

Northwest Cullompton Urban Extension

Masterplan SPD Stage 1 Consultation Summary

In total, there were 65 valid responses received during the consultation period which ran from the 12th September until the 12th October 2014.

Responses were received via mail, email, a comments box at the Hayridge Centre and through an online questionnaire. This document summarises the responses received.

The masterplan will need to take account of and enhance natural/environmental features of the site and its surroundings. Are there existing environmental features you would particularly like to be protected or enhanced?

Many of the respondents which commented on this section mentioned the retention of hedgerows, mature trees and public rights of way through the site. A number of respondents suggested the retention of Rull Hill as a green space and the conservation of the Roman Fort on St Andrew's Hill. Sixteen percent of respondents asked that Goblin Lane be protected and nine percent were concerned over the loss of countryside and views due to the proposed development.

"Spoiling Devon Countryside unnecessarily when other options have not been thoroughly explored"

"I am very worried that the 'essence' of Cullompton will be lost with the positioning of the development on the north western edge, as it will be built into the beautiful, up to now unspoilt hillside."

"Development should be low level (no more than 2 storeys high), at the base of/along the contours of any hills/ or as much 'on the flat' so that no housing is prominent and so to retain the 'countryside' feel and appeal of the area."

"This allocation also involves the development of environmentally and archaeologically sensitive land as evidenced in the 'constraints' paper and now seeks to develop land previously agreed as green infrastructure in previous consultations."

"The little dip near St George's Well is of real character and should be protected."

"Development of land that is elevated should be carefully designed and screened."

"The footpaths that run through the site are used by many local people to 'escape' from the town into a rural setting. It will be a significant loss if they do not retain the rural feel that they currently have."

"The area AL/CU/1 to the west of Growen Lane is currently used for equestrian purposes and should not therefore be included in the plan."

"Rull Hill left as a high level family leisure outlook vista and casual recreational area."

“Any development must have a zero impact upon the environment. For example any hedge rows and trees removed by the developers for roads etc. must be replanted elsewhere within the development.”

“Protection for Goblin Lane all the way to Rull Lane is essential as there are rare plants growing in the hedge rows and evidence of ancient boundaries.”

“As many of the mature trees as possible.”

“The water meadow identified as Floodzone between St Georges View and St Georges Well should be a protected habitat.”

“There is at least one ancient oak tree with a protection order located on the edge of St Georges View which needs to be preserved.”

“It would be good to try and enhance the ‘Roman Fort’ on St Andrews Hill and provide suitable access to and signage for the site.”

“Goblin Lane Access – There will obviously be a major increase in pedestrians using Goblin Lane for access once the estate is built. The lane is and always has been over the last 27 years in a very poor condition. Could the lane be made up with drainage and proper tarmac?”

Planning policy allocated the site for 1100 dwellings and employment. Due to site constraints, this cannot be achieved. Only 700 houses are likely to be provided on the allocated site. It is unlikely that this will be enough to pay for the infrastructure that would be required including the new road, primary school and other community facilities. Should the boundaries between the green infrastructure and housing land be amended on order to increase the amount of housing to compensate for this and pay for these facilities?

Of the 65 responses received, eleven were unhappy about the option of less green infrastructure and commented that:

“This is bureaucratic speak but actually blackmail. So the choice is Either NO ‘infrastructure’ plus houses OP1, versus high density housing and a new inadequate poorly sited ‘ring road’.”

The developers are already trying to ‘twist arms’ for more land before they can provide an adequate infrastructure.”

“It always seems like green infrastructure is the first to go in situations like this.”

“How come the policy allocates the site for 1100 dwellings and employment but they already know they cannot achieve this number!!”

“The scale and loss to the green infrastructure allocation on the original plan is unacceptable.”

Many of the respondents believed that the new road and primary school were critical for the development, many saying they would only choose the second option of more development to ensure these infrastructure requirements were met. Overall, 23 respondents chose an option some

of which felt they were being coerced into choosing the higher amount of housing to achieve all the required infrastructure. Of those 23, 44% were in favour of increasing the number of houses built and reducing the green infrastructure while 56% were not in favour of increasing the amount of housing to obtain the infrastructure required. As many of the respondents who chose the second option of more development mentioned only doing so to ensure the required infrastructure be delivered, these results are biased towards the more development option (Option 2).

