li> </ul>	The left in <b>left out junction off the A361</b> has been built at great expense to the public purse. No development of EUE was permitted until it was complete. There was no condition that it should be used!. We have a white elephant on our hands and a situation where all the construction traffic for Braid Park passes through Blundell's School and up Post Hill. There is an accident waiting to happen, not to mention the fact that the road is in such a state of disrepair that any traffic calming measures provided in Blundell's Road are actually unnecessary as the potholes will slow traffic down to <20mph. I note that £10m is due to be spent on the Northern part of the A361 slip road in 2022? Why? It won't be used. <b>MDDC need to address the problems they have with Chettiscombe Trust and Area A, rather than trying to force the delivery of Area B to keep to their quotas.</b>	n/c – Area A issue	-
52	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overdevelopment</li> <li>Transport / highways</li> </ul>	Do we really need 1,600 + homes in Tiverton? How will post hill cope with the <b>extra traffic</b> ?	n/c – Principle established in Local Plan as above	-

53	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land use</li> <li>• Transport / highways</li> <li>• Green infrastructure</li> </ul>	<p>My objections to the above are as follows: -</p> <p>The canal is adequately served with <b>parking</b> facilities</p> <p>The horses that pull the Barge are housed in that field for at least half a year</p> <p>The possibility of travellers seeing it as a place to park are very high indeed.</p> <p>Then what? The police would be involved and some nasty scenes could follow. The police have enough to do.</p> <p>Not what you want for one of Mid Devon's Top tourist attractions.</p> <p>Obviously no one on the planning committee lives up here otherwise they would know it is a very quiet place and that is how the residents want it to stay,</p>	Remove Follett Road Car park	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99
54	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic / Highways</li> <li>• General</li> </ul>	<p>I have heard from an extremely reliable source, within MDDC, that one of your upcoming virtual planning meetings will discuss the ridiculous and highly unpopular proposal, to build a <b>carpark</b> in the paddock at the end of Follet Road.</p> <p>Apart from the very unwelcome extra traffic in the Glebelands and Tidcombe area, which would result from such a situation, that paddock is vital to the survival of the Grand Western Canal Barge Company, one of Tiverton's main tourist attractions. It is the only suitable location, where their horses can be rested out of season, and that is the opinion of the Barge Company, not just me.</p> <p>Although you will no doubt try to tell me, that members of the public will be able to join such <b>virtual meetings</b>, many people are not au fait with</p>	Remove Follett Road Car park	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99

		<p>such technology, and will be caught unawares. While it is perfectly reasonable to conduct routine administrative matters remotely, during this difficult time, there is no reason to push controversial measures through in this manner. It gives the impression of a deliberate attempt to avoid public scrutiny. For the sake of a few short weeks of lockdown, controversial proposals absolutely must be left until they can be properly discussed at public meetings in Phoenix House. There is nothing so urgent about a carpark, that cannot be left until then.</p> <p>I have written to the Gazette, so that the wider public will be aware of the plan.</p> <p>Please do not proceed along this undemocratic pathway.</p>		
55	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport</li> </ul>	<p>Only that it appears to be constrained by the settlement limit along Manley Lane to the extent that it <b>frustrates the scope for a secondary access route across Manley Lane from the direction of Hartnoll Farm to the east.</b></p>		-
56	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General / consultation process</li> </ul>	<p>I feel very strongly that this <b>consultation process is no longer transparent or fair!</b></p> <p>Since the lockdown began one of the consultations has been cancelled ( I understand why of course )</p> <p>Online it said there were telephone options to talk to some people but how did you expect people to know this? Not everyone is online!</p> <p>There are elderly residents who wish to make comments that struggling to do so, who are not good in email and are unable to get letters posted to you for comments.</p> <p>People are worried about getting food and medication and it is not right that you are carrying on with something as big as this in these current times. This</p>	<p>n/c – Central government has made the specific request of Councils that all aspects of the planning system continue as far as possible during the COVID19 period. To that end the planning service is continuing to prepare planning policy documents whilst providing the best public service it can in these exceptional and very challenging circumstances</p>	

		<p>consultation should be extended for longer than 3 days. You should be making better attempts to engage with people or allowing people much more time to make comments.</p> <p>I would often help a number of my Neighbours with emailing etc but it is not so easy now when I need to stay 2m away!</p>		
57	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land use</li> <li>• Transport / highways</li> </ul>	<p>There is provision for access to the country park from the end of Follett Road including a <b>car park</b> for up to 16 places. Access to the country park should be from the canal NOT from Follett Road and there should be no car park. People should be encouraged not to drive there but to walk for the exercise and better health. The only access here should be from the canal as otherwise excess traffic would be generated through the Glebelands estate and Tidcombe Lane and neither of these could support extra traffic volumes. Also an access point from Follett Road could encourage people to park in that road if the car park became full, to the disadvantage of residents.</p>	Remove Follett Road Car park	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99
58	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land use</li> <li>• Access</li> <li>• Ecology</li> </ul>	<p>Housing and building works north of West Manley Lane is supported. The <b>area of green land the south side of WEst Manley Lane should not be accessed by the public</b>. This area of land should be kept as it is - unaccessible - apart from via the disused railway path. The reason the area is so full of wildlife and beautiful is because people do not have access to it at present. Please keep it like that. we do not need an extended area for people to picnic and park their cars to go for a walk across the fields. There is already a beautiful tow path to walk along, with the lovely fields either side, untouched by the public so please leave it like this. If a park is built, please ensure that there is not a <b>car park</b> from Follett Road, as that will cause safety issues in Tidcombe lane and along Glebelands Road and Follett Road</p>	Remove Follett Road Car park	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99

59	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General</li> </ul>	I f these proposals are passed I am sorry to say that another large area of classic English Rural Countryside will be lost forever due to bizarre and incompetent planning decisions.	n/c – Principle established in Local Plan as above	
60	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General / Consultation Process</li> </ul>	That this <b>consultation period</b> has occurred throughout the COVID 19 lock-down makes the enquiry a joke and arguably unlawful as those without internet access can't visit the council house to review the proposals. The enquiry period should be extended to start from when the lock-down is eased and run for the full duration period.	n/c -	
61	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gypsy &amp; Travellers</li> <li>Transport</li> <li>Employment</li> </ul>	The plan states a <b>traveller site and industrial adjacent to Manley lane</b> . This will severely effect both the current residents and values of properties in the area and effect the tourism and walkers bought to the area. The allocation of travellers sites are supposed to be going into area A, putting them into area b will not be in keeping with the local area and will have a dramatic effect. The employment area should be limited to office space only. No HGV or LGV's will have reasonable access to the site without going throught the houses. We have already had a large increase in sq ft of light industrial from the Hartnoll business park and an increase in height of buildings. To add more industrial when we already have suffered from hartnoll and so many others are extending such as hitchcock business park, this has easily exceeded the increase square ft you were provided in this plan for employment. The veiws from down Manley lane will be spoilt from the side of building and the environment impacted by the noise from light industrial units such as already exist in hartnoll business park.	Clarification added into SPD as above G&T site and employment uses	54,71,72
70	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land use</li> <li>Highways / Transport</li> </ul>	No to the <b>Country Park</b> . No to the <b>car park</b> . No no on. No to the traffic down tidcombe lane, this is going to be a logistical nightmare and fields should be left for the wildlife and no access to the public. This is why people	Remove Follett Road Car park	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of

		love Tiverton, don't ruin it! The <b>car park</b> is in an elderly residential area and I am not happy with that at all. I do not agree with the additional stress this is putting on the elderly community already. Leave them in peace.		new CP at p76 and p99
71	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Employment</li> </ul>	Is it possible to include a policy that dictates <b>Employment</b> (if it must be included despite the new provision from Hartnoll Business Park in the past 4 years) cannot be B2 or other industrial use other than B1? Can the <b>Manley Lane access</b> be removed from plan pictures/figures to be clearer?	Clarification provided on B1 use	P 54,71
72	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land use</li> <li>• Green infrastructure</li> <li>• Traffic / Highways</li> </ul>	<p>I do not support the plan for a picnic area, <b>car park</b> and entrance to the country park at the end of Follett Road. The extra traffic along Follett Road and on the Glebelands Estate is not suitable for an area of mainly elderly people. Cars coming from Glebelands Road travel quite fast and often cut the corner into Follett Road. I myself a short while ago was nearly caught after visiting my neighbour opposite and nearly fell.</p> <p>The picnic area will attract noise and litter, which will not be very good for the wildlife.</p> <p>The field that is being proposed for the car park, usually has the barge horses in and I enjoy that field. I can't walk too far along the canal, so if you change that field to a car park and a picnic area, all I will see is cars and people.</p> <p>We shouldn't be bringing more cars up Tidcombe Lane. The building of more houses at Tidcombe Hall is not suitable at all either. The traffic in Tidcombe Lane is busy now and with the bus going over the narrow bridge.</p> <p>The board walks in the Country Park will be used by children, and as children do will run up and down and disturb birds and wildlife.</p>	Remove Follett Road Car park	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99

		<p>Why do we need a <b>country park</b>? We have a lovely area used by locals and visitors. Everyone loves the peaceful feeling. One lady I talk to comes from quite away off once a week with her lunch and a flask to watch the kingfisher.</p> <p>I object to the <b>traveller pitches</b> in Area B area, the first place proposed was much more suitable.</p>		
73	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land use</li> <li>• Green infrastructure</li> <li>• Traffic / Highways</li> </ul>	<p>I am very concerned about the prospect of a <b>car park</b> and entrance to the country park at the end of Follett Road so I object to this very strongly. I am registered blind and live in a quiet residential area, where I know a lot of the residents. There are already quite a few cars that come up Follett Road to visit or deliver and they often cut the corner and come quite fast.</p> <p>It is quite daunting for me to go out and cross the road already, but the prospect of more cars being encouraged to drive onto the state is not good.</p> <p>There is only one way into the estate so all these cars will need to be travelling through the estate to get to the car park at the far end of the estate at the end of Follett Road. Tidcombe lane is also very busy road already too and this will lead to it becoming even busier.</p> <p>When I walk along the canal with my neighbour I like to listen to the birds and I can hear the horses in the field. If this area is turned into a carpark and picnic area, when I go out I will have to dodge cars and will be listening to the sound of people, car doors opening and closing and the sounds of people picknicking. It would be a shame to lose the lovely peaceful area along the canal by making a car park for people to drive to.</p>	Remove Follett Road Car park	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99



		<p>I <b>do not support the idea of pathways</b> across all the fields along the side of the canal. The housing developments will have destroyed the homes of much of the wildlife and I think it would be better to leave the areas so that the wildlife can continue to be undisturbed.</p> <p>I object to the idea of a boardwalk across the fields. This will be noisy as people and children run along it and again will frighten the wildlife. Please leave these areas so that people cannot walk through it.</p>		
74	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Density</li> <li>• Land use</li> <li>• Transport / Highways</li> <li>• Gypsy and Traveller site</li> </ul>	<p><b>Amount and density of building</b></p> <p>I support the plan for most of the buildings to be residential with a number of smaller areas for business and employment. There should be <b>sufficient parking facilities attached with each individual property</b> as block garages and block parking areas do not seem to work well in housing estates and cars end up being parked on the streets. As roads take years to be adopted, this leads to problems with parking and bus routes. If garages are built, it is essential that these are actually big enough to contain a large sized car!</p> <p>Housing should have <b>sufficient parking for 2 cars</b> and if there are bigger houses which lend themselves to extended facilities living together there should be plenty of private parking within the plot. I do not support the building of houses that do not provide enough off-road parking within each individual plot.</p> <p>I support the plan for a play park, central to the housing area and the building of allotments and the sports facilities, which are all suitably situated around the</p>	n/c – clarification provided above.	-

		<p>housing I support the plan for these facilities to all be north of West Manley Lane.</p> <p><b>Traveller Pitches</b></p> <p>The original area a and area b plan shows 3 <b>traveller pitches</b> up by the relief road – these are now shown south of post hill and along the side of Manley Lane. The traveller site, if needed, should be in the position suggested on the original plan.</p> <p><b>Access to the site</b></p> <p>I support the plan for there to be no access to the site from Manley Lane, West Manley lane or Mayfair. There should also be no access to the Area B site.</p>		
75	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General / Process</li> </ul>	<p>It has been brought to my attention that the <b>planning application</b> to have <b>car park</b> in the field at the end of Follett Road – where the barge horses go – will due to the unprecedented situation we find ourselves in at the moment, will be held as an internet link up.</p> <p>Surely it would be much more correct to place this matter to one side to be dealt with when procedures return to normal as there is absolutely no need to rush through these important decisions.</p> <p>Please consider all the circumstances surrounding this planning application with due diligence.</p>	Remove Follett Road Car park	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99
76	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General / Process</li> </ul>	<p>Further to my letter of the 16<sup>th</sup> April, I have today heard that you are planning to have a meeting regarding the above, via facebook/social media. If this is correct I have to make very strong objections. I for one do not have the facility.</p>	n/c – Central government has made the specific request of Councils that all aspects of the planning system continue as far as possible during the COVID19 period. To that	

