

Appendix 1 – Survey responses

	<p>The consultation document has been revised to reflect updated policies in the Mid Devon Local Plan. Do you think the detail within the SPD properly reflects these updated policies?</p> <p>Please do not comment on the policy wording itself as this is adopted policy in the Local Plan.</p>	<p>Do you agree with the way the three new areas shown on the interactive map have been masterplanned?</p> <p>Please do not comment on whether the three parcels should be included as these are already allocated in the Local Plan.</p>	<p>Do you have any other comments on the draft North West Cullompton Masterplan SPD?</p> <p>Details of the key revisions are set out on the About the consultation page. You can view the full consultation document on the Draft masterplan page.</p>
1	Yes	<p>I like that the design has been careful to maintain the local landscape to a degree but I do object to leaving veteran trees to provide 'Leafy Character'. It's not about leaving trees so they look pretty, it's about salvaging some of the habitat you're already so keen to destroy for needless housing. The fact that there are protected species out there such as dormice and bats and they are still able to build is unbelievable.</p> <p>I still also have concerns over the infrastructure and the fact that the primary won't be in place until the 2/3rd phase of the build which is ridiculous when the primaries here are already over prescribed. One new primary to cover 420 students isn't going to cover the existing housing let alone the amount being built. Plus the secondary school which had expanded to its maximum when I was there 20 years ago will also be overwhelmed. Why is there not the scope for a new secondary school as well or to at least provide land for the existing one to move to.</p> <p>It's also disappointing to see that the swimming pool has been missed off the new sporting facilities as this is what residents have wanted for a long time. Also with the new hill parks and recreation areas not much thought seems to have been given to green spaces in which to walk your dog off lead. With the recent boom in pet ownership (pet ownership of dogs and cats increased by 3.2 million during lockdown) it would have been good to see some proposals centred around this with so little places to walk the dogs already and to the better provision of dog poo bins. Having parks with benches outside so that you can sit with the dog and keep an eye on your kids in the park would also be a nice consideration rather than having to stand outside because dogs aren't allowed.</p> <p>On a final note we live in Head Weir and are worried the road will become a rat trap for the new estates when people work out it's a through road. People already speed through here and it would be an increase in traffic directly past our front window on what is usually a quiet street. We are also concerned that the junction onto to Willand Road from Head Weir will be impossible to turn out onto, we already struggle now more than we used to when we lived here 6 years ago.</p> <p>We can already hear the noise from the first phase of the build, I hope this doesn't increase.</p> <p>It would also be good if the new estates actually all had double driveways as opposed to just a small garage like some of the new ones do around the bottom of Head Weir where the owners just park their cars on the pavement because all they have is the garage and a foot of hard standing. Most households today have at least two cars if not a commercial van or motorhome. Plus what's the point in us trying to all reduce our carbon footprints when you are desecrating a rural market town by doubling it in size?</p> <p>The loss of habitat, decent agricultural land, ecosystems and wildlife does not set a good example for residents to do their bit to 'save the planet'. This movement needs to start with our councils valuing our green spaces and land for the life systems they are rather than the cash cow they've been developed into.</p>	<p>A key revision should also include secondary school education to ensure that all these children moving into the area have the opportunity to attend their local school and not one out of the town. It should also consider a swimming pool as part of the new sports facilities. I'm glad the primary's school spaces have been increased too and that they are looking to upgrade the motorway junction to support the traffic as it can already take 20 minutes some mornings and PM's just to travel the hill from the services to the first mini roundabout past the Weary Traveller, it simply won't cope without some intervention and it should be done before the houses are built.</p> <p>As mentioned it would also be good to have better areas to exercise our dogs as well as for our children to play. I also feel that dental and medical services have been severely underestimated in this plan. We already can't secure a doctor's appointment without over a two week wait, our dentist only has one dentist in residence so we rarely get seen there either. The practices aren't going to cope and a lot of people's health will continue to suffer for it.</p>
2			<p>The delayed delivery of the spine road will have serious implications in Town Centre at Tiverton Rd/Fore St junction for traffic and pedestrians.</p>

