

Village sites (non-allocated)

| Policy/para | Summary of main issues raised | Comments made by (customer ID in brackets) | Response |
|---|---|---|-----------------|
| OBA1 Bourchier Close, Bampton (previously AL/BA/2) | Supports exclusion of site given re-classification of Bampton as a village. | Individual (2781, 5308, 2075, 2840) | Support noted. |
| | Supports exclusion as no need for housing given other recent developments in Bampton/no demand for office space in Bampton/existing commercial space elsewhere in village. | Individual (5562, 2840) | Support noted. |
| | Supports exclusion of the site as would extend village envelope into open countryside. | Individual (2482, 5840) | Comments noted. |
| | Strongly opposed to any building in/around Bampton. | Individual (5261) | Comments noted. |
| | Supports exclusion due to traffic impact on local road network, poor access/inadequate visibility, lack of or capacity of public transport, lack of footpaths/streetlights, implications for safety, lack of parking in village centre. | Individual (5308, 5309, 5562, 2075) | Comments noted. |
| | Supports exclusion as site not supported by local councillors at time of allocation in 2009/10. | Individual (2075) | Comments noted. |
| | Supports exclusion as will alter historic/popular landscape/is close to historic castle. | Individual (2075) | Comments noted. |
| | Concerns about flooding/capacity of sewage system, with history of floods noted. | Individual (5308, 5562, 2075) | Comments noted. |
| | Concerns about capacity of schools/doctors. | Individual (5308, 5309, 5562) | Comments noted. |
| | Concerns re lack of employment opportunities/leisure facilities for the young. | Individual (5309) | Comments noted. |
| | Supports exclusion on sustainability due to negative impact on climate change from residents having to drive to 'strategically placed workplaces'. | Individual (2075) | Comments noted. |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| | Objects to de-allocation of site as application has come forward demonstrating deliverability; site is sustainable, given level of facilities/services in Bampton. | Summerfield Developments Ltd c/o WYG (3773) | The plan proposes 4 allocations within Bampton, more than any other village. Of these two are brownfield redevelopments, whereas Bouchier Close would result in the loss of grade 3 agricultural land. The site is also elevated and visually prominent, and would be more intrusive than other sites proposed to be allocated. |
| | Objects – housing requirement in plan too low, site should be carried forward into new plan to given Bampton’s role and function in the district. | Summerfield Developments Ltd c/o WYG (3773) | The Council is proposing to amend the overall housing need figures to reflect the SHMA Final Report. There is sufficient housing supply within the plan, including an element of flexibility, and no requirement therefore to allocate additional sites. |
| OBA2 South Molton Road, Bampton | Objects to exclusion of site which is deliverable and sustainable, with good access and can provide local highway improvements/road safety benefits. | Colin Rowland c/o J Anning Land Planning Services (4925) | The plan allocates 4 sites within Bampton, more than any other village defined under S13. Further sites are not required. |
| | Site is in flood zone 1, in area of least risk of flooding; can be provided with a surface water drainage strategy based on SUDs principle; site can be connected to foul sewer network on B3227. | Colin Rowland c/o J Anning Land Planning Services (4925) | Comments noted. |
| | Strongly opposed to any building in/around Bampton. | Individual (5261) | Comments noted. |
| OBA3 Land at Ball Hill, Bampton | Strongly opposed to any building in/around Bampton. | Individual (5261) | Comments noted. |
| OBA4 School Close, Bampton (previously AL/BA/1) | Supports deletion of allocation but recommends settlement limit be amended to bring it back to existing hedge boundary. | Mr D. Stephenson c/o Jillings Hutton (5845) | An amendment is proposed to include the remaining part of the allocation OBA4 School Close, Bampton (previously AL/BA/1) to be consistent with the approach taken elsewhere in the plan that all permitted but unimplemented existing allocations be rolled forward into the Local Plan Review. |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| OBO2 East Langford Farm, Bow | Objects to exclusion of site, is preferable to BO1 'Land adj Hollywell'. | Bow Parish Council (47) | Comments noted, however the shape and location of the site represents an unusual and illogical extension to the built environment. The proposed allocations can be much more easily be assimilated within the existing pattern of the built environment. |
| | Site is suitable for development – is not known to flood, is unlikely to be archaeological interest and landscape impact can be mitigated. | Mr and Mrs G&D Jackman c/o Stephens Scown LLP (979) | Comments noted, however the shape and location of the site represents an unusual and illogical extension to the built environment. The proposed allocations can be much more easily be assimilated within the existing pattern of the built environment. |