"Infrastructure needs to be guaranteed/fully funded first, as there is already too much traffic for the roads we have and limited options for motorway access."

"If the only way to achieve the new road, school and community facilities is to amend the green infrastructure etc. then this should be done."

"I suggest that full use is made of any existing brownfield sites within the town environs before considering expansion into green spaces. Whilst the country needs homes, it needs agriculture and food more."

"I'm split on this if there was more information on how full the schools were for example then I would be able to make a better decision."

"700 houses are not enough, there should be more in Cullompton, surely there is a need locally?"

Some of the respondents asked where the contributions from previous developments in Cullompton had gone and why other developments in Cullompton could not contribute to the required infrastructure. It was also suggested that the site be increased to include some of the areas of land put forward in the Local Plan Review Options Consultation to ensure that the amount of green infrastructure be retained and the requirements for other infrastructure achieved.

"What have you done with all the money from the houses already built?" (Along Tiverton Road and between it and Swallow Way as well as the proposed 700 houses)

"With careful design of the site, the number of houses could be increased without losing too much green infrastructure. There should be no development at all if we will not get the school etc."

The development will increase traffic. How should this be dealt with and where should the proposed road connect into Tiverton Road and Willand Road?

The current traffic problems within Cullompton were mentioned often in the representations received. Nearly a quarter (23%) of respondents expressed the need for either updating or creating a new motorway junction at the beginning of or before any more development occurred while nearly a third (28%) declared the need of a relief road to be in use early in the development or before any development occurred. Mention was given to the current state of the High Street, where one stopped car or lorry could create extensive traffic problems. It was also suggested that the junction of Higher Street and Station Road be upgraded for the current and future amounts of traffic.

“The other infrastructure improvement suggested is traffic lights at the motorway junction, this will exacerbate the queues which already occur at peak times will result in gridlock if another 1000-1200 cars are trying to use the roads.”

“We understand that a link road will be built but will this actually make any difference to the High Street. Will the link road be built before anything else as to alleviate the army of work vehicles delivering building materials.”

Of the 65 respondents, nine percent said that the creation of a new road and development should not result in the creation of new rat runs. Five percent of respondents mentioned that Langlands Road was currently used as a rat run and this should not be the case for the new development. It was also mentioned that the amount of car parking for dwellings needs to be adequate to ensure that cars are not parked on the roads.

“This is essential and needs to be built like Swallow Way, not Langlands Road, so there are no cars parked on it – Safer for everyone.”

“We have been given verbal assurances that this will not become a motorists ‘rat run’. Would like to see this in writing. Can money from the builders be used to tarmac the lane and put in proper drainage.”

Of the 65 respondents, 28 commented on their preferred option of the location of the proposed new road meeting Willand Road. Option 1, the roundabout at Millennium Way, received 36% in favour, while Option 2, linking to Willand Road, received 64% in support. Some of the respondents were concerned over the routes of Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) as the route from Willand to Station Road has a weight restriction on it. Four of the respondents suggested that the proposed new road join with Tiverton Road to the west of Trumps Orchard near the junction of Ponsford Lane, rather than past the cemetery. It was also suggested that the High Street be made either one way or become pedestrianized, or that the new development not be accessible from Tiverton Road.

“Good well thought through safe junctions are essential at both road connections.”

“There should be NO access at all on to Tiverton Road from any part of the area.”

“The pedestrianisation of the main high street would attract new retail opportunities. Dare we even imagine it could rival Totnes as a favoured retail opportunity for independent stores and high quality retailers.”

“There should be a scheme that connects the two roads- It should allow the town feel to continue and not be a wide relief road but a series of tributary roads – somewhere near the cemetery and St Georges View would provide a good access. Relevant roads should have some restrictions to maximise traffic flow at peak times.”

“I would prefer it to be beyond Trumps Orchard but the end of the lane leading to Knowle Lane by Trumps Barn would link better to the road in the new estate.”

"The proposed road layout of the development ring road with Tiverton Road should be opposite Ponsford Lane with a view to running straight across the bottom of Knowle Lane by the Rugby Club and join Swallow Way there, solely to make the best of a bad situation altogether."