Appendix 1 – Survey responses

	<p>The consultation document has been revised to reflect updated policies in the Mid Devon Local Plan. Do you think the detail within the SPD properly reflects these updated policies?</p> <p>Please do not comment on the policy wording itself as this is adopted policy in the Local Plan.</p>	<p>Do you agree with the way the three new areas shown on the interactive map have been masterplanned?</p> <p>Please do not comment on whether the three parcels should be included as these are already allocated in the Local Plan.</p>	<p>Do you have any other comments on the draft North West Cullompton Masterplan SPD?</p> <p>Details of the key revisions are set out on the About the consultation page. You can view the full consultation document on the Draft masterplan page.</p>
3	No	No	<p>This is a disgrace as the infrastructure cannot support it! This should never have been agreed until the road structure has been improved. We cannot get a doctor's appointment now - is there going to be additional schools and doctors? How are you going to manage the additional traffic to the motorway and town?</p> <p>Disgraceful</p>
4		<p>Private motor vehicle remains the dominant form of transport. Cullompton road infrastructure is already inadequate for the volume of traffic with queues forming for 2-3 hours daily. New road infrastructure is needed before construction of dwellings commences. Where is the bypass, where is the second-half of the motorway junction that is clearly needed?</p>	
5	No idea I'm not a town planner	<p>I do not agree with any of this plan or previous plan as there has never been anything set up to support the town when these houses have been built.</p>	<p>I have plenty to say but nobody listens. This town is already in chaos with traffic on a weekly basis. Absolute tragedy. You can make great plans for housing which gives the local authority money, but you have completely failed to provide any plans for any infrastructure that will actually help this town to progress.</p>
6	No	<p>No, this is totally ridiculous as at busy times (also when the M5 is shut for any reason) the roads through town are clogged right up, queued back down to the motorway bridge and beyond, it gets really bad, and you now want to build yet more houses bringing much more traffic to the town?</p> <p>We need more roads first, I know there has been talk of a relief road but where is it? Still on a 'proposed map'. Schools will not cope with all the extra pupils, as well as doctors surgeries etc. This is just thrown together and not thought out at all. It isn't even as though we have the train station to alleviate things yet either. Concentrate on the infrastructure before just throwing stupid amounts of houses at the town, it is already struggling.</p>	
7			<p>I'm very concerned, as are lots of local residents, about the infrastructure necessary to support the extra housing stock. I have no objection to new developments, I think it will help breathe new life into Cullompton, however the current road and transport system cannot support the existing residents. I live on Higher Street and am frequently unable to exit my property due to the build up of traffic. I can't get a doctor's appointment at my surgery for months. It takes me 15 minutes some mornings to get to the motorway junction which is less than a mile from my house. I see kids walking to school along Higher Street having to walk single file as the cars/lorries whip past so quickly - someone is going to get hurt unless something is done. A relief road to take through traffic away from the town centre is needed, speed limits need to be reduced - just like they will be in Tiverton. Cullompton deserves to not be treated as the poor relative in the Mid Devon planning, and proper thought given to its existing residents.</p>
8		<p>The town should have had a relief road built before any of this new development went ahead. The traffic is horrendous at the best of times through the town.</p>	

Appendix 1 – Survey responses

	<p>The consultation document has been revised to reflect updated policies in the Mid Devon Local Plan. Do you think the detail within the SPD properly reflects these updated policies?</p> <p>Please do not comment on the policy wording itself as this is adopted policy in the Local Plan.</p>	<p>Do you agree with the way the three new areas shown on the interactive map have been masterplanned?</p> <p>Please do not comment on whether the three parcels should be included as these are already allocated in the Local Plan.</p>	<p>Do you have any other comments on the draft North West Cullompton Masterplan SPD?</p> <p>Details of the key revisions are set out on the About the consultation page. You can view the full consultation document on the Draft masterplan page.</p>
9		<p>There are two areas where I would like to see changes. The first of these is around the three existing bridle paths on the site. I am the P3 volunteer for the parish but these remarks are all made in a personal capacity. I am keen to see these paths enhanced by the development and I feel more attention to them needs to be given the main part of the plan.</p> <p>While section 6.3 notes there are three paths and says they should be retained with existing character, the detail on what this means in practice is lacking. Firstly, as these are currently bridle paths, they need to be suitable for use by horse riders and cyclists as well as pedestrians. Secondly, the hedge banks along these paths are a key piece of the character. Thirdly it is important to understand the purpose of these paths in the future development to inform decision on possible improvements. Finally the existing bridleways will be crossed in two places by the link road and will require some sort of crossing. Section 4.4 is the obvious place to address these matters but at the moment it only refers to Goblin Lane (Bridleway 9) and not the two other paths Bridleway 8 (Bluebell Lane which run through the middle of the site) and Bridleway 10 (Growen Lane) which also borders the site.</p> <p>I would therefore suggest the bullet on Goblin Lane should be rewritten as: Retention of the three bridle paths running through the site (Growen Lane, Goblin Lane and Bluebell Lane) with their existing hedge banks kept intact and upgraded to facilitate their use for pedestrians, cyclist and horse riders. Where the link crosses these paths, suitable crossing should be provided for all users.</p> <p>The other matter concerns the impact of the traffic flow on the junction of Tiverton Road and Fore Street. This is a very congested and difficult junction and this development has the potential increase traffic here. The local plan states Development will be targeted to: Provide enhancements to the town centre through additional investment, traffic and transport improvements but this not mentioned in section 4.4. As well as enhancements and traffic calming measures on Willand Road, similar measures need to be considered on Tiverton Road.</p>	
10	No	No	The through road must be built first before any houses are built. This was done first on every new development that was built when I lived in Somerset.
11	<p>There should not be any access for construction via Tiverton Road. The junction at Costa is dangerous as it is and also coming from the north is very narrow. A new access road via Willand Road is required.</p> <p>None of these works should be allowed without the relief road being in place.</p>	No thought given to existing residents along Tiverton Road. There should be no construction traffic along here.	