| | Traffic issues can be overcome via use of alternative access off Station Road, along with implementation of traffic calming scheme. | Mr and Mrs G&D Jackman c/o Stephens Scown LLP (979) | The highways authority note that a transport solution may be achievable, but this will not overcome the reasons why other sites have been preferred as set out above. |
| OBO3 Land adj Jackman Car Park, Bow | Site should be included within settlement limit and infill permitted. | Individual (5254) | Site is not required. |
| OBO4 South of Iter Cross (Commercial) | Objects to de-allocation of employment site. | Bow Parish Council (47) | This site has been allocated since 2010 and has not come forward for development. Policies on rural employment development are now more permissive, so the site does not need to remain allocated in order to come forward. |
| OBO5 South West of Junction Road (commercial) | Objects to de-allocation of employment site. | Bow Parish Council (47) | This site has been allocated since 2010 and has not come forward for development. Policies on rural employment development are now more permissive, so the site does not need to remain allocated in order to come forward. |
| OCB1 Glebe, Cheriton Bishop | Site is better suited to new development than proposed allocation. | Individual (5269, 4672, 4630) | This is used as public open space, the loss of which is not preferable. |
| | Developing this site would allow opportunity to address issues of road safety associated with main C30 road; site has better access on to road. | Individual (4163, 5320, 4630) | Site has access on to the main road. However, for the reason set out above it is not preferred. |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| | Developing this site would have less impact on existing residents. | Individual (5320, 4630) | No clear reason why the impact of this site on existing residents is any different from proposed allocation or that those impacts are unacceptable. |
| OCB3 Land adj Woodleigh Hall, Cheriton Bishop | Site is better suited to new development than proposed allocation. | Individual (5269) | Not agreed. This site is isolated from the main body of the settlement. The proposed allocation can be assimilated within the existing pattern of the built environment. |
| OCB4 Land east of Hill View | Developing this site would allow opportunity to address issues of road safety associated with main C30 road; site has better access on to road. | Individual (5320, 4163, 5320, 4361, 4499, 4672, 4630) | Site has access on to the main road. Though this option could have been selected (being adjacent to existing development), the proposed allocation is in closer proximity to local facilities, such as the school, and could reduce walking times and reliance on private car. |
| | Developing this site would have less impact on existing residents. | Individual (5320, 4361 4499, 4630) | No clear reason why the impact of this site on existing residents is any different from proposed allocation or that those impacts are unacceptable. |
| | Site is better suited to new development than proposed allocation. | Individual (5320, 5269, 4361, 4499, 4672, 4630) | Not agreed. Please see comments above. |
| | Site is closer to pub and post office than proposed allocation and a footpath could be provided through the field to Church Lane. | Individual (4361) | Comments noted, however the proposed allocation is nearer the school, and proposed footpath is not in control of that site owner so no guarantee it can be delivered. |
| OCF1 Glebe, Cheriton Fitzpaine | Supports exclusion of the site/satisfied with Local Plan proposals for the village. | Individual (4273) | Support noted. |
| OCF2 Landboat Farm, | Supports exclusion of the site/satisfied with Local Plan proposals for the village. | Individual (4273) | Support noted. |

| | | | |
|---------------------------|--|----------------------------------|--|
| Cheriton Fitzpaine | Objects to exclusion of site and states is preferable to CF2 Land adj school. Raises concern about scoring between the sites within the Sustainability Appraisal in relation to natural and built environment, flooding, economic growth, community health/wellbeing, infrastructure. States land within the settlement limit should not be taken into account when scoring sites. | Garside Planning Services (3645) | Responses to specific comments are set out below. |
| | States that landscape impact has been overstated, with visual impact likely to be less than school site (CF2). | Garside Planning Services (3645) | The school site is on moderately higher ground than the objection site. However, within the context of the local landscape, both are relatively contained, with higher ground to north of proposed allocation and to south of objection site, with few opportunities for views in from long distances. The school site is visible from the public highway, but there is existing development along the south side of the road and buildings to the east and the school to the west. These buildings screen much of the site from views and provide a degree of mitigation to any visual impact. Presence of dwellings on south side of highway means that skyline when viewed (from very limited viewpoints to south) is unlikely to be significantly altered. |
| | Site could create physical link between adjacent housing. | Garside Planning Services (3645) | These comments are acknowledged and not disputed. It would lead to a considerable length of linear frontage development on the south side of the entrance to the village, whereas the proposed allocation would result in a more balanced design encompassing both sides of the street. |