DCC supports the proposal of the junction of Tiverton Road and Olympia Way being re-aligned "so that priority runs from the west onto the new highway link (and vice versa)."

"Within the NW Extension, the road from Tiverton Road to Willand Road must be a distributor type road in order to cope with the sudden increase in traffic that results from a motorway closure"

Cullompton Town Council

"I would like to see a north western relief road that can be accessed from the padbrook roundabout, all around the north of the town, past the rugby club, through the west side near knowle, all around the back of trumps barn, to pick up the roundabout at the Willand side of Millennium Way, this should include shops, pub, schools and industrial along the way."

"No access into Tiverton Road. This road should be closed at the junction with Cullompton High Street."

"A traffic data survey of the whole town should be conducted in order that a proper traffic management plan for the whole town can be formulated and implemented"

"The idea to make a B road into a link road is nonsensical... there is a weight restriction from Willand to Station Road."

"One would question whether the road through Willand is able to support the proposed additional 1000-1500 cars which the new housing would inevitable come with."

"There should be a ban on large commercial vehicles and buses using Tiverton Road. I do however appreciate the need for two way traffic for emergency and delivery vehicles."

"A road should only be considered if it runs across Old Tiverton Road to link into Swallow Way thus providing a route round the west of the town."

The residential element will provide a range of housing types and affordability. What types of housing would you like to see?

For all the responses received about the types of housing, there was a large mixture of suggestions. Many respondents suggested the need for the development to integrate the mixture of houses, with a need for affordable housing, housing for the elderly, eco-housing or housing with solar panels and the suggestion of some self-build plots also incorporated in the site. It was mentioned (by 14% of respondents) that there should be enough parking for two or more cars per dwelling at least, as there are other new developments in the town where not enough parking was provided and this has resulted in parking on the road, causing problems for pedestrian, cyclist, buses and other car users. A handful of respondents mentioned the need for good design, referencing poor design standards in other locations of Cullompton which would not be acceptable in this development. The evidence for

the need for the quantity of housing proposed was requested as well as the evidence for the amount of social housing needed.

Some respondents considered that to meet the housing needs of Cullompton 2-3 bed dwellings would be most appropriate. Other felt that building a proportion of larger 5 bed dwellings would pull in families with high household incomes and hence spending power into the local economy and town centre businesses in particular.

"A mixed range of houses well integrated so that there are no separate areas for affordable housing, old people or those better off. That would lead to a much more cohesive community."

"As much variety as possible. Mixed housing interspersed with green areas would create a pleasant environment. Affordable housing should also look attractive, rooms should not be too small as this end of the market are more likely to have young children."

"Wide range of 2-5 bedroom houses i.e. terrace, semi-detached and detached. All with garages and drives."

"Housing design should reflect on existing properties where they are near to the development."

"Ideally the new properties should allow for proper frontage and rear garden, unlike the 2012 Swallow Way development where some are very small and everyone is on top of their neighbours."

"High quality older persons mini villages as per the Florida template, will bring loads of cash into the area."

"Houses with character (not little boxes made of ticky tacky). Affordable homes (and I mean affordable – for young couples) not executive houses and a good allocation of social housing but houses they can be proud of (not Colditz style)."

"Houses that will be environmentally friendly and reduce the fuel bills for the homeowners."

"As evidenced by the millwood development the need for a high proportion of social housing is non existing in Cullompton."

"Cullompton needs a stronger influx of wealthy residents who will have disposable income and the houses should be middle or upper quality homes."

"I would like to see some self build plots and also some 'eco' housing."

"There needs to be a full range of housing available from affordable small starter flats and homes, through to proper large family homes with gardens. There should also be an allocation for bungalows and retirement/sheltered housing in the appropriate places."

The urban extension proposes employment floorspace. What types of employment should this include and where should it be located?