		<p>We are in one or the worst situations this Country has known since WWII with most of us at home for at least three months and you are thinking of making very important decisions where the majority of the public cannot be involved. Not very democratic is it!</p> <p><b>I am asking you to postpone any meeting until the Country returns to a more normal position</b> when the people of Tiverton can attend a meeting to air their views.</p> <p>I await hearing from you.</p>	<p>end the Council is continuing its service with Council meetings being held virtually with members of the public able to attend via the internet (via a weblink and standard internet browser).</p>	
77	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transport</li> <li>• General / Process</li> </ul>	<p>We are very alarmed to hear that the planning meeting to discuss building a <b>car park</b> in the paddock field at the end of Follet Road on the Glebelands estate may be done through social media with councillors and members of the public giving their views via a computer screen.</p> <p>We protest most strongly! You will have received many letters and emails about the proposed car park. We obtained an extension to the closing date – 23<sup>rd</sup> April because the majority of residents here are senior citizens and some have been unwell but wanted to send a letter in.</p> <p>Many of the residents want to attend the meeting as they do not have a computer let alone social media.</p> <p>Not one brick has been laid yet on Area B southern side of Blundells Road, so what's the hurry? Surely the meeting can be postponed until after the Corona Crises has settled down. The majority of the residents have lived here for many years.</p>	<p>- Remove Follett Road Car park</p>	<p>Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99</p>

		You have told us several times that the paddock field would remain the same so what's going on?		
78	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transport</li> <li>• General / process</li> </ul>	<p>I now understand that there is to be a 'virtual' Planning Committee tomorrow. I have not seen the agenda but im told it includes the <b>car park</b> to be sited in the field at the end of Follet Road. This is part of the area being promoted as a public park for which the need is arguable and there has been no mention of a car park made in the publicly available planning reviews. Nor is it evident that the existing, more appropriate and easily expanded park at Manley Lane has been given consideration.</p> <p>For all the reasons made clear in so many approaches to MDDC on related matters, Tidcombe Lane and its adjacent roads are insufficient for the volume of traffic already experienced. Adding to this is unneeded folly. At present a pedestrian only entrance to the park is promulgated but this merely shifts parking into Follett Road which is not suitable for this additional burden. Whatever decisions are made regarding the recreational park, such should not include access via Tidcombe Lane and the Glebelands estate.</p> <p>In my earlier correspondence, I expressed my concern that the normally accepted <b>processes of democracy</b> might be compromised in the light of the extraordinary circumstances in which we now live. Sensibly, the proposed emergency powers were canned by my concern continues with employing a virtual mechanism. Im told that there may be some provision for public engagement but I bring to your attention the fact that those most likely to be affected by this planning matter are the least able to convey their views by this means. The Glebelands estate comprises almost exclusively of elderly people, most of whom are unfamiliar with</p>	Remove Follett Road CP	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99

		<p>electronic communication and therefore denied access to the conversation.</p> <p>In any event, why is it though necessary to rush this matter through so quickly and at a time when there is no practical possibility of pursuing the meeting's resolutions in the near future? This amount of haste seems odd and does not promote public confidence in the probity of the Council.</p>		
<p><b>79</b></p> <p><b>SPORT</b></p> <p><b>ENGLA</b></p> <p><b>ND</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sporting and recreation</li> </ul>	<p>Dear Sir/Madam</p> <p>Thank you for consulting <b>Sport England</b> on the above Tiverton Eastern Urban Extension (EUE) Area B Masterplan...</p> <p><b><u>3. Specific comments on the Masterplan</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area A no formal sport is planned to be delivered. Leaving Area B to pick up the slack.</li> <li>• Area B – without the evidence as set out in (1) above how do you know what to plan for, what sports, what size, what ancillary facilities, sports lighting? Co-location with other sports / other complementary uses?</li> <li>• What about planning for other sports (non pitch sports e.g. tennis/bowls/indoor bowls/badminton)? On-site or s106/CIL to off-site? As set out in (1) above.</li> <li>• Are you designing homes that will help residents to live an active lifestyle? As set out in (2) above. Are you creating links by foot and cycle into town and out into the rural areas – beyond the masterplan designation?</li> </ul>	<p>review but most issues for Local Plan Review requirements (i.e. indoor sports) and further issues for Development Management stage. Could add web refs for guidance.</p>	<p>Proposed changes:</p> <p>Added references to detail of sports provision at DM stage p99</p> <p>Added reference to encouraging an active lifestyle with foot and cycle links p73</p> <p>Added clarification about links between country park and formal sport hub p99</p> <p>Added reference to 'Active Design' at The Green p95</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will the new Country Park be linked to the formal sports hub proposed and what sport and physical activity opportunities will be designed and managed in the new Country Park?</li> <li><b>The Green</b> could be a multi function green space as in line with Active Design? It could deliver formal and informal recreation as well as being a community focus space.</li> <li>The <b>proposed sports hub</b> appears to have been designing for certain sports and not others e.g. cricket. Why not? Will the MUGA have lights? How will it be managed and generate income or will it be an 'open' facility and maintained by Council budgets?</li> <li>Will <b>proposed sports hub</b> be delivered during phase 1. Why would residents need to wait until phase 4? This is not clear.</li> <li>Have you reviewed the recent design guides for non traditional sport to increase physical activity – (scroll to the bottom) <a href="https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/design-and-cost-guidance/active-design">https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/design-and-cost-guidance/active-design</a></li> <li>What is the definition of 'new garden neighbourhood' and 'modern lifestyle'?</li> </ul>		
80	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport</li> <li>Land use</li> </ul>	<p>1. There should be <b>no additional access to the site from the end of Follett Road</b> for vehicles or pedestrians. Access should be from the north and not from Tidcombe Lane and Glebelands Road which are narrow and congested.</p>	Remove Follett Road car park	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99

		<p>2 Tidcombe Lane is dangerous because it is much used by pedestrians and has no footpaths.</p> <p>3. There is already a footpath from Follett Road to the canal and there are easily achievable accesses from the canal to the green area.</p> <p>4 The barge horses have a secure place to feed in the winter in the field at the end of Follett Road. If the horses cannot be safely secured the future of the barge which is one of Tivertons main tourist attractions will be endangered.</p> <p>5. Glebelands estate is predominantly inhabited by elderly residents. They fear that opening up the field at the end of Follett Road to increased access will create a risk of all sorts of abuses. These could include unauthorised camping, caravans, littering, toileting and other antisocial activities.</p>		
81	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General</li> </ul>	<p>I would like to register my very <b>strong opposition</b> against the above proposals.</p> <p>I am Tiverton born and bred and have lived at this address for over twenty years. Sadly I have slowly seen the surrounding area spoilt by out of character developments.</p> <p>I also own a local company employing approximately thirty five people and make regular donations to the upkeep of various things in the local community as well as sponsoring the up keep of three local roundabouts.</p> <p>I am extremely disappointed in the shape our local community is now taking and do feel that several</p>	n/c – Principle established in Local Plan	-

		<p>decisions by Local Council have not been in the area's best interests.</p> <p>I certainly hope and pray that this proposal is not yet another.</p> <p>If this development in its present form is to be given the go ahead I must unfortunately say that another area of Classic English Rural Countryside will be lost forever and in my opinion due to bizarre and incompetent planning decisions</p>		
<b>[Responses received via email 1<sup>st</sup> May but logged pre 23 April deadline]</b>				
<b>82 (West Manley Resi)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transport / Shared lane</li> <li>• Green infrastructure / agricultural land</li> </ul>	<p>One of the cornerstones of the TEUE Area B Masterplan is the proposed connectivity between the housing development and the concept of the country park, by way of both existing and suggested lanes, pathways and tracks.</p> <p>Unfortunately, the start of this public consultation exercise has coincided with the so-called 'lockdown' brought about by the Corona virus pandemic. Given that such a situation can have few positive outcomes, nevertheless as a resident of WML, it seems to me that the relevant observation, namely the reduction in vehicular movement within the area, has led to a significant increase in pedestrian traffic using the West Manley Lane/Old Railway Track/Grand Western Canal circuit and beyond, in search of safe, scenic and sustainable exercise and enjoyment.</p> <p>This would appear to <b>strengthen the argument for eventually creating a 'shared lane' concept for WML</b>, with appropriate speed restriction, use of <i>existing</i> hedge gaps as passing places and adequate signage. It also suggests that, south of WML, there would be only a limited need for the creation of more "cycle and</p>	<p>Consider Shared Lane point WML.</p> <p>looked at food issue in Country Park and suggest no changes- as this is about change of use from agricultural land for food production to country park</p>	Changes made to page 69



		<p><i>pedestrian links</i>" as indicated in Masterplan document. Further, to maintain a safe route for non- vehicular traffic to and from the country park, vehicular access onto WML from the development area to its north, should be strictly limited to only the existing points of entry.</p> <p>Within the compass of the country park, consideration should be given to <b>maintaining a percentage of the grade one and two agricultural land; after all, food security</b> will continue to be an essential requirement and looking over a five-barred gate at a herd of sheep will remain a bucolic pleasure.</p> <p>Overall, the planned green infrastructure as envisaged in the Masterplan has succeeded in outlining an acceptable compromise between developmental needs and environmental protection; hopefully, the required fine tuning will become clearer over time.</p>		
<b>83 Wadde ton Park</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transport</li> </ul>	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the emerging masterplan. Our client, <b>Waddeton Park Ltd</b>, has in interest in the adjacent site, Hartnoll Farm.</p> <p>As part of the existing Development Plan it is important for housing supply in the district that Area B comes forward for development in an expedient fashion.</p> <p>It is also important that the development takes a sustainable form. The movement strategy of the SPD is important in this regard. In order to serve the site effectively and efficiently via public transport the ability to deliver a spine road, as depicted, is important (bus services are difficulty and costly to run if accessing a large cul-de-sac). <b>Whilst fully understanding and acknowledging that the SPD can make no comment on matters and sites that lie outside the purview of the current allocation there is a clear potential to, at some</b></p>	<p>review form of access arrow on key (remove star and change colour/dash and wording – see fig 29/33 etc).]</p>	<p>P60 and p68 – edits to key/colours to help clarity on Manley Lane/Hartnoll Farm access</p>

		<p>time, extend the spine road across land in our client's control to enable bus services to serve the eastern extension on a 'through-route basis' and to link the new areas of housing to the existing Hartnoll Business Park (to the east of the current allocation). This infrastructure improvement would underpin 'walkable neighbourhood' principles.</p> <p>It is also noted that the SPD recognises the inherent unsuitability of Manley Lane to serve additional traffic movements. The provision of an extended spine road would assist in achieving this objective, as well as assisting in the delivery of an efficient and sustainable public transport infrastructure to serve the allocation.</p> <p><b>Therefore, our client is supportive of the movement strategy of the SPD.</b></p> <p>Since our client does not have an interest in land within the area that the SPD is providing guidance upon we have no detailed comments to make upon the rest of the document, other than to stress the point that <b>effective implementation (and thus delivery) is dependent upon effective engagement of landowners and their representatives</b>, and a careful balancing of objectives, to achieve deliverable outcomes in plan time periods. The Delivery, Monitoring and Review element of the document could therefore end up being of particular focus as consideration proceeds.</p>		
84.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General</li> </ul>	<p>I would like to register my <b>very strong opposition</b> for the above proposals.</p> <p>I have lived at this address for over twenty years and have slowly seen the surrounding area spoilt by out of character developments.</p>	n/c	

		<p>If this development in its cthe present form is to be given the go ahead I must unfortunately say that another area of Classic English Rural Countryside will be los forever due to bizarre and incompetent planning decisions.</p> <p>I have lived in Tiverton all of my life and have seen it slowly spoilt from the lovely town it was by numerous planning committees.</p>		
<p><b>85. West Manley Conser vation Group</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green infrastructure</li> <li>• General / mixed use</li> <li>• Country Park</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>West Manley Lane Conservation Group response on TEUE Area B Masterplan consultation.</u></b></p> <p>Representatives of <b>WMLCG</b> were able to attend the initial public exhibition before the SARS-CoV-19 pandemic forced its subsequent cancellation. Although the Group continues to have significant doubts as to the concept of the <b>TEUE</b>, nonetheless it accepts its long term inevitability and is pleased to note that many of the concerns that we have previously raised have been incorporated into the outline Masterplan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In formulating our response, we have chosen not to be restricted by the questionnaire and to concentrate primarily on those elements of the plan which directly affect the area of West Manley Lane, a policy to which we have adhered from the beginning. In so doing, we fully endorse the sentiments expressed in the <b>Area B Masterplan document (SPD.B)</b> at <b>4.1, page 61</b>. It is, therefore, most unfortunate that one of those <b>“pockets of mature woodlands”</b>, previously designated as a (Biodiversity Action Plan) <b>Priority Habitat</b> situated at <b>NGR SS 985124</b> has recently been decimated. With <i>this</i> questionable activity, coupled with other examples of recent tree and hedgerow destruction within the boundary of</li> </ul>	Review detailed points listed	Text added page 98 on hedgerow south of sports area