| | Questions 'loss of open space' associated with site, with area in question never fulfilling function as is private land; redevelopment could provide accessible public area. | Garside Planning Services (3645) | The land was previously designated as being 'important land for sport and recreation'. |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| <p>OCFNEW Bramble Orchard, Cheriton Fitzpaine</p> | <p>Objects to plan allocations and submits new land for housing and provision of alternative footpath for school use. Objector owns field which proposes for development, potentially via inclusion in neighbourhood plan. Sale of land for housing would enable owner to address high mortgage costs, but also to release proceeds of sale to purchase Arthur's Wood, which is for sale.</p> | <p>Martin Lee c/o Stags Professional Services (5377)</p> | <p>The personal financial circumstances of applicants are not a material planning consideration.</p> |
| | <p>Proposal would enable future housing needs of the village without prejudicing intrinsic character and quality of historic core of the village. Site is deliverable and desirable, represents a logical extension to the village in keeping with character and landscape setting.</p> | <p>Martin Lee c/o Stags Professional Services (5377)</p> | <p>The plan already allocates two sites within the village which collectively will provide 29 new dwellings. Both sites will provide some affordable housing for local residents. The site is elevated and separated from the village. There is likely to be a detrimental impact on the landscape given the prominent location of the site. This does not represent a logical extension of the village given the separation of the site from the settlement.</p> |
| | <p>Site has substantial highway frontage sufficient to provide safe access for all purposes and owner has investigated potential to provide footpath links for pedestrians independent of the existing public highway.</p> | <p>Martin Lee c/o Stags Professional Services (5377)</p> | <p>Advice from the highway authority states that the site is remote from the settlement and will increase reliance on the private motor vehicle. There are no footpaths or lighting. Further issues over topography, road widths and forward visibility. Highways advise that the site be rejected accordingly.</p> |
| | <p>Site does not lie within area of flood risk, nor is there likely to be an increase in surface water run-off as no increase in impermeable hardstandings proposed. The site is well-related to existing service infrastructure.</p> | <p>Martin Lee c/o Stags Professional Services (5377)</p> | <p>Comments provided by Devon County Council confirm that there are no flood risk issues within the site boundary. The other comments are noted.</p> |
| <p>OHA1 Land at Blundells</p> | <p>Supports exclusion of site as it is in the conservation area.</p> | <p>Halberton Parish Council (58)</p> | <p>Support noted.</p> |

| | | | |
|------------------------|--|-------------------|--|
| Road, Halberton | The settlement limit should be amended if this site is pursued. | Individual (4447) | No change is currently proposed to the settlement limit around this site. This would be considered in the eventuality that the site was allocated. |
| | An amendment to the settlement limit may be compromised by the site being within the Halberton Conservation Area. | Individual (4447) | The settlement limit will generally be amended to included proposed allocations. The impact on the conservation area has been a consideration in the decision not to propose allocating this site. |
| | Supports exclusion of site but requests it be removed from the Sustainability Appraisal as an alternative option. | Individual (4447) | Not agreed. It is a regulatory requirement to appraise alternative options. |
| | Supports exclusion but questions Sustainability Appraisal scoring and mitigation measures. | Individual (4447) | Responses to the scoring of the Sustainability Appraisal for this site are provided in the SA update. |
| | Copy of options consultation response. Concern over impact on residential amenity, including potential for overlooking due to the proximity and elevation of the site to existing dwellings. | Individual (4447) | Comments noted. These issues were considered as part of the appraisal of each site. |
| | Copy of options consultation response. Concern that the development of 25 houses will be detrimental to highway safety of Lower Town which is of restricted width and has a twisting course. | Individual (4447) | Comments noted. These issues were considered as part of the appraisal of each site. |
| | Copy of options consultation response. Concern over impact on setting of Grade II* listed building and barns. | Individual (4447) | Comments noted. These issues were considered as part of the appraisal of each site. |
| | Copy of options consultation response. Concern over impact on Halberton Conservation Area. | Individual (4447) | Comments noted. These issues were considered as part of the appraisal of each site. |
| | Copy of options consultation response. Concern over loss of Grade 1 agricultural land. | Individual (4447) | Comments noted. These issues were considered as part of the appraisal of each site. |

| | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| <p>OHANEW The Pethers, Halberton</p> | <p>Objects to inclusion of HA1 site and offers preferable alternative. Compares site with Sustainability Appraisal scoring of HA1 Site is stated as being preferable over proposed allocation as has less archaeological potential, less likelihood of flooding and better access.</p> | <p>Garside Planning Services (3645)</p> | <p>Not agreed that objection site has better access, as proposed allocation has existing access (objection site does not). The objection site falls within the same zone for the breach of the Grand Western Canal as the proposed allocation and though generally it has the same risk of groundwater flooding, it does encroach into an area at high risk of groundwater flooding. The Devon County Council Archaeology Team has confirmed that the scale and situation of the proposed allocation will not impact on any known heritage assets and state that they would not need to be consulted should an application come forward. This part of the policy is proposed to be deleted. The proposed allocation is also the preferred site of the parish council.</p> |
| <p>OHE1 SW of Conigar Close, Hemyock</p> | <p>Site is preferable to proposed allocation HE1 'Depot', as is immediately available, has full services and access in place from adjoining development and would not result in significant wider landscape impact. Would also provide meaningful number of affordable houses in sustainable location.</p> | <p>Messers Brooks & Nicolson c/o Greenslade Taylor Hunt (5767)</p> | <p>Since this representation was received, planning permission has been granted for this site.</p> |
| <p>OHE2 Culmbridge Farm, Hemyock</p> | <p>Site is in a sustainable location and given the overall number of dwellings needs to increase should be allocated.</p> | <p>Summerfield Developments c/o WYG (3773)</p> | <p>The housing requirement in the Local Plan has been updated to reflect the SHMA final report. The plan allocates sufficient land for housing and this site, in the AONB, is not required.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| <p>OHENEW Land adj cemetery, Hemyock</p> | <p>The settlement boundaries of larger villages, such as Hemyock should be extended where there is scope for sensible schemes in sustainable locations that are well related to the development on at least one side. Site should be allocated instead of that proposed. Hemyock is sustainable location with good range of services/facilities; site is close to village centre; can unobtrusively be accommodated within AONB; is contained on three sides by residential development; site can also provide recreational facilities for benefit of wider community. Should be allocated for up to 45 dwellings, no development in floodplain, provision of drainage strategy, mitigation of wildlife impact, provision of informal and formal public open space, allotments, landscaping and suitable design which respects local character. Extension to cemetery also possible.</p> | <p>Waddeton Park Ltd (3815)</p> | <p>Hemyock's inclusion on the list of village under Policy S13 indicates that it is a sustainable location for limited development. However, the village's location within the Blackdown Hills AONB requires particular consideration of the impact on the special qualities of the landscape. Accordingly, a brownfield infill site was proposed, as this would have been least visually intrusive, and also negated the need to develop a greenfield site. The brownfield site is no longer deliverable and is now not proposed as an allocation. However, there are sufficient sites within the plan to meet the Objectively Assessed Need, and therefore it is unnecessary to allocate further land for development.</p> |
| <p>OMO1 Tatepath Farm, Morchar Bishop</p> | <p>Supports exclusion as would result in increase in traffic on narrow lanes (including construction traffic); access is poor; public transport is limited.</p> | <p>Morchar Bishop Parish Council (89); Mid Devon CPRE (486); Individual (5208, 5263, 4117, 5295, 3971, 5642, 5641, 4093, 5604, 5605, 5607, 5608, 5609, 4476, 5603, 4475, 5599, 4101, 4363, 5594, 5597, 5598, 5600, 5592, 55936, 5595, 5596, 6063, 4215, 5586, 5587, 5588, 5589, 5358)</p> | <p>Comments noted.</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| Supports exclusion as Greenaway site (MO1) is more than sufficient to meet needs/site not required as Greenaway not yet developed. | Morchard Bishop Parish Council (89); Individual (5263, 4117, 5295, 3971, 5642, 5641, 4093, 5604, 5605, 5607, 5608, 5609, 4476, 5603, 4475, 5599, 4101, 4363, 5594, 5597, 5598, 5600, 5592, 5593, 5595, 6063, 4215, 4212, 5586, 5587, 5588, 5589, 5358) | Comments noted. |
| 16 properties too many. | Morchard Bishop Parish Council (89); | Comments noted. |
| Concern over capacity of sewerage and drainage/impact on flooding of development. | Morchard Bishop Parish Council (89); Individual (5208, 5295) | Comments noted. |
| Supports exclusion – house sales and lettings regularly come up in the village indicates on-going supply. | Mid Devon CPRE (486) | Comments noted. |
| Supports exclusion – development in the rural areas should be as a result of windfalls only, in order to protect agricultural land/countryside. | Mid Devon CPRE (486) | Comments noted. |