Of all 65 respondents, only 11 (17%) chose an option for the location of floorspace. Eight were in favour of employment in the north east of the development and three were in favour of the employment site being split between the north and the south. Many were concerned over the increase in large vehicles in Cullompton from employment areas in the new development and a number suggested that there should not be any employment in the new development at all, but extend the Kingsmill site to the east of the M5. Some queried the need for employment space when there are empty employment spaces in Willand and the Kingsmill Industrial Estate. Of the suggestions received, many wanted light industry or offices. One suggestion was to create a 'pre-science park' and link it to the Exeter Science Park as a start-up location for small high tech industries before moving to the larger Science Park in Exeter.

"Is there a strategy to introduce the right level of sustainable economic development so that Cullompton does not become a huge commuter town?"

"Not sure how this will work at either site as there is a weight limit in place between Willand and Millennium Way???"

"Why not extend the industrial estate on the other side of the motorway (Kingsmill) or other areas already set up for industrial use, such as Alexandra Industrial Estate or similar?"

"Whatever is built should not need regular deliveries by large HGV lorries. Small local businesses should be encouraged and located so as not to disturb residential houses."

"Probably nearer the northern end of the area to give easy access to the motorway via Millennium Way."

"Light industry, small garages, offices. End of proposed new layout with good easy access to road network."

"Out of town large M&S and Waitrose and others suitable to attract visitors to area and provide ample free parking."

"There are suitable units already available in Cullompton and Willand with the appropriate infrastructure in place."

"Mixture of office type accommodation and small scale workshops – Larger scale employment would be more appropriate the other side of the motorway near the present estate."

"The quality of existing retail and distribution type employment space needs a serious quality upgrade and there is potential to do so East of J28."

"Flexibility is key – units that can adjust the internal space with partitioning to accommodate a variety of businesses, particularly small businesses and allow them to grow. Start-up and early growth businesses need easy-in easy-out arrangements. We could try creating a 'pre-science park' for businesses aspiring to be part of the Exeter Science Park but not yet big enough to afford to move there and have a link between the two."

Where should the new primary school be located?

Of the 65 respondents, 39 commented on their preferred option for the location of the new primary school. The north east location (Option 1) received 15% responses in favour, with Option 2 (near the Health Centre) and Option 3 (Rull Hill) receiving 44 and 41 percent respectively. Many people commented that they would like to see the proposed sports pitches next to the school, so they could be utilised by the pupils and that the location of the school should be accessible and safe for cars, pedestrians and cyclists.

“Current policy states that a site the size of 2.1 hectares will be required, however it is considered that at this scale impacts upon the amount of housing or green infrastructure the site can deliver, then a developable site of 1.8 hectares would be acceptable.” DCC

“Don’t think any are very good.” (Options for location)

“New sports pitches should, obviously, be near the school so they can make use of them.”

“A School surrounded by green fields on 3 sides would be fantastic for the children.”

“Anywhere you can provide good safe access for pedestrians/cycles and adequate short stay car parking.”

The masterplan will provide major areas of green and recreational space. What should this include? Where should new sports pitches be located?

Three respondents believed that the Cullompton Community Association fields should be retained, and many respondents believed that as well as having a few large sports pitches, investment should be made into the current recreational spaces in Cullompton. A large number of respondents were in favour of having larger areas of green space and not having small play areas for children, as it was felt that these areas were not utilised to their full extent.

“Fairly good facilities are already on CCA so why not offer development resources to them?”

“Experience has shown that small play areas have very little play value and the play equipment is not always used in the way that it was intended.”

“We already have major areas of green spaces – that you are trying to destroy to put in different green space... it just doesn’t make sense.”

“In the consultation a number of sites are mentioned for the location of new sports pitches but in the town we already have successful rugby, cricket and football clubs together with two crown bowls clubs so I would suggest improvements to these facilities would be of greater benefit to the town.”

“Do we really need more small children play areas?? Current locations look to be underutilised – where are the signature spaces for teenagers??”

“The masterplan shows the sports pitches away from CRFC therefore additional maintenance equipment and secure storage area will be required.” CRFC suggested placing new pitched adjacent current ones so they are better able to look after and utilise them.

