

# Feedback report on consultation on the draft East Devon Local Plan (Regulation 18) that was consulted on from 7 November 2022 to 15 January 2023



**PDF 10 of 10**

Appendices

**Pages 483-510**

July 2023

## Appendix 1 - Feedback on comments on the Commonplace platform

Set out below are a range of comments made by people on their negative experience of using Commonplace (the citizen engagement platform used for the consultation). It should, however, be noted that most people who used the platform did not raise negative concerns.

### **Re: use of the interactive map**

If you look at the screenshot I've attached it says that by clicking on a particular point I can leave a comment (or that's what I've understood). I keep clicking on those black dots and nothing happens. Am I doing something wrong? If so what are my options for leaving comments?

I'm truly baffled as to why I cannot leave a comment. I'm using a laptop and mouse rather than an iPad, so in theory it should work. Would you know if this is a widespread problem or just me?

It seems impossible to comment on the individual sites on the Site Map included in the Commonplace consultation. I have followed the instructions but tapping on the points within each site does not take me anywhere. How can I comment on individual sites please? I note that at the top of the site map is the notation "completed". What does this mean please? I have not commented on the sites yet.

The district wide map of proposed sites which purports to give a means of commenting on each individual site (by clicking on "points") simply does not work. It is even headed "completed" rather than "active". I have therefore been unable to respond to this so I shall write to you separately about this section. This tool is clunky, unnecessarily complicated and has the appearance of being designed to put large numbers of people off responding. Maybe this is your intention?

### **Re: each individual comment being acknowledged separately**

Every time I wish to make a comment or agree with a comment it seems that I have to have an email sent to me in order for that agreement or comment to be accepted. Is this truly the case or am I still doing something wrong? If it is the case, is this not an incredibly clumsy process which many might find time wasting and off putting? I can't believe many residents will be motivated to get involved if this is the case.

### **Re: use of emojis**

Some people thought the sentiment emojis were patronising, while some were confused about exactly what they meant and what the numbers meant. There was a feeling by some people that it was some sort of score that would be added up and so would count against people going for the "0" end. I think it would be MUCH better to put the usual legends under each one ("strongly disagree", "disagree", etc.) and drop the percentage numbers both here and in the comments, replacing them with the matching legends.

In other places a 1-5 scale (agree....disagree) was used, and again there should be a separate legend under each one and that legend rather than the number used in the comment.

Because some people skipped clicking an emoji right at the top for one or other of the above reasons, their comment went through as neutral (50). The system should probably require a rating and not allow it to be skipped.

Conversely, some people clicked an emoji and moved on thinking they'd done their feedback, so I had to tell them to plough on through the section until they were thanked and only then was their feedback recorded. The system should probably do the "do you really want to abandon your comment?" thing.

**Re: lack of clarity whether documents had been successfully uploaded**

I have endeavoured to upload our consultation response on the draft East Devon Local Plan for 2020 – 2040 but to no avail. I keep running into problems when I try and upload or attach the documents via the East Devon Commonplace website. It is possible that I have uploaded it several times (I tried several times) but I have not had any confirmation. As such, please accept our consultation response via email.

I have submitted representations on a couple of policies via the council's Commonplace portal. I think I have also uploaded a site plan and covering letter. Indeed I might have uploaded these twice! However, the system does not seem to record that the documents have been uploaded. Therefore I am copying these to you as well, as a back-up that they actually get submitted.

**General comments**

Please either make this site works or provide some other way for people to make their views known. The site is unusable as it is and I am not old or incapable by any means!!!

I have just (attempted) to complete my response to the content of the Draft Local Plan. This is one of the worst examples I have seen of a tool that is supposed to be the principal means of gathering views from the public. Having worked at director level in a professional capacity for many years, I consider myself as competent and literate when it comes to IT. Many people will not have the IT skills, nor the same knowledge of public sector language to enable them to work their way through this and respond. The front page is muddled and confusing and gives little clear guidance about navigating through the relevant and appropriate section.

Have tried to submit my response to the EDLP consultation documents, but the Commonplace website won't let me in to the appropriate pages. I asked for support from them but got a message about stuff I should do at my end to try to get it to work. I use a new iMac running the latest operating system software - tried again this morning - still no go. I figure it's not my job to fix deficiencies in their software, so maybe you're paying too much for outsourcing the consultation work. I'm sending my comments here and hope you can add them to wherever they should be at your end.

My final comment is what a tortuous process it has been to use this system, see the information, read the maps, constantly request confirmation emails to be sent again. Truly exhausting. I fear you will have lots of graded responses (very satisfied to very dissatisfied) and limited rich information in the form of actual thoughts and words, Please treat the rich information with more seriousness than smiley faces.