| Supports exclusion and requests site boundary be amended on east sided to give protection to public assets. | Mid Devon CPRE (486) | Comments noted. Site is not proposed as an allocation so there is no site boundary to amend. |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| | Supports exclusion of site and requests it be removed from the Sustainability Appraisal as an alternative option. | Individual (5208, 4106, 5234, 4081, 5263, 4117, 5295, 3971, 4082, 4416, 4459, 5642, 5641, 4093, 5604, 5605, 5606, 5607, 5608, 4474, 4473, 5609, 4476, 4108, 4111, 4112, 5603, 4460, 4152, 4110, 4481, 4475, 5599, 4101, 4363, 5594, 4105, 5597, 5598, 5600, 4471, 4472, 5592, 5593, 4077, 4074, 5595, 5596, 5601, 6063, 4212, 4215, 4681, 4682, 4075, 5590, 5591, 5586, 5587, 5588, 5589, 4076, 5358, 4356) | Not agreed. It is a regulatory requirement to appraise alternative options. |
| | Development of site would be detrimental to village and character of adjoining listed buildings. | Individual (5208, 5234) | Comments noted. |
| | Supports exclusion as school has limited capacity for expansion. | Individual (5263, 4117, 5295, 3971, 5642, 5641, 4093, 5604, 5605, 5607, 5608, 5609, 4476, 5603, 4475, 5599, 4101, 4363, 5594, 5597, 5598, 5600, 5592, 5593, 5595, 5596, 6063, 4215, 4212, 5586, 5587, 5588, 5589, 5358) | Comments noted. |
| | Supports exclusion as site is outside settlement limit and would result in loss of views to wider countryside. | Individual (5263, 4117, 5295, 5642, 5641, 4093, 5607, 5608, 5609, 4476, 5603, 4475, 5599, 4101, 4363, 5594, 5597, 5598, 5600, 5592, 5593, 5595, 5596, 6063, 4215, 4212, 5586, 5587, 5588, 5589, 5358) | Comments noted. |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| | If sheltered housing instead provided on site MO1 'Greenaway', then 'Tatepath Farm' could be location for cross-subsidised affordable housing allocation. | Mr & Mrs Jeffrey c/o Stephen Hargreaves (5833) | No change is proposed to MO1, so a further allocation is not required. |
| OMO2 Church Street, Morchard Bishop (Gurneys) | Supports exclusion as would result in increase in traffic on narrow lanes (including construction traffic); access is poor; public transport is limited. | Morchard Bishop Parish Council (89); Mid Devon CPRE (486); Individual (5208, 5263, 4117, 5295, 3971, 5642, 5641, 4093, 5604, 5605, 5607, 5608, 5609, 4476, 5603, 4475, 5599, 4101, 4363, 5594, 4105, 5597, 5598, 5600, 5592, 5593, 5595, 5596, 6063, 4215, 4212, 5586, 5587, 5588, 5589, 5358) | Comments noted. |
| | Supports exclusion as Greenaway site (MO1) is more than sufficient to meet needs/site not required as Greenaway not yet developed. | Morchard Bishop Parish Council (89); Individual (5263, 4117, 5295, 3971, 5642, 5641, 4093, 5604, 5605, 5607, 5608, 5609, 4476, 5603, 4475, 5599, 4101, 4363, 5594, 5597, 5598, 5600, 5592, 5593, 5596, 6063, 4212, 4215, 5586, 5587, 5588, 5589, 5358) | Comments noted. |
| | Supports exclusion – house sales and lettings regularly come up in the village indicates on-going supply. | Mid Devon CPRE (486) | Comments noted. |
| | Supports exclusion – development in the rural areas should be as a result of windfalls only, in order to protect agricultural land/countryside. | Mid Devon CPRE (486) | Comments noted. |
| | 25 properties too many. | Morchard Bishop Parish Council (89) | Comments noted. |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|-----------------|
| | Concern over capacity of sewerage and drainage/impact on flooding of development. | Morchard Bishop Parish Council (89); Mid Devon CPRE (486); Individual (5208, 5295, 5263, 4117, 3971, 5642, 5641, 4093, 5604, 5605, 5607, 5608, 5609, 4476, 5603, 4475, 5599, 4101, 4363, 5594, 4105, 5597, 5598, 5600, 5592, 5593, 5595, 5596, 6063, 4215, 4212, 5586, 5587, 5588, 5589, 5358) | Comments noted. |
| | Development of site would be detrimental to character of village and/or adjoining listed buildings/archaeological interest. | Morchard Bishop Parish Council (89); Mid Devon CPRE (486); Individual (5208, 4106, 4081, 5234, 5263, 4117, 5295, 3971, 4082, 4416, 4459, 5642, 5641, 4093, 5604, 5605, 5606, 5607, 5608, 4474, 4473, 5609, 5602, 4476, 4108, 4111, 4112, 5603, 4460, 4152, 4110, 4481, 4475, 5599, 4105, 5597, 5598, 5600, 4471, 4472, 5592, 5593, 4077, 4074, 5595, 5596, 5601, 6063, 4215, 4212, 4681, 4682, 4075, 5590, 5591, 5586, 5587, 5588, 5589, 5358, 4356) | Comments noted. |
| | Supports exclusion – development would have a detrimental effect on the public right of way bisecting the site. | Mid Devon CPRE (486) | Comments noted. |
| | Supports exclusion as site is outside settlement limit which should be used to guide development. | Mid Devon CPRE (486) | Comments noted. |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| | Supports exclusion of site and requests it be removed from the Sustainability Appraisal as an alternative option. | Individual (5208, 4106, 5234, 4081, 5263, 4117, 5295, 3971, 4082, 4416, 4459, 5642, 5641, 4093, 5604, 5605, 5606, 5607, 5608, 4474, 4473, 5609, 5602, 4476, 4108, 4111, 4112, 5603, 4460, 4152, 4110, 4481, 4475, 5599, 4101, 4363, 5594, 4105, 5597, 5598, 5600, 4471, 4472, 5592, 5593, 4077, 4074, 5595, 5596, 5601, 6063, 4212, 4215, 4681, 4682, 4075, 5591, 5590, 5586, 5587, 5588, 5589, 4076, 5358, 4356) | Not agreed. It is a regulatory requirement to appraise alternative options. |