Of the four options for the location of green and recreational spaces a total of 22 respondents showed a preference. Both the first (split land between Rull Hill and land north and south) and the third (split land between Rull Hill and land to the north) options received support by five respondents each, while the second option (land to the west) received support from only three respondents. The fourth option (split between Rull Hill and land to the west) receive the most support, having a total of nine respondents in favour of the option. Along with sufficient parking for visitors to the green spaces and sports pitches, it was suggested that the following be included within these spaces:

- Allotments;
- Community garden;
- Orchard;
- Wildlife habitat
- Landscaped parkland; and
- Skate boarding park.

“Sports pitches should be located toward the Willand end of the development in order that they can be accessed from Millennium Way.”

“We would like to propose that there be a community owned health garden adjacent to the Culm Valley Integrated Centre for Health.”

“Community gardens are not a new concept but this one would be unique bringing together our health centre, local patient groups and voluntary services, the proposed new school and outside academic and horticultural/agricultural initiatives.”

“The proposal of a community ‘Health Garden’ is a once in a lifetime opportunity to link local planning with a radical proposal to improve health. Bringing health, education and the local community together, this proposal offers Cullompton a unique opportunity to be a pioneer and to showcase a new way of improving the health and welfare of its patients and residents.”

“Option 2 – The new sports pitches suggested near Tiverton Road are actually shown placed on a sloping field (not flat). The adjacent building land is shown on an absolutely flat field. The site should be reversed with sports pitches on the flat field and the building sites on the sloping field. This would also place the pitches that much nearer to Cullompton and its schools.”

“New sports pitches should, obviously, be near the school so they can make use of them.”

“Cullompton is in desperate need of accessible public Tennis courts.”

“Consideration should be given to developing a network of wildlife walks or large semi open parkland as free to access land.”

“Need to allow sufficient space for parking.”

The policy proposes a new community centre and youth facilities. What new community facilities are needed? Where should they be located?

A total of 18 respondents inquired into the need for new facilities in Cullompton as there are several community facilities in Cullompton, two of which (The Hayridge Centre and the Cullompton Community Centre) are only a few years old. It was questioned whether developer contributions could go toward the Cullompton Swimming Pool Campaign which is a registered charity that is trying to raise the funds to build and operate a community based pool. One representation claims that nearly £110,000 has been raised and that a site at Padbrook has been selected. Apart from contributing to the Cullompton Swimming Pool Campaign, it was also suggested that facilities should be located near to the centre of the development and the following community facilities be considered:

- Somewhere for the older generation to meet up for tea, dance, bingo etc.
- Public House
- Community Hall/Youth club
- Free parking facilities

“We already have a new community centre and a lovely library, what we need is free parking.”

“I also question whether the provision of local retail and community facilities within the new estate will isolate the estate rather than join it to the local centre, so current ‘indies’ in the high street would possibly not benefit from more footfall.”

“I have difficulty in understanding what the ‘new local centre’ is and what its purpose is and how it might take footfall away from The Walronds, The Hayridge and the new Cullompton Community Centre (off Church Street).”

“I think there are serious reservations (for me) about additional Community Facilities (other than a new school) given the investment there has been in the Hayridge, The Walronds and Cullompton Community Centre (off Church Street) which MDDC seem to be in denial about!!”

“Cullompton does not have a community arts theatre which could include exhibition and performing space, rehearsal space, cinema, etc. This would be a very welcome addition to the town.”

“I have massive difficulty with this issue given that DCC seem to have ‘given up’ on the John Tallack Centre, MDDC have (over many years?) under-invested in the Leisure facilities and they also seem to be in absolute denial that Cullompton Community Centre already exists.”

"If the housing is allowed then the developers should also make a contribution to the Cullompton Swimming Pool Campaign who will be building a swimming pool and hydrotherapy pool at Padbrook Park, facilities which will be used by residents of the new housing.

"The new school needs to be multipurpose (hence sports pitches adjacent), the John Tallack Centre needs revitalising and there needs to be Town and District Council support to sustain Cullompton Community Centre (opened in Jan 2012)."

"Spend money on saving existing facilities not on unnecessary new ones. "

"I was under the impression that community centres were being closed across Devon and as we have recently had the new library not sure if there is a need."

"Who would fund new youth facilities??"

"Near town centre and not adjacent to homes."

"Located centrally on site."

"Do need a letterbox at north end of Cully!"

Please comment on the two emerging development options. Of the two options put forward, do you have a preference?