Appendix 1 – Survey responses

	<p>The consultation document has been revised to reflect updated policies in the Mid Devon Local Plan. Do you think the detail within the SPD properly reflects these updated policies?</p> <p>Please do not comment on the policy wording itself as this is adopted policy in the Local Plan.</p>	<p>Do you agree with the way the three new areas shown on the interactive map have been masterplanned?</p> <p>Please do not comment on whether the three parcels should be included as these are already allocated in the Local Plan.</p>	<p>Do you have any other comments on the draft North West Cullompton Masterplan SPD?</p> <p>Details of the key revisions are set out on the About the consultation page. You can view the full consultation document on the Draft masterplan page.</p>
12	<p>I think a flat map does not allow for the full visualization of the impact of the proposed changes, the interaction section does not really work.</p>	<p>No I don't agree. The areas may have been allocated but the proposed usage is no of benefit to any residents either new/current/ or moving in the future. I can't see it will benefit local businesses or attract new ones as due to issues of transport, access and there is not enough green space included for the wildlife or residents.</p>	<p>Flooding: concerned that building on this open space will increase the risk of flooding, there are already issues in/around this area, water regularly seen on the road. In conjunction with other building sites in this area radically reduces opportunity for rain fall to be absorbed. Since building works have started on the Permission Homes site the nearby water course has on numerous occasions been brown, presumably with additional mud/sediment. This water course is part of the flood relief, if it becomes blocked or silted up it will increase risks of flooding, whether shown in flooding maps/reports from the environmental agency or not.</p> <p>Traffic: already many issues. This includes congestion giving pollution and raising issues of possible increased levels of collisions and road safety including cyclists and children. There is also the increase in lorries and plant machinery needing access, with multiple buildings sites running concurrently compounds impact of roads and road users. Many times, I've parked in the slow lane of the motorway to access Cullompton, there will be a serious/injury accident here soon, with large numbers of vehicles queuing this way. Increases of risk in winter months due to lack of lighting to show vehicle stationary. None of the proposed infrastructure changes to assist with this, the relief road, and the railway station, have not yet appeared with no current dates forthcoming. The relief road will still mean that all vehicles exit/enter the motorway on the same number of slip roads so will not reduce issues here, see above. If public access from the surrounding area to the train station is made by cars this will increase road usage, not decrease it. In addition, the buses and bus routes are being reduced another factor in increasing road usage. Surely it is imperative that this work is undertaken before any more houses are built in around Cullompton and the surrounding area. There needs to be a holistic review of all work in Cullompton and surrounding area, sites cannot be viewed in isolation and surely must be linked with all the other building work, the additional amount of traffic will be significant. I am a cyclist but will not currently cycle on the roads because they are too dangerous, traffic increasing make this even more dangerous. This includes access to the sites for lorries and other equipment that will be required for the building work.</p> <p>Additional infrastructure appears to be only inside the new sites, no proposals for external infrastructure to improve the area for current residents. Additional noise from traffic to building sites alone will increase issues of pollution in the area and subsequently the additional people and vehicles which will come with these many houses will also have issues the pollution. This also reduces the amount of open land in the area, not sure how this sits with conservation or loss of habitats, but this will have an ongoing effect. This covers all applications/plans in Cullompton itself and the wider area.</p> <p>There is a limit to the amount of housing and people that can be supported within the area. I understand that at least one of the current applications is going to build a school however where are the extra facilities required coming from? Here I talk about doctor surgeries, it's already very difficult to get an appointment; how will this be managed moving forward if you currently must wait over 4 weeks to see a doctor? How will more people moving into the area with no sign of additional medical facilities going to work. There is no mention of extra facilities for shopping or fuel will both be needed by more people being in the area this will have a knock-on effect of more deliveries more vehicles more lorries more pollution more chance of collisions and accidents.</p> <p>It does not appear to be an all-inclusive approach to the expansion of Cullompton, the rate of build loss of green spaces. The relief road is nowhere in sight, doesn't include an extra slip road in from the motorway putting all traffic through current ones. Surely before anymore building is approved the whole infrastructure needs to be reviewed and updated. At the rate of applications number of houses not only in Cullompton in other local areas, this will soon change from individual towns into one sprawling metropolis where Cullompton Bradninch Tiverton and Kentisbeare at least become one big area. I cannot see that this will be to the benefit anybody but human and wildlife.</p>