		<p><b>Area B</b>, we can but hope that <b>MDDC</b> seriously considers apportioning suitable protection to those remaining <b><i>“rich hedgerows and areas of mature trees”</i></b>, currently in private ownership, ahead of the implementation of its <b>Green Infrastructure (GI)</b> project. We bring to the attention of both officers and planners that <b>in accordance with the criteria of the Hedgerow Regulations 1997 the hedgerows of West Manley Lane are all defined as ‘important’ based on wildlife and landscape</b>. As such they are afforded protection under that said regulation and any proposed removal of the hedgerows would require a hedgerow removal notice issued from the Local Planning Authority prior to any such works.</p> <p><b>(Devon Wildlife Consultants, Hedgerow Assessment Report No: 09/085 Date: September 2009 Client: West Manley Lane Conservation Group (WMLCG) Andrew Charles MSc MIEEM).</b></p> <p>Whilst it is not strictly within the overall setting of the <b>SPD.B</b>, we feel that the outcome of the recent Planning Inspectorate’s dismissal of the appeal at <b>NGR SS984 125 (APP/Y1138/W/19/3239009)</b>. must be considered here, as the inspector clearly feels that the site in question is open to <b><i>“mixed use development”</i></b>. That being the case, he seems to be taking a contrary view to the <b><i>“no development south of West Manley Lane unless in association with green infrastructure”</i></b> decision taken earlier by <b>MDDC</b>. This suggests that all areas outlined in yellow within <b>TEUE Area B</b> could be similarly designated should further planning applications be submitted by relevant landowners. <b>(Appeal decision para 25)</b>. That said, it is important that from the outset of this <b>Masterplan</b>:</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Both the <b>MDDC</b> and planners should define what is meant by <b>“mixed use development”</b>.</li> <li>They should indicate which sites in <b>TEUE Area B</b> might be scheduled for any such development as defined above and which might be considered as contributing ultimately to the <b>GI plan</b>.</li> <li>That the <b>“landowner collaboration”</b> set out on <b>SPD.B p117</b> is in place from the outset and is sufficiently robust.</li> </ul> <p><b>South of West Manley Lane: Countryside Park.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In the formulation of the masterplan for <b>Area A</b>, it was confirmed that there would be no vehicular exit from developments north of and onto <b>West Manley Lane (WML)</b>, existing gaps would be infilled, and no new ones created. With the publication of <b>SPD.B</b> there are two extant vehicular exits (at <b>Sweet Meadow</b> and <b>Prowses Farm</b>) and one footpath (<b>Drovers Track</b>) north of and onto <b>WML</b>. Can we safely assume that as with <b>Area A</b>, no further northern exits will be created and the existing field gaps similarly infilled?</li> <li>The <b>SPD.B</b> seems to be leaving an option open to access <b>Manley Lane (ML)</b> through Hartnoll Farm complex. This option could cause further traffic issues in <b>ML</b> and so potentially into <b>WML</b>. This issue should be addressed before the finalisation of <b>SPD.B</b></li> <li>It is imperative that to maintain the nature of <b>WML</b>, the southern barrier of the designated sports area remains as the current ancient hedgerow, enhanced were necessary, and that no gaps are permitted for use by traffic, vehicular</li> </ul>		<p>Added to 69 to clarify lack of any access from any future junction at Hartnoll to WML</p>
--	--	--	--	--



		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To gain access to the "orchard and natural play area"(DN564794) and then on to the <b>Railway Walk (RW)</b> and <b>Grand Western Canal(GWC)</b> (shown on <b>SPD.B</b> map <b>p 116</b> but <i>inexplicably not on pp 100,102</i>) would require breaching up to 12 feet of the existing hedge bank contrary to the planners stated "<i>every effort should be made to retain existing hedgerows...</i>".</li> <li>2. This indicative footpath would require a newly constructed bridge to cross the <b>Ailsa Brook</b> somewhere before reaching the <b>RW</b>; the route as illustrated, would also require a degree of repair of the associated culvert to ensure safety.</li> <li>3. Rather than creating new pathways (as illustrated above) use could be made of the existing tracks and associated bridges situated at <b>Pool Anthony and Black Bridges</b>.</li> <li>4. Consideration should be given to suitable screening of those houses backing on to the proposed 'natural play', orchard and picnic areas as set out on <b>pp100,102</b> Further, siting a bird hide on the edge of the picnic area would seem tenuous: perhaps this field could be left to agriculture, as at present. A flock of sheep is just as in keeping with the concept of green infrastructure, rough pasture attracts much needed invertebrates. Alternatively, the field could simply be</li> </ol>		<p>added text</p> <p>Pages 103 and 105</p>
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>planted with appropriate native trees and shrubs to attract wildlife.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whilst <b>WMLCG</b> is satisfied with the inclusion of long-term management and maintenance (<b>p118</b>), nonetheless the plan envisaged is far from conclusive and we would hope that a definitive structure is permanently in place before work within the <b>CP</b> is underway.</li> <li>• The approach to development phasing incorporating <b>Areas A&amp;B</b> (e.g. <b>p112</b>) seems far from settled and as such suggests that any piecemeal development could adversely affect the overall impact on the <b>CP</b></li> <li>• Understandably at this stage, there is little reference to the required civil engineering works involving land and properties around <b>WML</b>. Presumably, SuDS, mains drainage and water supply will have to be incorporated into this area and will need to have been agreed between developers and current residents on both sides of the lane.</li> </ul> <p>Given the apparent need for this venture with its diverse requirements, <b>WMLCG</b> is satisfied with the overall balance of development versus ecology and the expression of importance for environmental protection. In our opinion a significant amount of the indicative planning within the proposed Countryside Park needs refinement and clarification, as we have set out above. However, we would be happy to contribute further and to be involved in its evolution.</p>		
--	--	---	--	--



<p>86.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Country park / cycle / walkways</li> </ul>	<p><u>Regarding the proposed indicative cycle/walkways and field use within the Country Park</u></p> <p>Whilst appreciating that these plans for cycle paths and walkways are 'indicative' and not <i>necessarily</i> definitive, I feel that it is important to raise reservations to those tracks at this early stage of the planning process, and do so for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The use of the 'Drovers track' leading straight onto two dangerous corners at West Manley Lane (see photograph 1 below) is a potential accident blackspot. Several residents of the lane have experienced near miss accidents on this and other corners without roadside mirrors; (those mirrors in place are privately owned). Further, tractors using the lane daily leave little room for cyclists or pedestrians as evidenced by the photo below of tractor tyre tracks immediately against a property wall where an indicative entrance to the field is proposed (see photographs 2 &amp; 3 below).</li> </ol> <p>PHOTOGRAPH 1                      PHOTOGRAPH 2 PHOTOGRAPH 3</p>	<p>review detailed points listed.</p>	<p>added text</p> <p>Pages 103 and 105</p>
------------	---	---	---------------------------------------	--



2. 'Punching' an entrance to the field (Land Registry DN564794, OS3445 or NGR 985125) through an original Devon bank (of some height) and its protected hedgerow (see photograph 4 below) is unnecessary and counter-productive when there already exists a gated entrance.

PHOTOGRAPH 4



3. It should be noted by the planners that, *'In accordance with the criteria of the Hedgerow Regulations 1997 the hedgerows of West Manley Lane are all defined as 'important' based on wildlife and landscape.* As such they are afforded protection under the Hedgerow Regulations 1997, and any proposed removal of the hedgerows would require a hedgerow removal notice issued from the Local Planning Authority prior to any such works.

*See Devon Wildlife Consultants, Hedgerow Assessment Report No: 09/085 Date: September 2009 Client: West Manley Lane Conservation Group (WMLCG) Andrew Charles MSc MIEEM.*

4. Ailsa Brook crosses this field referred to in Area B plan (vs). In the winter the brook is very deep and fast flowing and subject to flooding; therefore, it would require a new, sturdy bridge to effect a crossing; moreover the brook continues through a significantly damaged culvert (see photograph 5, 6 and 7 below) which runs beneath the old railway track, on the other side of which there is a considerable and

potentially hazardous drop which might act as a magnet for children with the possibility of consequential injury.

PHOTOGRAPH 5

PHOTOGRAPH 6



PHOTOGRAPH 7



5. Any Cycle/walkway of this nature should be critically evaluated for its nuisance factor. A Community Policing evaluation of these proposals would be prudent. Specifically, such routes could be used as 'rat runs' by those with criminal intent, and will be subject to noise and nuisance by dogs (whose owners are (already) failing to control them or put them on leads even when there are livestock in this field. Uncontrolled dogs have already entered gardens in the vicinity of the railway track and have killed ducklings and threatened livestock on a property (see photograph 8 below). Motorcycles not infrequently use the Railway Walk: appropriate designation of usage must be considered to prevent on-going anti-social

practice. Unless suitable byelaws were considered, recreational picnic areas could be used at all hours and so cause disturbance not usually experienced in this area. Whereas, picnic tables placed at intervals along the old railway track away from homes would be preferable and for those using them, provide a real feeling of a country picnic. Such an approach would lessen the possible impact of continual complaints to the local Council and our over stretched police force.

PHOTOGRAPH 8



6. Use of an existing and ancient track leading to Black bridge and would prevent the cost of building of a new bridge over Alisa Brook in the above field (see photograph 9 below).

PHOTOGRAPH 9



7. This would then lead directly to a choice of existing pathways towards Black Bridge and the Railway Walk/cycle track. Prevention of access to the culvert should be considered (see photograph 7 above).
8. A further entrance to the Railway Walk (in Area A) could be obtained via the track running beside the old orchard at Pool Anthony (see photograph 11 & 12 below) and on to Pool Anthony Bridge, to link with the path suggested from Follet Road (subject to the benevolence of the owner).



PHOTOGRAPH 10  
PHOTOGRAPH 11



9. The number and variety of birds in this area has declined with the increase in dog activity, the proposal to build a bird hide near to the railway track is fanciful and ill-informed and could be a focus for vandalism. Increased human use of this field may well threaten visiting egrets and other species which have been monitored in this area for some 20years. More-over the possible destruction of



		<p>large areas of nettles infrequently found in pasture these days will destroy the food source for some insects and butterflies. Trees and hedges planted in this area will take many years to reach maturity.</p> <p>10. Repurposing this field for recreational use denies the farmer further use of the land for grazing stock. Much grade one and two agricultural land has and will continue to be lost to housing development in Tiverton; such pockets should be preserved.</p> <p>11. The guarantee that developers will maintain this 'recreational' land into the long- term future must be robust.</p> <p>In conclusion, although the overall plan for the Country Park for Area B is imaginative, the potential consequences arising from the details of the indicative ideas need to be addressed to reduce possible conflict, so that both present and future residents and visitors can enjoy the benefits of the country area envisaged.</p>		
87.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport</li> </ul>	<p>I continue to be hugely concerned by the implications of this proposed development and the development of the new housing area adjacent to Fairway for the safety of pedestrians and traffic on Post Hill.</p> <p>I have looked at the boards and can find <b>no clear guaranteed statement as to where Area B will definitely be linked across Post Hill</b> and out to the link road but only a lot of design of the internal area....have I missed something or are you putting the cart before the horse?</p> <p>Apart from these recent weeks when traffic has greatly reduced (when the golf course has been shut and construction has been stopped), the junction between</p>	<p>n/c – Vehicular access via Area A is shown.</p> <p>There's no reasonable case to prevent walk/cycle/emergency access via Mayfair. Knock-down bollards or similar would ensure emergency-only access by motor vehicles.</p>	-

		<p>Post Hill and the little lane leading up to the golf course/construction has been an accident waiting to happen. Signs went up advising of a new road layout ( much fuss over a splayed entrance to the lane) and Post Hill was again re-stated to be a 40 MPH road. Vehicles come over the rise from Tiverton and then need to suddenly brake if vehicles are backing up to turn up or exit the lane.</p> <p>This same road at Sampford Peverell is now a 30 MPH area with flatter terrain, better visibility and only housing on one side.</p> <p>Post Hill continues therefore to be a potentially dangerous road and will only become more so. There seems to be no clear encouragement of this area becoming a residential area. Although there has been a lot of residential development, you have also allowed the development of Hartnoll Business Park and the digester;( the traffic to and from which is dangerous, heavy, very frequent, fast and cannot stop in time at the access up to the golf course and new housing area....even if it were keeping to the speed limit). I have no clear idea of the nature of the industrial units in Area B or the burden of traffic which this will add but believe that this should be looked at very carefully. When there are so many light industry units vacant, why build more?</p> <p>You have not discouraged through traffic by the traffic calming measure at Blundell's, I live adjacent to Post Hill and can advise you of this fact.</p> <p>May I remind you of the following:          "It was resolved at MDDC Cabinet (26th October 2017) that subject to acceptable planning impacts, alternative access arrangements may be considered as part of the scope of this master planning. <b>However, these potential amended access arrangements should</b></p>		
--	--	---	--	--