## Appendix 2 - Feedback from in-person submissions at the consultation events

This appendix provides details of the main themes and issues that were submitted on the slips of paper that were available for people to make quick comments at the exhibition events.

### Paper slip comments from any/all consultation event that relate to the plan strategy

Comments relating to plan strategy	Type of comment	Policy or ref	Category	Summary of comment
plan strategy	support	8	new town	a second new tow near the city/airport is a good idea
plan objectives	comment	Table 8	objectives	objectives 9 and 10 are more important on your list and should go above objective 6. Development should only be approved if safe cycling and walking routes to main facilities are provided.
plan strategy	support	3	housing - need	support planning policy on creating homes
non planning related	comment	n/a	non planning related	Plan would be improved with further work on social mobility
evidence	comment	n/a	climate change - general	Plan would be improved with further work on climate change
evidence	comment	35	flooding	Plan would be improved with further work on flood prevention
evidence	comment	29	climate change - energy	Plan would be improved with further work on energy generation to help cost of living
evidence	comment	Table 8	infrastructure - general	Plan would be improved with further work on upgrades to infrastructure.
plan strategy	Objection		Exeter Airport	The airport was identified as a liability, not an asset. Its continuation and expansion was opposed on climate grounds.
plan strategy	support		Wind turbines	Welcomed that sites for turbnes were identified, it was suggested that general people prefer these to solar farms.
evidence	comment		date of maps	Map is out of date, does not show Cranbrook

Paper slip comments from the Axminster consultation event on the 1 December 2022

Subjects at: Axminster	Type of comment	Policy or ref	Category	Number of similar comments	Summary of comment
allocations_general	Support	19	allocations - support		Support site allocations
allocations_Axmi_02	Comment	19	site constraints - gas pipeline	5	Mains service (gas) for Axminster run through field
allocations_general	Comment	19	biodiversity - phosphates	2	Phosphates in river Axe will delay any development. Potential pollution to River Axe from runoff
allocations_general	Comment	19	infrastructure - transport	6	Traffic management - improvements needed to pinch points in highways at George Hotel and Stoney Lane and Weycroft Bridge or gridlock will be exacerbated by 1000+ homes.
allocations_general	Comment	19	retail		New developments on edge of town will encourage people to shop in Chard or Seaton rather than Axminster unless traffic flow improved in Axminster.
allocations_general	Comment	19	scale of development	2	number of new homes will change character of town completely.
allocations_general	Comment	19	infrastructure - water	2	increased population needs increased water supply and waste water management
allocations_general	Comment	n/a	non planning related		increased risk of wild fires
allocations_general	Comment	19	infrastructure - health	7	Lack of access to health services
allocations_general	Comment	19	environment - design		new buildings need to be eco friendly
allocations_general	Comment	19	housing - affordability	3	housing needs to be affordable in perpetuity. Axminster needs affordable housing for local people and new people on lower incomes. Most homes will be unaffordable and bought by rich retirees
allocations_general	Comment	19	infrastructure - transport	2	need public transport improvements. lack of public transport - bus and train links already difficult to get to work or evening leisure outings
allocations_general	Comment	19	infrastructure - green		need green spaces for nature

Draft East Devon Local Plan - Consultation feedback report – July 2023

Subjects at: Axminster	Type of comment	Policy or ref	Category	Number of similar comments	Summary of comment
allocations_Axmi_02	Comment	19	environment - historic	7	historic site - archaeological interest from Fosse Way
allocations_Axmi_02	Comment	19	allocations - access	7	access poor with lack of parking and tractors using lane. Already congested and parked cars more housing would be chaotic and dangerous
allocations_Axmi_02	Comment	19	biodiversity - wildlife	8	biodiversity - bats fly around the field. There is a bat roost. rare butterflies and linnet roost in hawthorn tree on northern edge of field
allocations_Axmi_02	Comment	19	flooding	4	will cause flooding - runoff from field bad when wet - storm drain floods
allocations_general	Comment	19	infrastructure - transport	5	North to South bypass has not been built - need relief road
allocations_GH/ED/83	objection	19	allocations - access		lack of safe access to A358
allocations_GH/ED/83	objection	19	flooding		adjoins flood area
allocations_GH/ED/83	objection	19	loss of amenity	2	site used for outdoor walking and activities. Beautiful area used for dog walking with footpath and cyclepath
allocations_Axmi_02	objection	19	loss of amenity	3	recreation area for local people giving access to countryside - lovely area to walk and de-stress. leave our countryside alone
allocations_general	objection	19	brownfield first	4	infill brownfield before greenfield. Town centre needs improving should use empty buildings
allocations_general	objection	19	flooding		All houses on higher ground add to runoff and flooding
allocations_general	Comment	19	infrastructure - general	3	insufficient infrastructure - should be plans for new infrastructure
allocations_general	Comment	19	overdevelopment	3	Over development of Axminster. Are all these houses needed? We don't need all this development.
allocations_general	Comment	19	infrastructure - transport		transport already insufficient
allocations_Axmi_02	Comment	19	infrastructure - transport	5	will there be an access point?
allocations_general	Comment	19	infrastructure - education	4	need to consider school places