Of the 65 respondents just under half showed a preference. Seven respondents (21%) preferred the first option while 20 (61%) preferred the second option. Six decided that neither option was preferred (18%).

Overall do you agree with the proposed scope and content of the proposed masterplan document?

Twenty-eight respondents conveyed their approval or disapproval of the scope of the proposed masterplan document. Sixteen (57%) believed that the scope of the document was adequate, while 12 respondents (43%) believed it was not adequate.

"This sort of development relies on development providing essential 'infrastructure' i.e. roads which are always there will compromise planners who are supposed to safeguard the interests of the population already living there, but never can."

"I do not feel well enough informed to answer this fully."

"Yes - The more homes the more wealth to the town the better."

Do you have any other comments to make on the proposed masterplan document?

There were many comments on other areas of the proposed masterplan for the northwest Cullompton urban extension. The main points raised were around flooding and drainage issues, noise and air pollution (11%), the inclusion of pedestrian and cycle paths, the reestablishment of the train station and suggested restricting the development to two stories. There were a few comments that the consultation was not well publicised and that having meetings during the working day meant many commuters were unable to attend events. Around 10% of respondents questioned the need for an urban extension in this location when there is the option in the Local Plan Review for an urban extension to the east of the M5.

One respondent expressed their opposition to development at Junction 27 and a few respondents referred to farmland around Cullompton as 'green belt' land when explaining how they did not want development on good quality agricultural land.

Re-establish the train station. *"It could be done simply and cheaply, again getting network rail to just tweak the timetable."*

A new M5 Junction should be created to the south of the town on the B3181. *"Then at least the M5 will be doing the job it stole from the town because it absorbed its original bypass."*

"It looks very exciting and the first positive action in the town for some time."

Don't cover the countryside in housing. *"Once its concreted over you cannot produce food."*

"A programme of archaeological investigation needs to be undertaken. Although there has been some archaeological work undertaken so far, not enough has been done to sufficiently cover the masterplan area. Devon County Historic Environment Team are happy to discuss the scope of works required."

"The option to co-locate the primary school, sports facilities and possibly a rank of shops with shared parking would seem a sensible solution."

"Has the New town at Cranbrook area been utilised fully or is there capacity to develop this site further?" (N.B. Outside Mid Devon District)

"Has an assessment been carried out to assess the audible, visible, and environmental (air quality/pollution) impact of traffic and new road system? If not why not?"

"Are there any plans to implement cycle paths and tracks, as this area is popular with cyclists and the roads are dangerous enough as it is, with a thousand new homes this will become dangerous in the extreme."

"I think the council should stand their ground and allow development but not at all costs."

"Not enough information on access, parking, footpath, cycle routes and traffic management."

"What measures are being taken to minimise the impact on local residents adjacent to the site?"

"Put in user friendly signage and police it (parking on double yellow lines by Barclays, Ignoring the no right turn into main street, tell Tiverton Road users where M5 is)."

"The Council should review the entire current allocation needed in light of the proposed Eastern Urban Extension to Cullompton of 3,000 houses as defined in Mid Devon Plan."

"The Council should look to maintain natural beauty of Rull Hill and protect rural setting of historic Rull Hamlet built around Grade II Listed Medieval Farmhouse 'Little Rull'."

"As this allocation predates the Mid Devon decision to extensively develop the East of Cullompton, we believe this whole allocation should be reviewed strategically."

"The North West Cullompton Urban Extension should take into account other emerging allocations, in the interests of safeguarding future growth options."

Network Rail request a Policy is included within the document which requires developers to fund any qualitative improvements required in relation to existing facilities and infrastructure as a direct result of increased patronage resulting from new development.

"Any development must start at the Willand end of Cullompton as the town is already congested with lorries and the junction between High Street, Fore Street and Tiverton Road is not designed for large vehicles."

"Angle the roofs of properties in a southerly direction so solar panels can be fitted where the electricity is needed rather than filling our fields with ugly solar panels."

With the provision of 1100 homes, the population will potentially increase by over 10%. There is nothing in the plan mentioning additional doctors and dentist facilities, both of which are currently overloaded.