		<p><b>not include those at Mayfair and/ or Manley Lane / Post Hill Junction.</b></p> <p>A network of streets will be provided across Area B which form natural extensions to those provided within the adjacent Area A. Key masterplan principles for these routes and connections include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No vehicular access will be provided to the site from West Manley Lane, Manley Lane or Mayfair (although emergency access might be provided from Mayfair)"</li> </ul> <p><b>I would like to know how this access point can be assured to be only for emergency vehicles</b></p> <p>Re-sent as I didn't remember to sign it!</p>		
88.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Employment</li> <li>• Gypsy and Travellers</li> </ul>	<p>I have reviewed your plans and there are several areas that need to be addresses. Mainly the <b>employment area and the travellers site.</b></p> <p>The travellers site was supposed to go into area A where there are already park homes. Putting it into area B will not be in-keeping with the area and also effect the house prices and tourism in the area forcing people to go elsewhere and residence not wanting to move into the pre existing houses that have been in place for many years.</p> <p>The light industrial units due to go in along Manley lane side will also chase people away from the area. Unless the business are office space only the noise pollution that comes with light industrial will be bad for the environment and tourism. The other issue is the light industrial has no direct access meaning all LGV and HGV will need to go through the residential areas to meet there destination. This means that you will need to put in an access somewhere else and I presume that</p>	Clarification on use class and G&T provision	54,71,72

		<p>can only be Manley lane if if you attempt to put those type of vehicles down here it will be dangerous and stop people wanting to use the lane to walk down to the country park.</p> <p>There is no reason the light industrial is required as whilst this plan has been proposed Hartnoll business park has already drastically increase its square ft and Height of the premises and other business parks such as Hitchcocks business park in uffculm have also just been given permission to expand alot. This should be ample and stop the requirement of needing more light industrial space thaty we wont fill.</p> <p>Ultimately the need for industrial and travellers sights are negated and should not be put into area B at all unless there is office space only. The travellers sight would be better placed with the other park home style properties above the golf course in tiverton area A as they were before.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

<p><b>89. Woodl and Trust</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Green infrastructure</li> </ul>	<p>As the UK's leading woodland conservation charity, the Woodland Trust's vision is for a UK rich in native woods and trees, for people and wildlife. We work to protect, restore and create native woods, trees and their wildlife for the future. We manage over 1,000 sites, including over 200 across the South West, and have 500,000 members and supporters.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft SPD for the Tiverton Eastern Urban Extension Area B Masterplan. These comments respond to the most relevant aspects of the online questionnaire.</p> <p><b>1. Vision</b></p> <p>We welcome the vision which places healthy green spaces at its heart. We would like a more explicit reference to the importance of green corridors for wildlife and people. The vision should also better reflect the climate emergency, and the role of well-integrated green infrastructure in building more resilience to these impacts including flood control and urban cooling.</p> <p><b>2. Key Development Objectives &amp; 3. Principles</b></p> <p>We welcome the development objectives to realise a low carbon, nature rich and well-connected development fit for the future. We strongly welcome intentions for landscape-led scheme, working with existing natural assets, establishing a Country Park and focused on development of a sustainable, well connected site. These are welcome objectives principles where more detailed requirements are needed to ensure they are best realised.</p> <p><b>5. Movement and Connections</b></p> <p>We welcome the network of 'green' routes and the intent to support active travel alongside natural corridors as part of an integrated approach to green infrastructure. We welcome 'every effort should be made to retain existing hedgerows and trees across the site given their inherent ecological value' but would prefer that this is strengthened to require the retention of existing hedgerows and trees.</p> <p><b>6. Landscape, Open Space and Recreation</b></p> <p>We welcome that hedgerows and trees are integral to the wider GI network.</p> <p>We would like to see minimum targets for quality and quantity of GI to ensure development schemes coming forward effectively embrace the principles here. We suggest this would include a canopy cover target, for example for the whole site to achieve at least 30% canopy cover. Our <a href="#">Emergency Tree Plan</a> provides more context for this. An increased canopy cover should follow the principle of 'the right tree in the right place' and ensure that wider ecological corridors and the green infrastructure network are best enhanced. Our guide to <a href="#">Residential developments and trees</a> may help to provide a framework.</p>	<p>n.c - Local Plan Review, Policy TIV1 sets an area of 47ha for GI. The 'GI Strategy' and 'Proof of Biodiversity New Gain' at planning application stage will confirm minimum targets for quality and quantity of specific elements such as canopy cover target.</p>	<p>50, 63, 108</p>
-----------------------------------	--	---	---	--------------------

		<p>Similarly, MDDC might wish to test the forthcoming Biodiversity Net Gain requirement on this scheme. If so, we would urge MDDC to be ambitious in this requirement – we highlight that Swindon is requiring developers to deliver at least 20% (rather than the minimum 10% by Defra) biodiversity net gain in its Local Plan currently submitted to Inspector.</p> <p>We welcome the Country Park and the intent to re-establish orchards. We note an ancient woodland (ASNW) is adjacent to the site boundary (to the South of the Country Park), and the importance that the Country Park strengthens this natural asset (and its links to the wider ecological network) by sensitive, native planting which strengthen green corridors, and avoids any impacts on the integrity of the ancient woodland.</p> <p>Page 61: 'It is important that these assets [hedgerows, trees and woodland] are retained as the site comes forward for development.' We welcome this but would like it to be strengthened to explicitly require retention e.g.: 'these assets... will be retained.'</p> <p>When considering protection of trees and hedgerows, it is essential to consider the extent of root area to ensure that adequate buffers are provided. Where ancient and veteran trees are identified on the site, we highlight that they are protected per NPPF para 175c. For ancient and veteran trees, we recommend a minimum Root Protection Area of 15 times the diameter or 5 metres beyond the crown, whichever is greater.</p> <p>We welcome the reference to native planting on page 93 (ref Green spine: 'Ecology and biodiversity will be improved through planting of wildflower meadows alongside the existing hedgerow and reinforcement of the hedgerow planting using native species'), but would like this to explicitly apply to all planting on the site (to use appropriate native species). We would also welcome the whole scheme to commit to planting trees sourced and grown in the UK to help avoid the spread of disease.</p> <p><b>7. Build principles</b></p> <p>We welcome at page 81: 'Local building materials should be used where possible to help reflect and strengthen local character'. We suggest an explicit requirement for sustainably-grown UK timber to be used in construction.</p> <p>'Using sustainably sourced locally grown timber (e.g. UKWAS) is an effective way of locking up carbon while supporting sustainable forestry to respond to the UK 19% woodland cover target advised by the Committee on Climate Change to reach Government targets. The Climate Change Committee has recently produced several useful reports on this issue including <a href="#">Wood in Construction in the UK</a> and <a href="#">UK housing: Fit for the future?</a> Building on their recommended national target (that 40% developments should have timber frames), the Masterplan might consider adopting a similar, or more ambitious, target for the whole scheme.</p> <p><b>8. Delivery and Phasing</b></p> <p>We acknowledge importance of a phased approach over time to ensure viability. We stress the importance of planning for green infrastructure from the earliest stage of the process to most effectively deliver multiple benefits while being more cost effective.</p> <p>As above, we welcome that green infrastructure is embedded in the Masterplan. We would welcome an explicit requirement for development proposals to consider green infrastructure from the start of a scheme to ensure it is delivered more effectively, and best considers how</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>green infrastructure relates from the site level to the wider landscape. We highlight <a href="#">Building with Nature</a> as an example of a Green Infrastructure Standard which individual schemes can work to, and note the forthcoming green infrastructure standards currently in development by Defra (as an action from the 25 Year Environment Plan).</p> <p>It is crucial that green infrastructure is appropriately funded from its creation through to ongoing management. Taking an integrated approach to all infrastructure on the site (which would include green infrastructure alongside grey infrastructure) could help identify funding streams.</p>		
<b>90. Devon Countryside Access Forum</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Country Park</li> <li>Transport</li> </ul>	<p><i>(NOTE SUBMITTED GREENSPACE POSITION STATEMENT NOT REPRODUCED HERE).</i></p> <p><b>The Devon Countryside Access Forum (DCAF)</b> is a local access forum under the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW Act). Its statutory remit is to give independent advice “as to the improvement of public access to land in the area for the purposes of open-air recreation and the enjoyment of the area...” Section 94(4) of the Act specifies bodies to whom the Forum has a statutory function to give advice and this includes District Councils.</p> <p>The DCAF currently has fourteen members, appointed by Devon County Council, who represent the interests of landowners/managers, access users and other relevant areas of expertise such as conservation and tourism.</p> <p>The timing of this consultation did not coincide with a public meeting of the Devon Countryside Access Forum. This response reflects previous advice given by the Forum and will be on the agenda for formal approval at its next meeting, when a date can be arranged.</p> <p>The Devon Countryside Access Forum is attaching its Greenspace Position Statement to inform the</p>	<p>n.c - Local Plan Review, Policy TIV1 sets an area of 47ha for GI. Early discussions regarding the long term management arrangements with an appropriate management trust or company, including DCC as manager of the GWC Country Park will be further explored.</p>	-

		<p>development of appropriate greenspace associated with the Area B development in Tiverton.</p> <p>Proposed country park and its future management</p> <p>The <b>Forum</b> would like to provide specific comments on the proposed new country park,</p> <p>26 ha in size. Abutting the existing Grand Western Canal country park, the new area allocated for an additional country park will be a very valuable addition. It will create a larger total greenspace area and be an important recreational access area for residents of the new development, as well as providing sustainable transport options. However, the Forum does have some concerns, as outlined below:</p> <p>The Terms of the Masterplan state that "the plan is illustrative and as such is designed to provide guidance about the quantity and location of different land uses as well as where key connections should be made throughout the neighbourhood. The plan is intended as a flexible tool so that the shape of different aspects of the new garden neighbourhood can be designed in many ways to respond to different circumstances. The actual position and alignment of routes, shape of blocks, streets and open space will of course vary from what is illustrated in the plan."</p> <p>The Devon Countryside Access Forum advises that the new country park, along with additional open space, gardens, allotments and green connections, are integral to the success of the development and the health and well-being of residents. It therefore advises that the park and additional green elements should not</p>		
--	--	--	--	--



		<p>be diminished or compromised during the planning and development process.</p> <p>The Forum regards the financing of open space and its future maintenance as highly important. Robust arrangements need to be put in place, particularly for the country park which should be considered separately from the smaller areas within the site. The Forum notes that planning obligations (section 106) may be used to finance the initial provision of the country park but that “day to day management and routine maintenance of existing open space may not be funded by S106” (MDDC Cabinet meeting, 7 March 2019). In this respect, the Devon Countryside Access Forum strongly supports comments in the Masterplan referring to the need to establish mechanisms for the funding and “robust and consistent” future maintenance arrangements as part of the planning application(s) and before any development takes place. Arrangements for an appropriate management trust or company must be explored, together with future funding in the long term, to ensure stewardship of these assets in perpetuity. As the adjoining Grand Western Canal country park is currently owned and managed by DCC, it would be appropriate for early discussions to take place to see whether a suitable agreement could be forged to secure the provision, management and maintenance of the country park in Area B. To ensure this park is used, valued and respected by local residents, it is important that it is well-managed and maintained to deliver access and biodiversity benefits.</p> <p>Sustainable transport</p> <p>The development of Area B provides an opportunity to ensure excellent cycling infrastructure: within the</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>development, making use of the existing Sustrans route along the old railway line and adding new sustainable transport connections to employment, retail and leisure areas. These aspirations are included in the Masterplan and reference is made to "delivery of a robust Travel Plan including measures and targets to maximise the transport sustainability of the development, minimising its carbon footprint and any adverse air quality effects." Mid Devon District Council is advised to ensure that developer contributions, cited in the Masterplan, towards well-connected cycling infrastructure and pedestrian links to the railway walk, Grand Western Canal and nearby rights of way are indeed secured at the outset. Maintenance of these links is a factor that also needs early consideration to ensure long term funding.</p>		
<p><b>91.</b> <b>(note</b> <b>submitt</b> <b>ed</b> <b>twice</b> <b>by 2</b> <b>respon</b> <b>dents)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transport (car park)</li> </ul>	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed idea of turning part of the countryside that is directly next to the canal and at the end of Follett Road into a <b>car park</b>.</p> <p>The reasons for my objections are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The car park would become a meeting place for joy-riders who would increase the traffic flow in a residential area and would not be respectful of the speed limit or the local residents both young and old.</li> <li>2. The car park would no doubt be visited by drug users who already use the disused railway track because it is away from the town centre.</li> <li>3. There is also a car park within the proposed development of Tidcombe Hall, also, there is a car park</li> </ol>	<p>Remove Follett Road car park</p>	<p>Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99</p>