| | Supports exclusion as school has limited capacity for expansion. | Individual (5263, 4117, 5295, 3971, 5642, 5641, 4093, 5604, 5605, 5607, 5608, 5609, 4476, 5603, 4475, 5599, 4101, 4363, 5594, 5597, 5598, 5600, 5592, 5593, 5595, 5596, 6063, 4215, 4212, 5586, 5587, 5588, 5589, 5358) | Comments noted. |
| | Supports exclusion as site is outside settlement limit and would result in loss of views to wider countryside. | Individual (5263, 4117, 5295, 3971, 5642, 5641, 4093, 5604, 5605, 5607, 5608, 5609, 4476, 5603, 4475, 5599, 4101, 4363, 5594, 5597, 5598, 5600, 5592, 5593, 5595, 5596, 6063, 4215, 4212, 5586, 5587, 5588, 5589, 5358) | Comments noted. |
| | Supports exclusion as would result in loss of trees. | Individual (4093, 4476) | Comments noted. |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| | Supports exclusion as development would result in loss of privacy for adjoining properties. | Individual (4093) | Comments noted. |
| | Supports exclusion as negatively affects property value. | Individual (4105) | Not a material planning consideration. |
| | Objects to exclusion – site could sympathetically accommodate up to 25 dwellings and fit with local environment in central location of village. | Messers LG & MR Partridge (964) | Objection noted. However, this site has the potential to impact negatively on the adjoining heritage assets, of which there are many along Church Street. |
| | Objects to exclusion – site is conveniently located near to facilities including school, pre-school, pub and church. | Messers LG & MR Partridge (964) | Objection noted. |
| | Objects to exclusion – the traffic generated would not use the main route through the village. | Messers LG & MR Partridge (964) | Objection noted. |
| | Objects to exclusion – the ‘walk to school’ footpath would integrate into the development well. | Messers LG & MR Partridge (964) | Objection noted. |
| ONENEW New Estate Site A, Newton St Cyres | Additional land submitted which has no significant constraints and is immediately available and deliverable. | The Church Commissioners c/o Deloitte Real Estate (1517) | Appraisal of the site has indicated that there are highway safety issues and the advice of Highways recommended that the site be rejected. |
| ONENEW New Estate Site B, Newton St Cyres | Additional land submitted which has no significant constraints and is immediately available and deliverable. | The Church Commissioners c/o Deloitte Real Estate (1517) | Appraisal of the site has indicated that there are highway safety issues and the advice of Highways recommended that the site be rejected. |
| OSH1 Bowdens Lane, Shillingford | Supports exclusion as development not needed and would crowd out those who bought in rural area by choice. | Individual (4280, 4339, 4329) | Comments noted. Shillingford is not a village listed under Policy S13 as being suitable for a limited amount of development. Consequently no allocations have been proposed. |
| | Supports exclusion of site as lack of local facilities (school, shop, pub or employment) or inadequate capacity of facilities. | Individual (4280, 4339, 4329, 4176) | Comments noted. |
| | Supports exclusion as scale of proposal/would radically alter community/set precedent for further development. | Individual (4280, 4339, 4329, 4176) | Comments noted. |
| | Supports exclusion due to loss of agricultural land. | Individual (4280, 4339, 4329) | Comments noted. |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| | Supports exclusion as site is close to floodplains/negative impact on sewerage. | Individual (4280, 4176) | Comments noted. |
| | Supports exclusion of site as likely to result in negative traffic impact, junction is poor with restricted vision, no pavement. | Individual (4280, 4339, 4329, 4176) | Comments noted. |
| | Supports exclusion as top part of site only 120m from high voltage power lines. | Individual (4176) | Comments noted. |
| | Supports exclusion as site is outside settlement limit. | Individual (4176) | Comments noted. |
| | Supports exclusion as less than 2 miles from Exmoor and would comprise their 'dark sky' status. | Individual (4176) | Comments noted. |
| | Supports exclusion as site is used by bats. | Individual (4176) | Comments noted. |
| OSP1 Higher Town, Sampford Peverell | Objects to exclusion of site, as one small allocation in the village is inadequate to meet needs of current and future generations. | Individual (3838) | Comments noted. On 22 nd September, Mid Devon District Council resolved to allocate land at Higher Town for residential development. |
| | Site is suitable as site is self-contained area for development. | Individual (3838) | Comments noted. On 22 nd September, Mid Devon District Council resolved to allocate land at Higher Town for residential development. |
| | Site is suitable and has a number of access options. | Individual (3838) | Comments noted. On 22 nd September, Mid Devon District Council resolved to allocate land at Higher Town for residential development. |
| | Site is suitable and could include affordable housing and/or self-build, plus retail outlet. | Individual (3838) | Comments noted. On 22 nd September, Mid Devon District Council resolved to allocate land at Higher Town for residential development. This allocation will be subject to 30% affordable housing and 5% self-build. |