"Although the new link road is welcomed what additional works will be carried out to alleviate the already overloaded Station Road and Junction 28???"

"It is also, regretfully, absolutely necessary to build the relief road through the CCA fields which is not in this plan."

"What sort of noise alleviation will you put in place? This question also applies to the new Link Road?"

"If infrastructure such as sports facilities were to be opposite our property, would there be flood lit pitches as this would cause problems in the evening."

"The recent developments in Tiverton Road has also seen a large increase in pedestrian traffic to schools and shops. Anyone coming out of the Kingfisher Estate has to cross Tiverton Road on a 'T' junction and back again (just past the Plymouth Brethren building) in order to remain safe. There are no continuous pavements coming out of that estate." Current lack of safe pavements.

"The safety of the people of Cullompton must come before the developers profits."

"Moving the main bus route through Kingfisher Reach is totally ridiculous as the road narrows and has four dog leg bends that does not lend themselves to the use of large buses who would have to take up almost all the road when turning them."

“May I suggest a community meeting whereby we are addressed by a Councillor with the full details of the proposal and where the residents have a chance to put forward their views and questions?”

“I would like to know where I can gain more information on the full scale of this project and the impact it will have on the current community and property prices.”

“Look to remove heavy vehicles from town centre by using northern orbital route to Swallow Way via Knowle Lane.”

“Is an eastern relief road from Millennium Way through to Padbrook roundabout also proposed (despite the issues of floodplain and the CCA fields)?”

“There is still not enough emphasis on flood risk, creative development of green spaces and there seems to be a tacit acceptance that Cullompton is (and will continue to be) a commuter town for Exeter and Taunton etc.”

“Where is the focus on localism, local regeneration and getting a signature inward investment to create more local jobs.”

“It flies in the face of residents wishes and ignores previous consultations. It puts existing facilities at risk and fails to identify whatever need it is to address.”

“I believe the government should take more responsibility for the expansion plans – if it demands more housing then it should contribute to the infrastructure – i.e. distributor road, improved access onto M5 and a new railway station and train service.”

“Allegedly this is a much larger proposed development and would allow for the infrastructure, i.e. the motorway junction to be improved, traffic lights would just exacerbate the existing problems.”

“Drainage and Flood risk from surface water and ground water is not well documented here. There is a lot of knowledge in the local community and evidence from recent works that must inform the plan – otherwise there is a real danger that the proposed development will cause massive difficulties both to residents in lower lying adjoining properties, or to flood risk from the rivers downstream of the site if run off is not properly controlled.”

Gypsy and Traveller Pitches

There were a number of representations opposed to including Gypsy and Traveller sites or questioning the expected need for them. Of all the 65 respondents, two thought the western area was the best location for Gypsy and Traveller pitches and one thought the northern location was preferred. No preference was given for the spit of the Gypsy and Traveller pitches between the west and north locations. A few representations believed that the pitches should not be on the outside of the development but more integrated, while others suggested the pitches be away from sports fields and pitches.

“We object to the Gypsy and Traveller site options presented on the grounds that they are not inclusive locations and are at a disadvantage in accessing key facilities and services. In the event that

employment land and the school were located in the north of the area, Option 2 might become more viable.”

Cullompton Town Council – Want to have confirmed:

- the number of Gypsy and Traveller pitches needed to meet legal obligations;
- whether showmen sites fall under the same legislation as the gypsy and traveller pitches proposed for NW Cullompton;
- whether the total number of existing gypsy and traveller pitches in Cullompton conforms to Government guidance and whether there is a need for additional pitches to be provided.

“On one of the plans a proposed travellers site is situated next to the pitches, in my experience, travellers and sports pitches do not mix.”

“If Option 2 is adopted the proposed Travellers site next to the sports pitches lacks foresight as further travellers could be encouraged to meet up and invade the sports facilities as recently happened in Exeter thus making the facilities unusable.”

“I would also like to understand why a Gypsy site is deemed necessary in this location.”

“I don’t agree with the traveller site off Tiverton Road - it would be better to the north which isn’t so congested.”

“I wholeheartedly disagree with travellers pitches as I do not believe they will be used an example is down by Nag’s Head Bridge travellers pitches formed and never used.”