		<p>planned for the sports area in the East Urban Development Plan. How many car parks do we need?</p> <p>4. This proposed car park would also add to the already busy Tidcombe Lane, which will become increasingly busier when the exit lane from the link road is opened.</p> <p>5. Where will the water run off go? Probably down to the disused railway track which already deals with a lot of water run off. Increased hard standings create more flooding.</p> <p>6. This will also no doubt destroy the established flora and fauna, as there are many wild animals that use this area for habitat, such as Foxes, Water Vole and Bank Vole.</p> <p>As far as I am aware this car park will be to service the proposed country park within the East Urban Development Plan, which in my opinion is totally unnecessary as the countryside already exists in its natural and agricultural form for all to see and enjoy from the canal tow path and railway track. This route, I walk most days and by putting cycle, dog and pedestrian walkways through the fields is going to make the many animals and birds flee to more natural surroundings, their safe havens will be gone! The only wildlife that we will see will be crows and grey squirrels which people will feed and it will look like any other man-made park with board walks and hides with no wildlife!</p>		
92	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport (car park)</li> </ul>	Separate submission of points raised in 91 above	Car park removed	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99

93. Halbert on Parish Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport</li> </ul>	<p>I am writing on behalf of <b>Halberton Parish Council</b> regarding the Tiverton EUE Area B Masterplan.</p> <p>The Council's view is that <b>no further development should take place until the new access routes onto the Link Road are in place and open.</b></p>	n/c – Area A issue	-
94.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport</li> <li>Community infrastructure</li> </ul>	<p>My main concerns are:-</p> <p>1) <b>No access (car, pedestrian or cycle) should be provided through Mayfair.</b> The character of the established Mayfair settlement should be preserved. Pedestrian and cycle access can be provided to the east of west of Mayfair if linkage is important</p> <p>2) Area B should not commence until access is provided through Area A with <b>connectivity to the Link Road.</b></p> <p>3) <b>Community infrastructure</b> (school etc) should be provided in A before too much housing is built out or B started</p>	n/c – there's no reasonable case to prevent walk/cycle/emergency access from Mayfair. Knock-down bollards or similar would ensure emergency-only access by motor vehicles. Refer to phasing section for 2 and 3.	
95. Devon County Council Country Parks Manager	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Country Park</li> <li>Green Infrastructure</li> <li>Canal / barge horses</li> </ul>	<p><b>Devon County Council Country Parks Manager</b></p> <p>Having attended the first consultation event at Phoenix House on the 2<sup>nd</sup> March, I had planned to make a more detailed response to this consultation, but alas events have somewhat overtaken us all and I have had a lot of other things that have dominated my work since then. However, I'm aware that today is the deadline for responses, and so I just wanted to make a couple of key points from the perspective of the Grand Western Canal Country Park:</p> <p>1. We welcome the concept of the GI land between the Canal and the development be used as a well thought out, 'master planned' Country Park with a</p>	<p>Review detailed points</p> <p>Remove Follett Road CP</p>	<p>Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99</p> <p>Text added p103</p>

		<p>consistent management plan across the site. We see this as having the potential to provide landscape and biodiversity benefits and to absorb some of the recreational pressure that will come with the new housing development.</p> <p>In particular we would be keen to see at least one field or fenced/hedged subsection of an existing field devoted to providing an opportunity for dogs to exercise off the lead. The canal simply isn't suited to this type of dog exercise and the provision of somewhere where dog owners can safely and reliably let their dogs run and chase balls would be of benefit to new residents and existing canal users. A much bigger example of how this has been done well locally is the <a href="#">Dawlish Countryside Park</a> - a Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace developed predominantly to <a href="#">deflect dog pressure</a> relating to new housing development in Teignbridge from Dawlish Warren SAC.</p> <p>Regarding the management of the new country park, the Grand Western Canal Country Park Ranger Service would be very capable and well placed to take this on provided the necessary resources could be made available. The Canal Ranger Service have the equipment, training, experience and existing specialist contractors to successfully take on both the practical maintenance and development of the country park and the community engagement (through events, educational visits, social media and publicity) which would really add value and make the most of the site. We are willing to enter discussions with MDDC about this at an appropriate time.</p> <p>2.The Grand Western Canal Country Park is probably best known for the horse-drawn barge trips which have</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>been taking place since 1974. This unique selling point for Tiverton and Mid Devon attracts a great deal of tourism income to the area and supports dozens of jobs. The Tiverton Canal Co which runs the barge trips operates under lease from Devon County Council and we are aware that they struggle to find the necessary land for grazing the horses that are key to the attraction. One of the fields that they currently rent - at the end of Follett Road - is shown as a car park and orchard in the plans. I appreciate that this field works very well as a gateway to the new country park and that it may be difficult to combine the existing grazing with such a use, but if it cannot remain as grazing land it is imperative that other suitable grazing be provided within the TEUE GI land, so that the horse-drawn barge business can continue.</p>		
		<p><b>Devon County Council (Chief Planner letter with attached comments)</b></p> <p>Thank you for providing the opportunity to comment on the proposed Tiverton Urban Extension, Area B. This response provides the formal views of Devon County Council in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local education provision,</li> <li>• Waste planning;</li> <li>• Minerals planning;</li> <li>• Public health; &amp;</li> <li>• The historic environment;</li> </ul> <p>The comments are included in the Appendix to the letter.</p> <p>At the earliest opportunity, the Authority would value further discussion regarding the archaeological impacts</p>		

		of the development. The response as it stands, amounts to an objection to the Masterplan in its current form.		
<b>96. Devon County Education</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Education</li> </ul>	<p>To re-iterate the previous comment made, as follows :- Education provision has been considered as part of the Local Plan and masterplanning process for this allocation. A site for a new primary school has been identified within Area A of the Eastern Urban Extension, which is expected to serve the whole allocation. As such, <b>a primary school site has not been identified within Area B. S.106 contributions from development in Area B will be expected towards the new primary school in Area A.</b> The school will include provision for early years which will require additional s.106 contributions. In order to ensure that there is provision to mitigate the impact of Area B, <b>development in Area B should not come forward until the school site has been acquired.</b></p> <p>The need for additional secondary provision has also been considered as part of the process. It is proposed to increase the capacity of Tiverton High School. <b>Again, s.106 contributions towards this will be required and expected from development within Area B</b></p>	Reference to education contributions (off site) added to 6.1	P108
<b>97. Devon County Historic</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Historic / Archaeology</li> </ul>	<p><b>The Devon County Historic Environment Team has concerns that the Masterplan is being prepared without sufficient information on the significance and extent of any heritage assets with archaeological interest across the proposed development site. While a geophysical survey has been undertaken for the majority of the site, neither the efficacy of the survey has been determined, nor are the nature and survival of the archaeological features understood.</b> The anomalies identified have the appearance of prehistoric settlement and ditched enclosures as well as later Romano-British field boundaries, but it is highly likely that other features are present that have not been identified by the</p>	Detailed survey work to be undertaken in support of development management stage (Archaeological assessment listed under 6.6 requirements)	P77, 95 & 120

		<p>geophysical survey. It is therefore impossible to determine the significance or extent of archaeological deposits across a site like this, or to set out what mitigation may be required, without undertaking intrusive archaeological field evaluation to investigate the anomalies identified as well as to test any apparently blank areas. The requirement for this information to inform planning decisions is set out in the NPPF. Without such information it is not possible to prepare an adequately informed Masterplan for Area B since the extent and significance of the known prehistoric and Romano-British heritage assets cannot be determined at this stage and cannot feed into any mitigation by design to allow preservation of archaeological remains if required (see MDDC Policy DM 27 and NPPF paras 190 &amp; 192). The area under consideration also contains a locally listed heritage asset - the site of a large flint scatter. The assemblage contains flint arrowheads and scrapers and is likely to be associated with the underlying archaeological features identified by the geophysical survey. Again, despite the presence of this locally listed heritage asset there is no consideration of its significance or of the acceptability of the loss of this heritage asset through the development of the site. The illustrative framework plan shown in fig. 29 of the Supplementary Planning Document Masterplan shows the site of the locally listed heritage asset completely covered with dwellings, while a completely untested anomaly is shown as being preserved within green open space. The Devon County Historic Environment Team would therefore advise that any further Master planning is informed by additional archaeological investigations. Undertaking field evaluation to inform the Masterplan should be considered risk management for the scheme to prevent the 'unexpected' exposure of significant heritage assets</p>		
--	--	--	--	--



		that may require preservation in situ or substantial levels of archaeological mitigation (e.g. a full scale archaeological excavation) during a crucial stage of the scheme. The Devon County Historic Environment Team can also provide advice of the scope of the works required, as well as contact details for archaeological contractors who would be able to undertake this work.		
<b>98. Devon County Minerals</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minerals</li> </ul>	There are no Minerals Safeguarding Areas or Minerals Consultation Areas near the Tiverton EUE Area B Allocation, therefore, there are <b>no minerals comments</b> to make on the Masterplan.	n/c	-
<b>99. Devon County Public Health</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Public Health</li> </ul>	<p>Tiverton's population includes a greater number of people aged 45-59 years whom tend to age well and with higher numbers of self-employment than other parts of Devon. Levels of income, employment, health and crime are better than the county average. Tiverton performs less well for fuel poverty and other aspects of the environment.</p> <p><b>The Public Health team largely support the masterplan proposals.</b> Positive features include: • The volume and mixed provision of green spaces • Cycle connectivity • Infrastructure that helps to deliver low/zero carbon development • Mixed type and densities of housing • Suggestion for a car club scheme.</p> <p>As the planning process evolves the plans would be strengthened by: • Considering proportions of adaptable housing as more of our populations tend to be living longer with more health conditions. • Wheelchair accessibility of dwellings and community facilities, enabling those who use wheelchairs to use their own homes, visit neighbours and benefit from outdoor spaces (both private and public). • The country</p>	Healthy living reference links added to SPD	P65

		<p>park may benefit from the inclusion of sign posted marking indicating loops that might facilitate initiatives such as couch to 5k groups, walking initiatives and play on the way features. • It is encouraging to see the ideas from the community from the consultations keen to include features that aim to address the climate and ecological emergency. If viability means not all are deliverable, we would encourage the planning authority to use the evidence that emerges from the Devon Climate and Ecological emergency website to inform its decisions. For example, the inclusion of electric vehicle charging points whilst encouraging will not address issues of private car ownership or traffic congestion. • As the school is near to the neighbourhood centre, we would recommend that the planning authority considers using the Public Health England guidance on creating healthy weight environments. • The plan does include opportunities for people to interact such as the primary school, country park, sports pitches and allotments, but would be strengthened by including some community indoor spaces for interaction to prevent social isolation.</p> <p>References:</p> <p><a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/active-travel-a-briefing-for-local-authorities">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/active-travel-a-briefing-for-local-authorities</a></p> <p><a href="http://www.gloucestershireccg.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2012/12/Active-Planning-Toolkit-2.pdf">http://www.gloucestershireccg.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2012/12/Active-Planning-Toolkit-2.pdf</a></p> <p><a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/improving-health-through-the-home-a-checklist-for-local-plans-and-policies">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/improving-health-through-the-home-a-checklist-for-local-plans-and-policies</a></p> <p><a href="https://www.devon.gov.uk/energyandclimatechange/strategy/climate-change-strategy">https://www.devon.gov.uk/energyandclimatechange/strategy/climate-change-strategy</a></p>		
--	--	--	--	--