| OSP5 Morrells Farm, Sampford Peverell (SHLAA sites, not Options site) | Site is centrally located and preferable to proposed allocation. Could accommodate 50 dwellings without adverse landscape or conservation area impact. Would remove farmyard use from centre of village and deliver affordable housing. | Taylor Wimpey UK c/o WYG Planning (1708) | Not agreed. The SHLAA assessment identified the potential for impacting on the grade II listed Morrells Farmhouse and a detrimental impact on the setting, significance, character and appearance of the conservation area. |

| | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| OS13 East of Hederman Close, Silverton | Supports exclusion of site, as has substantial number of objections previously, and any development in village should be small scale to protect character. | Residents of Hederman Close, Silverton (4927) | Comments noted. |
| OTHNEW Land north east of Silver Street, Thorverton | Additional land submitted which has no significant constraints and is immediately available and deliverable. | The Church Commissioners c/o Deloitte Real Estate (1517) | Appraisal of the site has indicated that the principal constraints would be the loss of grade 2 agricultural land and school capacity. |
| OTHNEW Land to the west of Lynch Close and Cleaves Close, Thorverton | Additional land submitted which has no significant constraints and is immediately available and deliverable. | The Church Commissioners c/o Deloitte Real Estate (1517) | Appraisal of the site has indicated that the principal constraints would be the loss of grade 1 agricultural land, school capacity and the impact on the adjoining grade II listed building. |
| OUF1 Land adj Poynings, Uffculme | Supports exclusion as only wishes to see infilling within and no extension of existing settlement limits. | Uffculme Parish Council (54) | Comments noted. |
| | Considers there to be traffic impacts, landscape and visual impacts from elevated position along rural lane. | Uffculme Parish Council (54) | Comments noted. |
| OUF2 Land adj Sunnydene, Uffculme | Supports exclusion as only wishes to see infilling within and no extension of existing settlement limits (though acknowledges proposal is relatively minor development which could normally be accommodated). | Uffculme Parish Council (54) | Comments noted. |
| | Sites lies within Waste Consultation Zone with poor access/visibility. | Uffculme Parish Council (54) | Comments noted. |
| | Objects to exclusion of site stating it can be accommodated with low visual impact, improved access point, and control of construction traffic along Clay Lane. | Individual (5378) | The access road to the site is a single carriageway lane, extending some distance from the centre of the village. Visibility is less than ideal along certain sections of the lane. The site is also on the rural fringe of the settlement, where the built environment is very low density. This combination of factors has indicated to the Council not to allocate this site. |

| | | | |
|---|--|---|--|
| OUF3 Land west of Uffculme, Uffculme | Supports exclusion as only wishes to see infilling within and no extension of existing settlement limits. | Uffculme Parish Council (54) | Comments noted. However, following a recent appeal decision, outline planning permission has been granted for up to 60 dwellings. The site is proposed to be allocated accordingly. |
| | Supports exclusion as site has greatest potential for impact on Uffculme; would extend village in linear fashion along B3440, with inspectors previously supporting no extension beyond 'Harvesters'. | Uffculme Parish Council (54) | Comments noted. However, following a recent appeal decision, outline planning permission has been granted for up to 60 dwellings. The site is proposed to be allocated accordingly. |
| | Supports exclusion due to negative traffic impact on local road network given high speeds along Uffculme Road, requirement for road widening, narrowness of Bridwell Avenue. | Uffculme Parish Council (54) | Comments noted. However, following a recent appeal decision, outline planning permission has been granted for up to 60 dwellings. The site is proposed to be allocated accordingly. |
| | Is within Halberton parish which would benefit from CIL, though Uffculme infrastructure would have to support site. | Uffculme Parish Council (54) | Comments noted. However, following a recent appeal decision, outline planning permission has been granted for up to 60 dwellings. The site is proposed to be allocated accordingly. |
| | Supports exclusion as is grade 1 agricultural land. | Individual (5310) | Comments noted. However, following a recent appeal decision, outline planning permission has been granted for up to 60 dwellings. The site is proposed to be allocated accordingly. |
| | Supports exclusion as is flood zone 2. | Individual (5310) | Comments noted. However, following a recent appeal decision, outline planning permission has been granted for up to 60 dwellings. The site is proposed to be allocated accordingly. |