Appendix 1 – Survey responses

	<p>The consultation document has been revised to reflect updated policies in the Mid Devon Local Plan. Do you think the detail within the SPD properly reflects these updated policies?</p> <p>Please do not comment on the policy wording itself as this is adopted policy in the Local Plan.</p>	<p>Do you agree with the way the three new areas shown on the interactive map have been masterplanned?</p> <p>Please do not comment on whether the three parcels should be included as these are already allocated in the Local Plan.</p>	<p>Do you have any other comments on the draft North West Cullompton Masterplan SPD?</p> <p>Details of the key revisions are set out on the About the consultation page. You can view the full consultation document on the Draft masterplan page.</p>
13	Probably	<p>I do not believe that this development is appropriate without the investment required in infrastructure happening first. The roads are going to be gridlocked there is insufficient places in schools, there is not local access to education without having to travel out of Mid Devon. There is not the capacity in dental or medical practices.</p>	<p>Clearly the local plan seems to have been compiled by people that do not understand that agricultural land should remain for that purpose. If these developments are going to go ahead it will allow the urban sprawl of Cullompton to come outside the bowl of the valley it currently sits in. We seem to have retrogressed in that we are using new land rather than repurposing brownfield sites because of the cost. It also seems that the local/masterplan does not take into account that without the infrastructure being properly funded nothing should be approved.</p>
14	Broadly	<p>We would use the local centre if built, ideal. Looking at it overall, I find it strange when councils are trying to make people walk/not use cars, why is the housing proposed at the furthest points from the local centre/shops but land nearest the local centre has no houses? Does not make sense to me. Can you ensure it has a good range of shops so we can get food/useful bits during the week?</p>	
15	Think so difficult to say	<p>No, please see below. Looks an obvious point when reviewing the masterplan, should build close to facilities, within 400 m, as radius arcs show.</p>	<p>A lot is mentioned about sustainability and local centre/employment in the report. When is this being built and by whom? Are housebuilders responsible for delivery? Is this via S106 etc? No mention of actual delivery of this in report just housing etc. Out of the 3 parcels proposed, why build houses so far from the local centre and not use the land nearest the local centre? Current layout goes against the report, suggest making it easy to walk to shops. For example north land too far from shops?</p>
16	Potentially	<p>Disagree with the masterplanning of 3 parcels. Housing development has been proposed on outer land (in part on a hill), on edge of the allocation away from facilities. This does not deliver sustainable communities and allowing people to walk to daily facilities. By co-locating mixed uses this promotes sustainable living. To make a local centre attractive and viable you need it surround it with daily customers who can walk or neighbour the centre.</p> <p>Housing should be focused on land more central to the allocation. Outer land should be re-considered or more GI to buffer development creeping into a new valley to up Tiverton Road. We believe the Scoble parcel of land can be better utilised, to better use development land well positioned in a more effective way to delivery housing and other uses (employment and local centre and Care) required by to the Policy. This is reflected in the forthcoming application for the site. The current Scoble land with 76% GI, is unlikely to be viable or available for the land uses/mixture currently proposed. We are aware the SPD cannot change policies of the previous Local Plan and we hope to work with MDDC on revised proposals going forward.</p>	
17 P			<p>It looks a bit like you are asking if the changes you have made are reflected accurately in the documents. If we can't comment on the changes themselves, what is the point?</p>