		<a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/healthy-weight-environments-using-the-planning-system">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/healthy-weight-environments-using-the-planning-system</a>		
100. Devon County Waste Plannin g	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Waste</li> </ul>	<p><b>The second paragraph in section 3.3.7 refers to the Tiverton EUE being identified as a 'site option' for the location of an energy from waste facility. The Devon Waste Plan was adopted in 2014 and the Tiverton EUE is referred to as a 'Strategic Energy Recovery Location' within that Plan. As such the reference in the masterplan should be updated accordingly.</b> It should be noted that only part of the Tiverton EUE Area A is identified in the Devon Waste Plan, with the area covered by this masterplan (Area B) being excluded. Nevertheless, development in Area B should have the ability to connect into a heat network if such a facility be delivered at a future date.</p> <p>G9 in this section states that, "The new neighbourhood should be designed to reinforce the importance of waste recycling and the efficient treatment of waste". <b>This should also refer to the importance of waste minimisation and reuse.</b></p> <p>Section 6.6. refers to the requirement for a Waste Audit Statement to be prepared as part of future planning application for this site, as per the requirements of Waste Plan Policy W4: Waste Prevention. This is welcomed. Devon County Council has prepared an SPD to provide developers further guidance on what should be included as part of such a statement and <b>it may be helpful to include a link to that document within the masterplan. The SPD is available at:</b>  <a href="https://www.devon.gov.uk/planning/planning-policies/minerals-and-waste-policy/supplementary-planning-document">https://www.devon.gov.uk/planning/planning-policies/minerals-and-waste-policy/supplementary-planning-document</a></p>	Sections 3.3.7, 6.6 amended	3.3.7 P57/58 and 6.6 P119 amended
101 Previou	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Horse barge operation</li> </ul>	As a <b>previous proprietor of the Horse-drawn Barge business on the Grand Western Canal for 21 years, and</b>	Remove Follett Road car park	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to

s barge horse operat or and now boat moorin gs operat or		<p><b>now in my present business operating Boat Moorings at East Manley Bridge</b>, on studying the Tiverton Masterplan (Stage 2) Consultation it is apparent that the field at the end of the Follet Road, Glebelands is scheduled for a Car Park and Orchard. With concern, I must record my objections to the published Masterplan for the following reason.</p> <p>This field has been rented by the Horse-drawn Barge business for over 25 years as grazing for their horses.</p> <p>The Horse-drawn Barge is an important Tiverton attraction, which brings much needed revenue to the local area. By the very nature of the business, horses require adequate grazing land, an absolutely essential requirement, which must be in close proximity to the its operating site at the Basin on Canal Hill. Should the business loose the use of this land, due to the continued ongoing housing development around the Tiverton area, finding an alternative 4 acres of grazing land near enough to the Basin to maintain the businesses daily activities and the welfare of the horses, could prove exceedingly difficult.</p> <p>I sincerely hope this will be given important consideration.</p>		location of new CP at p76 and p99
102. Network Rail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport (rail)</li> </ul>	<p><b>Network Rail</b> would like to make comment on the Tiverton Masterplan (Tiverton Eastern Urban Extension) (EUE) stage 2 (Area B). This email forms the basis of our response.</p> <p>As Network Rail is a publicly funded organisation with a regulated remit it would not be reasonable to require Network Rail to fund rail improvements necessitated by commercial development. <b>It is therefore appropriate to require developer contributions to fund such</b></p>	n/c note requirement for Local Plan rather than SPD.	

		<p><b>improvements.</b> With this in mind I would strongly urge that when the council undertakes its viability testing for any proposed allocated sites it considers the impact the proposal may have on the railway infrastructure. The cost of mitigating any impact may have a bearing on the viability and deliverability of any such proposed site allocations and future masterplans.</p> <p>Network Rail is a statutory undertaker responsible for maintaining and operating the country's railway infrastructure and associated estate. Network Rail owns, operates, maintains and develops the main rail network. This includes the railway tracks, stations, signalling systems, bridges, tunnels, level crossings and viaducts. The preparation of development plan policy is important in relation to the protection and enhancement of Network Rail's infrastructure.</p> <p>The plan provides for between 1550 and 2000 dwellings, between 95,000 - 130,000 sqm of employment floorspace, and includes a new grade-separated junction with the A361. Given the scale of the proposals and the ease of highways access to/from the strategic road network, the potential exists for a substantial volume of additional road-based travel to be generated. This refers particularly to the employment opportunities provided by the major centres such as Taunton, Bristol, Exeter and Plymouth, which are easily accessible via the A361/M5 corridor. Consistent with sustainable transport policy, the opportunity should be taken from the outset of this development to encourage the use of rail travel for these longer distance journeys.</p> <p>However, references to the role of rail in relation to the Tiverton EUE site appear to be limited at present. One</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>reference is at Policy TIV2 on transport provision, which refers to the transport infrastructure to be provided, including bus service enhancements between Exeter, Tiverton Bus Station, EUE and Tiverton Parkway Station.</p> <p>Tiverton Parkway is the nearest railhead to the EUE site. This station is well served by Great Western Railway services between London Paddington and south west England; and by Cross Country services between the North of England/Midlands and south west England. Car parking provision has been increased incrementally at the station to accommodate increasing demand, and there are indications that further extensions are likely to be necessary, even without major growth proposals such as the Masterplan site.</p> <p>Based on the above, Network Rail strongly recommends that the Tiverton EUE development process, starting with the Masterplan, takes full account of i) the strategic role of rail in providing for longer distance travel demands to major urban centres; and ii) the need to provide high quality access to Tiverton Parkway station, in order for these strategic benefits to be realised.</p> <p>As the proposals are developed, Network Rail requests more detailed consideration to the quantification of demand for rail travel; the enhanced bus services that are needed between the site and Tiverton Parkway; and the effect of any increase in demand for car parking at the station. This process should include identification of any contributions to further improvements that would be merited at Tiverton Parkway. These might include, for example, improvements to passenger facilities and cycle parking;</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>provision for electric vehicle charging; and further expansion of car parking for rail park &amp; ride.</p> <p>We are also aware that demand for rail access at Tiverton Parkway will increase further with the cumulative impact of Tiverton EUE Policy J27. This provides for a major high-quality regional tourism, leisure and retail attraction supported by ancillary roadside services and supporting infrastructure including a pedestrian bridge across the M5 motorway linking the site to Tiverton Parkway station.</p> <p>We look forward to continuing to work with you to maintain consistency between local and rail network planning strategy. We trust these comments will be considered in your preparation of the forthcoming Plan documents.</p>		
103. <b>Highways England</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport (M5)</li> </ul>	<p><b>Highways England</b> welcomes the opportunity to comment on the consultation for the Tiverton Eastern Urban Extension (EUE) Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), Area B Masterplan.</p> <p>As you may be aware we are responsible for operating, maintaining and improving the Strategic Road Network (SRN). No part of the SRN runs through the Tiverton Urban Extension area, but the M5 lies to the west, with Junction 27 approximately 7km west of the Masterplan area.</p> <p>Highways England is keen to ensure that the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) takes account of the need for transport and land use planning to be closely integrated. In this respect, your attention is drawn to the DfT Circular 02/2013 - The Strategic Road Network and the Delivery of Sustainable Development, which sets out how Highways England</p>	n/c	

		<p>will engage with the planning system to deliver sustainable development.</p> <p><b>Adopted Tiverton Urban Extension SPD</b></p> <p>The Tiverton Eastern Urban Extension (EUE) Masterplan was adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) in June 2018, and is intended to provide more detailed guidance on the masterplanning, design quality and infrastructure requirements for development across the EUE as allocated in the adopted Mid Devon Local Plan which covers the period to 2026. Policies AL/TIV/1-7 of the Mid Devon Allocations and Infrastructure Development Plan Document (AIDPD), which forms part of the adopted Local Plan, set out the requirements for development across the EUE. The AIDPD made provision for up to 2,000 dwellings and 130,000 of employment floorspace across the EUE area of 153ha. As discussed further below, the Mid Devon Local Plan Review 2013-2033 (MDLPR) has recently gone through examination, and whilst not yet adopted, its policies relating to EUE have been considered material in the development of the 2019 draft SPD Area B Masterplan.</p> <p>Two distinct areas are defined within the adopted 2018 SPD, referred to as areas A and B. The 2018 SPD established a detailed masterplan for Area A, and the draft SPD document now being consulted on will form the basis of the masterplan for Area B.</p> <p>The adopted 2018 SPD identifies capacity for around 1,520 dwellings and 30,000 square metres of employment floorspace across the 153ha EUE site, which is a reduction on the quantum of 2,000 dwellings and 130,000sqm of employment previously allocated in</p>		
--	--	---	--	--



	<p>the adopted Local Plan AIDPD. It is however noted that the preparation of the Area B Masterplan has been considered with reference to the MDLPR, which seeks to refine the Policy requirements for the EUE. The emerging MDLPR Policy TIV1 makes provision across the 153ha EUE area for a reduced quantum of development than previously allocated in the AIDPD, allocating 1,580-1,830 dwellings, and at least 30,000 of employment floorspace.</p> <p>We understand that to date outline planning permission for 1,030 homes has been granted in addition to full planning permission for a further 12 homes on Area A totalling 1,042 homes. With the AIDPD proposing up to 2,000 dwellings this would leave capacity for 958 dwellings to come forward within Area B, however, because the emerging MDLPR figure (Policy TIV1) proposes a lower quantum of between 1,580-1,830 homes within the EUE, the SPD makes reference to a revised target range of 538-788 dwellings on Area B.</p> <p>The quantum of development proposed across both areas of the EUE is provided in the 2019 draft SPD Area B Masterplan Consultation document in figure 31, as set out below:</p> <table><tr><td></td><td>Area A</td><td>Area B</td><td>Total</td></tr><tr><td>Residential (dwellings)</td><td>935*</td><td>684</td><td>1,619</td></tr><tr><td>Employment (sqm)</td><td>25,700</td><td>2050</td><td>27,750</td></tr></table> <p><b>*figure as set out in adopted 2018 SPD</b></p>		Area A	Area B	Total	Residential (dwellings)	935*	684	1,619	Employment (sqm)	25,700	2050	27,750		
	Area A	Area B	Total												
Residential (dwellings)	935*	684	1,619												
Employment (sqm)	25,700	2050	27,750												

		<p>As above, the proposed employment floorspace allocated across the EUE remains in line with both the adopted Local Plan and emerging MDLPR EUE policies.</p> <p>The quantum of residential development within Area A as set out in the adopted 2018 SPD has now been exceeded by the planning consents granted for 1,042 dwellings. Assuming provision is made for 684 dwellings at Area B, in line with the 2019 draft SPD for the Area B Masterplan, this would result in an overall quantum of 1,726, which remains in line with the draft maximum of 1,830 homes allocated under draft Policy TIV1 of the emerging MDLPR.</p> <p><b>Impact on the Strategic Road Network</b></p> <p>Highways England has been actively involved in reviewing the transport evidence base which underpinned the Mid Devon Local Plan Review (MDLPR), which included testing the impact of the proposed allocations, including development at the EUE, on the safe and efficient operation of the strategic road network. For the purposes of the MDLPR testing, a maximum development quantum of 1,830 dwellings and 30,000sqm of employment floorspace at the EUE was assumed, as set out in MDLPR draft Policy TIV1. On the basis of this work, Highways England is satisfied that the transport impact of the EUE on the operation of M5 Junction 27 could be safely accommodated without the requirement for infrastructure improvements on the SRN. As above, the quantum of development across the EUE as proposed in both the adopted 2018 SPD and draft 2019 SPD falls within the policy thresholds of both the adopted AIDPD and emerging, and recently examined MDLPR. <b>We therefore remain satisfied that the transport impacts of the Tiverton Eastern Urban Extension</b></p>		
--	--	---	--	--

		<p><b>SPD Area B Masterplan are unlikely to result in a severe impact on the safe and efficient operation of the strategic road network.</b></p> <p><b>Delivery of the Tiverton Eastern Urban Extension</b></p> <p>Section 6 of the 2019 draft SPD sets out how the delivery of infrastructure required to accommodate the EUE will be delivered, and provides signposts to the requirements of relevant Policies TIV1-5 of the emerging MDLPR.</p> <p>In line with MDLPR draft Policy TIV5, Section 6.1 of the draft SPD sets out the requirement to agree a strategy to ensure that infrastructure is brought forward in step with development. As set out in section 6.3, the principles of development phasing adopted in the 2018 SPD have also been applied to the 2019 draft SPD, which requires that infrastructure is provided in a timely way in order to reduce and/or mitigate the impact of development. The SPD seeks to ensure the co-ordination between both phases A and B of development to ensure necessary strategic elements of infrastructure are delivered in a timely manner and without prejudicing the ability of the following phases to do the same.</p> <p>The SPD also requires the provision of sustainable transport measures across the EUE to ensure appropriate accessibility for all modes. The provision of measures such as enhanced bus service and the delivery of cycle and pedestrian links will support the EUE in providing a comprehensive and sustainable transport network that offers a genuine choice of</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>modes to help reduce the reliance on the private car.  <b>This is supported by Highways England.</b></p> <p>In respect of the requirements for future planning applications, the SPD sets out that applications will need to be supported by a Transport Assessment which considers the impact of development within the context of Area B, Area A and wider transport network. Such Transport Assessments will need to assess the development transport impact based on the development and infrastructure that has come forward to date across the EUE, as opposed to basing their assessment on the planned order of delivery as set out in the Masterplan.</p> <p>The draft SPD also requires that development must provide a Framework Travel Plan which outlines measures to encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport across both the development, EUE masterplan area and wider transport network. As part of the co-ordination between both phases A and B, it is advised that a EUE-wide Travel Plan is adopted to ensure that sustainable transport opportunities can be joined-up, accessible and easy to understand, and offer a genuine choice of modes.</p> <p>We also support the 2019 draft SPD requirement that development within the EUE masterplan area should assist in developing a Public Transport Strategy which seeks to provides a viable and affordable sustainable transport network across the EUE site and wider transport network. This collaborative approach is likely to assist in the provision of a sustainable transport network which can provide efficiently aligned and</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>attractive sustainable travel options across the EUE and wider area.</p> <p>We trust that our response will be helpful and assist you with developing the Tiverton Eastern Urban Extension SPD for the Area B Masterplan. If you require further clarification on any issues, please do not hesitate to contact me.</p>		
104 Natural England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green infrastructure</li> <li>• Biodiversity</li> <li>• SUDS</li> </ul>	<p><b>Natural England</b> is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.</p> <p>Sustainable Urban Drainage Scheme (SUDs)</p> <p>Emerging Local Plan policy (TIV3(f)) requires provision of a SUDs ...paying particular attention in relation to run-off into Tidcombe Fen Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) in terms of quality and quantity of water entering the fen, and arrangements for future maintenance of the scheme. We advise that the Masterplan addresses the need for such a scheme in order that run-off can be planned and managed across the site as a whole. Such a scheme should be supported by appropriate evidence to demonstrate how the anticipated quantity and quality of run-off will be managed to ensure the integrity of the SSSI is safeguarded. <b>The scheme should include a SUDs planting and maintenance regime and a water quality monitoring programme, linked to further mitigation where necessary,</b> to address the</p>	AY/AAM/PRP Check clarifications and highlighted sections	Edits at p 50, 63 & 120 re SUDs