| | Objects to exclusion; Uffculme has a range of facilities, comparable with other S13 settlements but has no allocation; questions absence of assessment of the relative sustainability of settlements identified. | Messrs Persey and Harding c/o Jillings Hutton (4654) | Noted. The Council has considered potential allocations at Uffculme though for site-specific reasons they have not been preferred for development. However, following a recent appeal decision, outline planning permission has been granted for up to 60 dwellings. The site is proposed to be allocated accordingly. |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| | Objects to exclusion and disputes LPA claim that allocation would lead to long walking distances to school; states that a secondary school pupil in Uffculme would have a choice whether to walk to school. | Messrs Persey and Harding c/o Jillings Hutton (4654) | The nearest edge of the site lies over 1km from the secondary school and almost 1.5km to the primary school. The IHT Guidelines for 'acceptable' walking distances state that for education up to 500m is the preferred distance and up to 1km is an acceptable distance. Both schools lie beyond these distances. Being out of the acceptable range it is more likely that trips from the development to the schools will be undertaken in a car, not less likely as stated within the representation. The rep dismisses bus travel to schools, however in the case of Uffculme Secondary; this is the most popular mode of transport, accounting for about 50% in 2014. However, following a recent appeal decision, outline planning permission has been granted for up to 60 dwellings. The site is proposed to be allocated accordingly. |
| | Objects to exclusion and disputes weight given to appeal decision (on previously refused scheme on part of site). | Messrs Persey and Harding c/o Jillings Hutton (4654) | Objection noted. Following a recent appeal decision, outline planning permission has been granted for up to 60 dwellings. The site is proposed to be allocated accordingly. |
| | States principle of development not a concern for Devon County Council who advise on use of archaeological condition/highways conditions. | Messrs Persey and Harding c/o Jillings Hutton (4654) | The condition requested refers to archaeological considerations. This has been reflected in the post-mitigation score. The score for objective B considers various elements related to the built and historic environment including but not limited to archaeology. However, the site has since been granted permission on appeal and is now proposed to be allocated. |
| | States principle of development not a concern for Environment Agency who raised no objection to planning application. | Messrs Persey and Harding c/o Jillings Hutton (4654) | Comments noted. The site has since been granted permission on appeal and is proposed to be allocated accordingly. |
| OUF4 Land off Chapel Hill | Site is 'landlocked' and unavailable. | Uffculme Parish Council (54) | Comments noted. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| OUF5 Land off Ashley Road, Uffculme | Supports exclusion of site as only wishes to see infilling within and no extension of existing settlement limits. | Uffculme Parish Council (54) | Comments noted. |
| | Site is within Waste and Minerals Consultation Zones. | Uffculme Parish Council (54) | Comments noted – site lies within the Minerals Safeguarding Area for sand and gravel in the draft Minerals Plan. |
| | Land is elevated and development would result in overlooking. | Uffculme Parish Council (54) | Comments noted. |
| | Concern over access and highway issues. | Uffculme Parish Council (54) | Comments noted. |
| | Objects to exclusion as is adjacent to approved scheme, from which it has adequate highways access. | Individual (3840, 5806) | Objection noted, however site is within Minerals Safeguarding Area and is elevated in comparison with adjoining properties which could be overlooked. |
| | Objects to exclusion as would have no visual impact being set back from the main road. | Individual (3840, 5806) | As above. |
| OWI1 Quicks Farm, Willand | Supports exclusion of all sites previously considered for Willand and objects to their reintroduction. | Individual (5258, 4174, 5316, 5342, 5351, 5367, 5371, 5610, 5700, 5673, 4251, 4289, 5401, 4357, 5801, 4311) | Comments noted. |
| OWI2 Dean Hill Road, Willand | Supports exclusion of all sites previously considered for Willand and objects to their reintroduction. | Individual (5258, 4174, 5316, 5342, 5351, 5367, 5371, 5610, 5700, 5673, 4251, 4289, 5401, 4357, 5801, 4311) | Comments noted. |
| OWI3 Lloyd Maunder Way, Willand | Supports exclusion of all sites previously considered for Willand and objects to their reintroduction. | Individual (5258, 4174, 5316, 5342, 5351, 5367, 5371, 5610, 5700, 5673, 4251, 4289, 5401, 4357, 5801, 4311) | Comments noted. |
| OWI4 Lloyd Maunder (commercial), Willand | Supports exclusion of all sites previously considered for Willand and objects to their reintroduction which would have negative impact on local area. | Individual (5258, 4174, 5316, 5342, 5351, 5367, 5371, 5610, 5700, 5673, 4251, 4289, 5401, 4357, 5801, 4311) | Comments noted. |

| | | | |
|--|---|-------------------|--|
| OW15 Land adjacent to B3181, Willand (previously AL/WI/2) | Objects to exclusion of site as is allocated for affordable housing, has good access and good drainage. | Individual (2322) | Objection noted, however site has been allocated for 5 years but only remaining allocated part has come forward. Adjacent allocation will provide affordable housing for the village at a rate of 30%. |
|--|---|-------------------|--|