Appendix 1 – Survey responses

	<p>The consultation document has been revised to reflect updated policies in the Mid Devon Local Plan. Do you think the detail within the SPD properly reflects these updated policies?</p> <p>Please do not comment on the policy wording itself as this is adopted policy in the Local Plan.</p>	<p>Do you agree with the way the three new areas shown on the interactive map have been masterplanned?</p> <p>Please do not comment on whether the three parcels should be included as these are already allocated in the Local Plan.</p>	<p>Do you have any other comments on the draft North West Cullompton Masterplan SPD?</p> <p>Details of the key revisions are set out on the About the consultation page. You can view the full consultation document on the Draft masterplan page.</p>
18 P	<p>The updated policies now allow building behind Siskin/Nightingale whereas before this was designated as an overspill only and houses couldn't be built until the NW link road was built. So how can we be sure updated policies will not allow the new (massive) NW Extension estates to be built before the link road?</p>	<p>Need a larger proportion of affordable housing. Need to ensure there are electric car charging points installed in the new housing and areas where there are public spaces.</p>	<p>MDDC should insist on behalf of the Cullompton residents and tax payers that the NW link road is built before ANY houses are built. And please do not build that link road like the Swallow Way road, which one can only assume was a vindictive move by MDDC Planning against Cullompton residents. I hope the person – head of planning committee – responsible for agreeing this lost their job. Absolute disgrace. No confidence in MDDC planning committee to work for the best outcome for Cullompton.</p>
19 P		<p>I am disappointed to find that the plans displayed are so small and only 2 people can look at the plan at any one time. I appreciate the explanations given by the officers attending. Please could we have larger maps in future?</p>	<p>I am most concerned about the crossing of Goblin Lane.</p> <p>I am also concerned about the loss of our precious countryside, when there are still brownfield sites in Cullompton itself which remain derelict, especially the large site by Aldi's on the other side of Exeter Road.</p> <p>I also feel that before ANY houses are built, the congestion in the centre of Cullompton should be addressed. The relief road should have priority before any houses are built.</p>
20 P		<p>It is in no way big enough for people to see. My real concern is for Tiverton Road in the construction process. Even now it is difficult to navigate especially early in the morning when there are people going to work.</p> <p>My other concern is for the secondary school. I gather that there will be spending. Will that be given in front or will it be reactive when it will not be able to be used so constructively? Also will there be a new secondary school in the garden village as otherwise there will be problems at the motorway.</p>	<p>The whole process would be much helped by building the road through the CCA fields first which would at least help the traffic situation.</p>
21 E			<p>Why are the roads not being put in place first, how can people trust the council when the council are afraid of Developers?</p>

Appendix 1 – Survey responses

	<p>The consultation document has been revised to reflect updated policies in the Mid Devon Local Plan. Do you think the detail within the SPD properly reflects these updated policies?</p> <p>Please do not comment on the policy wording itself as this is adopted policy in the Local Plan.</p>	<p>Do you agree with the way the three new areas shown on the interactive map have been masterplanned?</p> <p>Please do not comment on whether the three parcels should be included as these are already allocated in the Local Plan.</p>	<p>Do you have any other comments on the draft North West Cullompton Masterplan SPD?</p> <p>Details of the key revisions are set out on the About the consultation page. You can view the full consultation document on the Draft masterplan page.</p>
<p>22 E</p>			<p>I am really disappointed that this plan has materialised after comments had previously been voiced and seemingly heard that houses shouldn't be coming into another valley.</p> <p>The extra buildings below Rull farm in this revised plan, are now over the brow, where then, does this expansion stop, if you are now entering another valley. It is also then impinging in the community there, as well as Cullompton, making a small hamlet, largely farming and also a couple of other businesses, which work on the back of being rural. I realise that we are a small community, but does that mean that our voice counts for nothing?</p> <p>It feels as if the houses, are being built for greed and speed, rather than with thought of both the people who will subsequently live there, people who live here at the moment, the environment, or the future.</p> <p>There are several brown field sites that have not been used in this new revised master plan, instead good prime agricultural land, that would be so useful for feeding the future generations</p> <p>I feel that this should not be roller coasted through. I am so saddened by the way that this has been done and that there is no thought. Also that we have had no letter through the post, dropped off, e-mail, or any communication, although it will affect us greatly, some of the parishioners are not aware of this revised plan.</p>

P = Paper survey

E = email