		<p>uncertainties associated with nutrient enrichment and removal efficiencies of SUDs features.</p> <p>On a more specific note, <b>figure 34 illustrates where SUDs provision will be located, but it is unclear how this provision fits with the street typologies shown in fig 47 and on pages 89 and 90.</b> For instance fig 34 indicates provision of SUDs along the 'central spine' but the indicative cross section and text describing the 'central spine' (p90) makes no mention of SUDs.</p> <p>It is also <b>vital that SUDs designed for Area B complement those agreed for Area A</b> so that they function together to maintain surface water as close to existing run off rates as possible to avoid exacerbating any existing flooding problems in the local watercourses as well as maintaining water quality. Their amenity and wildlife value can also be increased with careful design thus contributing to multi-functional green infrastructure. The RSPB and WWT have produced guidance which can be found at <a href="http://ww2.rspb.org.uk/Images/SuDS_report_final_tcm9-338064.pdf">http://ww2.rspb.org.uk/Images/SuDS_report_final_tcm9-338064.pdf</a></p> <p>Biodiversity net gain</p> <p>The reference to the need for biodiversity enhancement is welcomed. <b>However we advise that the Masterplan makes specific reference to the need for net gain in biodiversity.</b> This reflects national policy in the National</p>	<p>Local Plan Review, Policy TIV1 sets an area of 47ha for GI. The 'GI Strategy' and 'Proof of Biodiversity New Gain' at planning application stage will confirm minimum targets.</p>	<p>Edits to text with street typologies p90</p> <p>Reference added p Page 50, 63 &amp; 108 re biodiversity net gain</p>
--	--	--	---	---

		<p>Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and policy in the emerging Mid Devon Local Plan (DM26(a)).</p> <p>We advise that the <b>mitigation hierarchy is followed, as set out in the para 175 of the NPPF</b>. This requires that consideration is first given to retention or enhancement of existing environmental features on and around the site followed by a consideration of new features that could be incorporated within the masterplan area. Where onsite measures are not possible, consideration should be given to off-site measures.</p> <p>Biodiversity metrics are available to provide certainty and assist developers and local authorities in quantifying and securing net gain and we advise that a metric is used to measure potential biodiversity losses and gains at the masterplanning stage. <b>The Biodiversity Metric 2.0 - JP029 can be used for this purpose</b>. Local Authorities can set their own net gain thresholds but 10%1 is expected as a minimum.</p> <p>We note from page 105 that the existing fields between the canal and railway will be modified to create a series of wetlands, ephemeral ponds and meadows linked to Alsa Brook and the Tidcombe Fen SSSI. We welcome the creation of wetland/meadow habitat. <b>However it is important that such proposals are supported by appropriate hydrological evidence</b> to ensure these habitats can be sustained and that Tidcombe Fen is protected. We advise that the <b>need for hydrological assessment</b> to support the proposed habitat creation and maintenance is addressed within the masterplan.</p> <p><b>Habitats Regulations Assessment</b></p>		<p>Revised HRA attached to Draft Masterplan SPD including a screening stage and Appropriate Assessment stage</p>
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>We cannot concur with the conclusion set out in the screening report which states that the Eastern Urban Extension Area B is not likely to have a significant adverse effect on the integrity of habitats sites, and that further Appropriate Assessment is not required. The Habitats Regulations Assessment undertaken for the Mid Devon Local Plan Review<sup>2</sup> concluded, in respect of policies TIV1 – TIV5 (allocations at Tiverton) that effects remain uncertain and that Appropriate Assessment is required. We recognise that the Masterplan provides guidance for a future planning application but that guidance is site specific and relates to a specific geographic area rather than being general design guidance.</p> <p>We note from the text on page 33 that Area B may yield more dwellings than envisaged within the emerging Local Plan. If additional housing provision is proposed this should also be reflected in an Appropriate Assessment. The existing Habitats Regulations Assessment work undertaken for the Local Plan may be drawn on where appropriate and up to date to inform an Appropriate Assessment for the Masterplan.</p> <p>We would be happy to comment further should the need arise but if in the meantime you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact us.</p> <p>(Further response received following end of consultation period).</p>		
<b>105</b> <b>DAVID</b> <b>COLLIER</b> <b>R</b> <b>(CHAPEL)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Infrastructure</li> <li>• Phasing</li> </ul>	<p>Having read through the questionnaire and filled in our views we are aware of the complexity of the planning involved. The range of ownership of area B being</p>	AAM to review shared lane point	See text p69 re shared lane



<p><b>ANTHONY)</b></p>		<p>perhaps the biggest obstacle to reaching a final solution.</p> <p>In general we welcome the overall plan and the comprehensive text covers many of our concerns.</p> <p>Our principal wish is that the final document will encapsulate all of the details in your plan and tie all the landowners/developers into keeping to them.</p> <p>We welcome the proposals on GI and think this should be ringfenced. In particular we think the area of GI land to the south of WML should be held in public ownership with a local management committee.</p> <p>The present 'indicative' pathways and layout could be much improved by involving local people with knowledge of existing paths, bridges, culverts etc.</p> <p>The trigger to begin work on the 'country park' should be much sooner (than 1250 houses) with good access provided for the new residents of the area.</p> <p>In this respect we propose that West Manley Lane becomes a 'shared lane' which would make it safer for all and enhance it as an adjunct to the country park.</p>		
------------------------	--	--	--	--

		<p>Much has been detailed in the document on retaining the existing green infrastructure and we would like to see this listed and protected at an early stage as we are already aware of landowners clearing what would be better retained.</p> <p>The council have made the decision that there should be no housing to the south of WML in area A and more recently in area B. This is important as it provides a clearly defined boundary to the built environment and protects the new country park in the long term.</p>		
<b>106 POLICE DESIGN</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Designing out crime</li> </ul>	<p>Thank you on behalf of <b>Devon and Cornwall Police</b> for the opportunity to comment on this masterplan consultation.</p> <p>The masterplan plan should consider, incorporate and implement the principles of designing out crime. By so doing will promote and help ensure new neighbourhoods, residential and business, are safe and sustainable for all.</p> <p>Detailed design should encourage creation of places where ownership and a sense of community is fostered. Different uses should not create friction or undermine overall security of the newly created place or existing neighbourhoods.</p> <p>Specifically, I would raise the following as the most important considerations at this stage.</p>	check statements in SPD re crime prevention although majority of points for application stages.	Added point re security/ overlooking on routes to p89

		<p>Whilst permeability for pedestrians would be generally encouraged there <b>must not be permeability just for its own sake.</b></p> <p><b>Pedestrian and cycle connections and movement must be as safe as possible. In principle routes should be overlooked along streets providing active frontages that are properly lit.</b> Work should be undertaken to ensure that likely destinations within the masterplan area and obviously beyond will have such routes provided.</p> <p>Routes should be convenient without compromising security of dwellings or other uses. In particular, destinations such as the proposed local centre, schools, new sports/play areas and employment opportunities should have <b>safe walkable routes</b> provided.</p> <p>The masterplan does provide significant play and green space, marked "19 &amp; 21". <b>Here, I would suggest that play areas intended for young children/toddlers are located closer to dwellings than that proposed for older children and young people.</b></p> <p>How, both residential and employment space addresses all such green space is important. Development blocks should provide frontage to such space and <b>not have rear gardens backing onto these areas.</b> Similarly blocks should also address new streets and other public realm areas positively to ensure good natural surveillance. If necessary, <b>measures to prevent motorcycles and other vehicles accessing green space may have to be considered and incorporated</b></p>		
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>Public and private space should be clearly defined and areas of ambiguity avoided with <b>appropriate boundary</b> treatments provided.</p> <p>The issue of <b>street lighting</b> must be fully considered. If the intention is to encourage walking and cycling, then appropriate lighting of safe routes will be required. Employment areas must also be carefully designed to provide adequate security. Such areas are often more vulnerable out of hours or overnight when activity often reduces markedly. Blocks should be designed to <b>maximise natural surveillance</b> and where appropriate restrict points of vehicular access, often just one point of access is best.</p> <p>Elsewhere we have sometimes experienced issues of crime and <b>anti-social behaviour where employment space is located very close to residential blocks</b> where the commercial areas have become unofficial playgrounds at weekends/overnight.</p> <p>Whilst it may be considered a more detailed matter how <b>residential vehicle parking will be dealt with must be considered fully</b>. Whilst a mix of solutions would be expected if these include rear parking courts then it should be made clear that such spaces must be small, safe and be well overlooked from commonly habited rooms, with active frontages included. Adequate lighting of such courts should be mandatory.</p> <p>How retained <b>hedgerow is dealt with is often problematic for crime prevention</b>. I have seen examples of retained hedge requiring an ecology buffer leading to a potentially accessible space between the hedge and rear garden fencing which then creates concerns about security.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

		<p><b>New or existing landscaping/planting should not undermine security</b> especially natural surveillance by creating potential hiding places next to footpaths etc Please do not hesitate to contact me if any clarification is sought or I can assist further.</p>		
<b>LATE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Car park</li> <li>• Biodiversity</li> </ul>	<p><b>COMMENT RECEIVED 29/30 APRIL (PHOTOS NOT INCLUDED BELOW)</b></p> <p><i>I am enclosing 2 pictures of the paddock field where the canal barge houses live October - April. You will see the picture of the maize growing with the deer looking at us and the other picture of the feed baled up for the horses winter food. You can see the sparrowhawk on the front bale. This paddock is teeming with wild life. We have hedgehogs and badgers now - badgers being protected under the 1992 Badgers Act Protected species. How can councillors even consider destroying this environment? It all needs to be protected but the badgers are protected.</i></p> <p>For your file I have always advocated right from the start of the EUE discussions, say 7 years ago, the concept of the following:</p>	Remove Follett Rd Car Park	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99

		<p>Quote I have always stated that the EUE "Green Infrastructure " should be accessed from Area B Development off Blundells Road</p> <p>where the development consisting of a School – Apartments , Flats,2 bed, 3 bed, 4 bed and 5 bed Houses will be built.</p> <p>Playing fields, Sports pitches and Nature studies etc etc would complete that end of the EUE. unquote</p> <p>The Paddock Field that is home to the Canal Barge Company Horses ( The Top attraction in Tiverton ) from October to April each year and then in May the field is used to grow the maize for the horses winter feed.</p> <p>Along the Canal towpath there is a gate overlooking the Paddock where families stop to view the horses.</p>		
<b>106 LATE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Process</li> </ul>	<p><b>COMMENT RECEIVED AFTER CONSULTATION PERIOD (RECEIVED 27 APRIL)</b></p>	Remove Follett Rd Car park	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99

		<p>We have been informed of the following:</p> <p>The meeting we have all been waiting to attend – namely the proposal to site a car park in the paddock field has been cancelled.</p> <p>It will now be conducted through social media with councillors and members of the public speaking via the computer screen. This is totally unacceptable.</p> <p>The Glebelands estate is a very quiet residential area populated by a majority of senior citizens, they do not have computers and are very anxious to attend a proper meeting.</p> <p>Your decision will affect us all - We have a right to be there. We live in a democracy and request that the meeting be postponed until it is safe to be held. Surely the need to discuss building a car park cannot be that urgent that you will go ahead and leave the residents unable to participate. Are we missing the bigger picture here ?</p> <p>We know from the planning office that the paddock field would remain part of the green infrastructure so why has this suddenly changed ?</p>		
<b>107 LATE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Process</li> </ul>	<p><b>COMMENT RECEIVED AFTER CONSULTATION PERIOD (RECEIVED 26 APRIL)</b></p> <p>I wish to attend the planning meeting regarding the car park application in the paddock field in Follet Road.</p> <p>I understand it will now be accessed through a computer system. I do not have a computer and nor do many other senior residents who live here. That makes it totally unfair. "One of my sons has typed this letter for me."</p> <p>I would ask you to delay this meeting until it can be held at Phoenix House where EVERYBODY will be able to hear and see what is going on.</p>	n/c (process) - Central government has made the specific request of Councils that all aspects of the planning system continue as far as possible during the COVID19 period. To that end the Council is continuing its service with Council meetings being held virtually with members of the public able to attend via the internet (via a weblink and standard internet browser).	-
<b>108 LATE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Process</li> </ul>	<p><b>COMMENT RECEIVED AFTER CONSULTATION PERIOD (RECEIVED 27 APRIL)</b></p>	n/c (Process) – Central government has made the specific request of Councils that all aspects of the planning system continue as	-

		<p>My neighbours have informed me that the Council is arranging to have the planning meeting regarding the above proposal via Social Media with Councillors and members of the public giving their views via a computer link. As mentioned to the Council in an earlier letter, many of the local residents are elderly and I know they do not have access to Social Media.</p> <p>I agree with my neighbours that we believe the meeting could be postponed until it could be held in a public forum with the people actually able to attend in person rather than virtually and therefore making the process much fairer.</p> <p>Thank you for taking the time to read my letter and I hope you will appreciate the local residents' concerns.</p>	far as possible during the COVID19 period. To that end the Council is continuing its service with Council meetings being held virtually with members of the public able to attend via the internet (via a weblink and standard internet browser).	
<b>109 LATE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Employment (traffic / noise)</li> </ul>	<p><b>COMMENT RECEIVED AFTER CONSULTATION PERIOD (RECEIVED 24 APRIL)</b></p> <p>I am worried about the effect of the new <b>employment</b> areas introduced to the area B plan. It is not clear whether these will be offices or industrial sites and there are no character suggestions included. The noise from the extension of the Hartnoll business park ( from traffic and manufacturing) has carried down the valley and it would not be appropriate to introduce more in the suggested locations. Originally employment was to be by the A361 and the village centre, do we need more?</p>	Clarity on B1 use as above	54,71
<b>110 LATE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transport</li> </ul>	<p><b>COMMENT RECEIVED AFTER CONSULTATION PERIOD (RECEIVED 1<sup>st</sup> MAY)</b></p> <p>I should also be grateful if you would forward on my letter to the Highways/Roads committee, with this letter.</p> <p>I am greatly concerned by the way in which the <b>Sampford Peverell/Halberton/Post Hill/ Blundells Road is viewed and managed by Planning.</b></p> <p>At Sampford Peverell (way before the village as you approach from the link road/M5 ) there is now a 30mph</p>	n/c – not points for this SPD process	-



		<p>speed limit. There is also a very clear and open junction to Parkway with only houses on the right and open fields on the left until you get into the village later on...I can't see a logical reason for it. This speed limit appears inconsistent with further along this road.</p> <p>As you continue to view this road as a major traffic link and signpost it/manage speed limits on it in this way , traffic is encouraged to use it to access Tiverton from junction 27.</p> <p>Halberton traffic calming does not allow a sense of being in a village to exist and is not adhered to.</p> <p>The digester has created continual, heavy agricultural traffic thundering along Post Hill ( see previous letter) and the newly re-painted 40 mph signs are encouraging fast traffic on the brow of Post Hill, making both junctions with Mayfair and Fairway hugely dangerous. There is so much traffic along this road in normal times, not even a reduction to 30mph would make these junctions safe.</p> <p>While you have quite clearly decided that this area be developed for housing, why persist in allowing/planning for industry to exist in the same area? I can virtually guarantee that the people who work in these units will not be walking to work. The jobs possibly created at Hartnoll Business Park could have been sited away from what is about to be a major housing area....anywhere in fact where there is already light industry and vacant units.</p> <p>In the blurb about the EUE there was much made of developing something that would mirror and take the best of the Post Hill area, your blatant poor</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

		management of traffic has certainly done that for Post Hill, Halberton and Blundells Road.		
<b>111 LATE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transport</li> <li>• General / Demand / Infrastructure</li> </ul>	<p><b>COMMENT RECEIVED AFTER CONSULTATION PERIOD (RECEIVED 2<sup>nd</sup> MAY)</b></p> <p>I have decided to make an <b>objection against the proposal to develop area B before area A.</b> I will try to be concise and keep it to my main reasons why this proposal is bad planning.</p> <p>Firstly, there is no access to area B at present. You have tried to make the access through Mayfair which luckily has been rejected for many very good reasons which were purposely overlooked by the planners. The only other access I can see is Manley lane which again is not good planning. Both of these accesses are a compromise on the original plan which is a new road through area A. The question is why do you now want to develop area B ahead of area A? The answer I was given is that you need to show that area B is available to be developed in order to get the grant needed to complete the new junction to the A361. Area B is already available when area A is finished. I was also told that area A is available now for development. If this the case, why are you pressing to develop area B first? It doesn't make any sense at all. Especially commercial sense. No developer is going to develop area A if there are over 600 houses already being built in area B. There are only a certain number of houses that can be</p>	n/c – refer to phasing and infrastructure sections in 6.	-

		<p>sold each year without swamping the market.  Let's assume 75 a year. This would mean that it would take almost 10 years for area B to be finished.  No house builder is going to build houses in area A before area B is finished. Nor would a house builder start in area B if they knew that hundreds of houses were to start to built in area A at the same time.  As you have assured me ,area A land is already available for development. This means access to area B will not be needed until area A with all the planned infrastructure is in place.  We can therefore abide to the original plan.  If I am wrong and you can tell me how I am, please register this letter as an objection.</p>		
<b>112</b> <b>LATE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic Glebelands / Tidcombe Lane</li> <li>Car park</li> </ul>	<b>COMMENT RECEIVED AFTER CONSULTATION PERIOD (RECEIVED 2<sup>nd</sup> MAY)</b>	Remove Follett Rd Car park	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99

		<p>I am writing to STRONGLY OBJECT to the building of a car park and bridge across The Grand Western Canal at the end of Follett Road, Tidcombe. I also STRONGLY OBJECT to the development of the Tidcombe Hall Estate.</p> <p>Along with my parents and siblings we moved to the Glebelands estate in 1974. It has been the family home since. Over the years I have already seen what negative impact the very local development has had on the area and what over bearing strain has been put on Tidcombe Lane both from north and south. The narrow lane is already unsafe to walk along and the little bridge over the canal is under extreme pressure. It is already hazardous to drive along the lane too as traffic generation has increased due to the establishment of a Primary school. It is used a 'rat-run' by motorists wishing to avoid Canal Hill. Many motorists do not stick to the 20mph limit which only adds even more DANGER to the use of the lane by residents, children and parents from the primary school and by pupils at Blundells School. Even more traffic would cause unacceptable level of hazard.</p> <p>The Glebelands estate itself is a dead end so extra traffic generation will mean roads become over used , cause greater disturbance, noise and DANGER in what is currently a quiet , safe place to live.</p> <p>The Grand Western Canal has always been a place of tranquility, beauty and a haven for so many species of wildlife, <i>especially from this point along its course</i>. Why then the intention to DESTROY yet another remaining pocket of the countryside that is such an asset and benefit to so many. On the bank adjoining the proposed field site is an oak tree planted in memory of my late father by Tiverton Angling Club. Something, that if removed, can never be replaced. The horses that pull the barge are held in the field over the winter months. Hence another problem caused as they will need to be re-sited for that period of time.</p> <p>A car park already exists further along the canal, towards Halberton, in a much more suitable place on the main road. Please focus your attention on expanding that or maybe use the Mid Devon Show field site.</p> <p>Hopefully the rumours of a virtual gathering (due to COVID 19 restrictions), at which there will be no representation of the public to air their objections, are not true. This would be very unfair and badly thought of.</p>		
113 LATE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Country Park</li> <li>Ecology</li> <li>Follett Rd Car Park</li> </ul>	<p><b>COMMENT RECEIVED AFTER CONSULTATION PERIOD (RECEIVED 5<sup>th</sup> JUNE)</b></p> <p>Re; Planning application for the proposed car park at the end of Follett Road, Tiverton and the 'country park' aspect of the Tiverton Eastern Urban expansion.</p> <p><u>Country Park</u></p> <p>The existing wetland feature of this land looks like it is going to be tamed into a 'walk through' with the aim of 'spotting birds' from the hide that is planned to be midway along the boardwalk.</p> <p>The land is already a good wetland habitat for woodland bird and invertebrates together with</p>	Remove Follett Rd Car park	Changes to P76, 92,99,100-105. Ref to location of new CP at p76 and p99

		<p>associated amphibians and visiting deer, foxes and other mammals.</p> <p>To create an 'artificial' wetland with its 'ephemeral pond' and boardwalk would be to destroy the fragile natural infrastructure that is currently finely tuned and naturally balanced. The wetland is fed and supplied by the canal run off and if you divert any of the water sources – which you will have to do to create the 'country park walk through' – you will eliminate the current diversity of wildlife and leave a relatively sterile walk across once remarkable fields. Or is that the intention?</p> <p>'We like to see natural things but we don't want to get our feet wet or our shoes muddy'.</p> <p><u>Car parking at the end of Follett Road.</u></p> <p>Past experience of raising concerns regarding planning issues suggests that once the drawings have been made public, the result is a foregone conclusion with any consultations resembling 'public notifications' having little regard to public opinion. We hope, this time, to not outright oppose the suggestions but rather direct those determining the result to previous decisions and perhaps identify inconsistencies in the approach being considered.</p> <p>'While car ownership and use is acknowledged as a reasonable characteristic of life in Tiverton, the Local Plan and broader national planning policy aspire to reduce car use in order to address climate change globally. The Eastern Urban Extension is a place where</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>people can be expected to walk, whether to access local services and recreation.'</p> <p><i>Page 106 Tiverton Eastern Urban Expansion Design Guide.</i></p> <p>We have taken the above quote above from the TEUE design guide to illustrate the lack of joined up thinking currently coming from the 'plan' to construct a car park at the end of Follett Road.</p> <p>IF the thinking within the soon to be constructed TEUE is to reduce car usage in order to 'address climate change' etc, is there any sense in encouraging more car travel through a residential area with relatively limited access? Or is it so that as many people as possible can be saved having to walk too far from the canal basin where a car park already exists.</p> <p>'Cycling and walking have been a primary consideration in the design of the Masterplan SPD and the detailed design of the development should maintain a focus on achieving pedestrian and cycle connectivity across the development, to the Neighbourhood Centre and more widely to and from the rest of Tiverton.'</p> <p><i>P104 ibid</i></p> <p>So in terms of consistency and continuity of approach to planning, these extracts should really negate the whole idea of building another carpark if the Planning Authority are indeed to remain true to their 'vision'.</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>Additionally, the Design guide is very helpful in outlining numerous other negative aspects of constructing car parks and has made these aspects part of its raison d'etre for NOT providing car parks within the TEUE.</p> <p>If this reasoning holds good for the TEUE, then the same should hold for Follett Road.</p> <p>'All environments from the Centre to the Edge should be pedestrian and cyclist friendly, promoting the free movement around, and to and from, the Urban Extension. Secure by Design The Masterplan SPD provides a strategic framework which ensures that a safe and secure development emerges. Primarily this is achieved by creating a structure of streets which are overlooked by buildings. The Masterplan SPD minimises areas where surveillance of the streets is compromised or antisocial behaviour can go unnoticed. While not explicitly attributed to secure by design principles, many of the aspects of this design guide contribute to a safe and secure environment that seeks to design-out crime.'</p> <p><i>P104 ibid</i></p> <p>To construct a car park at the end of Follett Road - that would not be supervised, securely locked or have surveillance - would seem to run counter to the TEUE plan ethos. But perhaps residents of Follett Road and Westcott Road don't qualify for the same level of peace and tranquillity as is being foreseen with Area B of the TEUE.</p> <p>'Parking Courtyards In accordance with policy DM8, Local Plan Part 3, there will be no residential parking</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>courtyards permitted. These are considered to create unattractive, potentially unsociable, environments.'</p> <p><i>P104 ibid</i></p> <p>I have taken the liberty of conflating 'parking courtyards' with 'car parks' in this instance but I hope you will see the intention.</p> <p>Again, if these 'unattractive, potentially unsociable environments' are being designed OUT of the TEUE, how and why are they being designed IN to Follett Road?</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

### Sub-Questions (QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES ONLY)

What is your connection to the area?	
Live here	46
Work here	0
Study here	0
Other	3
What is your age group?	
13-15	1
16-24	0
25-34	4
35-44	5
45-54	8
55-64	8



65-74	13
75-84	9
84+	0
Prefer not to say	2
<b>What is your gender?</b>	
Male	23
Female	25
Other	0
Prefer not to say	2
<b>What is your employment status?</b>	
Working Full time	17
Working Part time	8
Student	0
Retired	20
Unemployed	0
Prefer not to say	5
<b>How did you hear about this survey?</b>	
Mid-Devon District Council's website	23
Another individual	12
Social Media	5
Local Group	3
Local Press	3
Email	1
Other	4 (email – previously registered; letter; consultation event)