Subjects at: Axminster	Type of comment	Policy or ref	Category	Number of similar comments	Summary of comment
allocations_general	Comment	19	employment - job opportunities	4	does Axminster have the infrastructure of employment opportunities for ove 1000 new households? Not enough local jobs
allocations_general	Comment	19	agricultural land	2	no to building on agricultural land need to protect farming land for food production
allocations_general	objection	19	housing - affordability		affordable housing will attract anti-social behaviour and crime
allocations_Axmi_02	objection	19	allocations - access		Musbury Road is dangerous - on brow of hill with blind bends.
allocations_general	Comment	19	infrastructure - transport		car parks congested
allocations_Axmi_02	objection	19	environment - parking		impact of additional cars on environmental quality of Woodbury Park
allocations_Axmi_02	objection	19	infrastructure - transport	4	Axminster FC had an application rejected because of traffic congestion
allocations_Axmi_02	Comment	19	infrastructure - transport		A lot of work needed around Musbury Road to make a safe route to town centre
allocations_general	Comment	19	retail		Supermarket needed to north of town and should be facilitated by EDDC
allocations_general	Comment	19	housing - need		housing needed for older people and young families
allocations_general	Comment	19	environment - design		higher density appropriate near town centre - not everyone wants a garden
exhibition	Comment	19	exhibition		exhibition staff not properly prepared and could not answer questions
allocations - Axmi_11 a	Comment	19	flooding		run off into stream by Foxhill already severe in bad weather - water channel is narrow leaving properties at risk of flooding - will drainage be properly managed?
allocations_Char_04	objection	26	infrastructure - transport		nothing should be developed here because of unsuitable roads and access, environmental impact on roads and hedges and increase in traffic
allocations_Char_04	objection	26	infrastructure - transport	2	2 mile walk on narrow unlit road to bus route on A358 with no safe pedestrian crossing in Tytherleigh.
allocations_Char_04	objection	26	infrastructure - transport	2	Too much extra traffic on busy roads, especially at school times, traffic gridlock would be worse and dangerous

Subjects at: Axminster	Type of comment	Policy or ref	Category	Number of similar comments	Summary of comment
allocations_general	objection	26	housing - need		houses not needed
allocations_general	objection	26	housing - affordability		houses would cost more than £500, 000

**Paper slip comments from the Exmouth consultation event on the 8 December 2022**

Subject at: Exmouth	Type of comment	Policy or reference	Category	Number of similar comments	Summary of comment
Allocations	Objection	20	General about all site allocation options and general housing growth	11	Loss of identity of Exmouth if sites go ahead as planned. Further development in Exmouth was considered to be unjustified and unsustainable. Objection to building on the periphery of the town with comments raised in respect of adverse impacts in the Maer valley and to the north of Exmouth. Some responses called for development close to the town centre. In one response it was stated that we already have more than enough houses to meet Government requirements though not enough affordable homes. It was noted in a comment that Exmouth has already grown rapidly. A response suggested abandoning Government housing targets and concern was raised around who would live in the new homes and would they be 2nd homes. Concern that many site will causes adverse environmental impacts but are needed to meet Government targets and housing should meet needs and not demands.
Allocations	Objection	20	Land on the north-eastern side of Exmouth	1	The site is remote from the town centre and this would encourage driving rather than walking to facilities.
Allocations	Objection	20	Land at Douglas	1	Concerns around safe access to the site, environmental impacts, sewage capacity and loss of green space.



Subject at: Exmouth	Type of comment	Policy or reference	Category	Number of similar comments	Summary of comment
			Gardens (Exmo_06)		
Allocations	Objection	20	Littleham Fields (Exmo_08 and Exmo_16 combined)	1	Objection to Littleham Brook development noting the current access for people to nature in this area and its importance for health and wellbeing. The river needs to cope with flooding events
Allocations	Objection	20	Land to the South of Littleham (Exmo_17)(Should be north east of Littleham)	16	Objection to the site on account of inadequate highway access, existing congestion, over parking, single access routes and safety issues on the surroundings roads. Extra roads as part of development were highlighted as likely to bring additional pollution. It was highlighted in response that the site is in the AONB with many ancient trees and hedges of wildlife importance. It was also suggested that allocation would set a precedence for building the AONB elsewhere. Development would generate need for more schools and health facilities with more ill health from more vehicle fumes. It was commented that the Littleham cemetery was nearly full and it was identified as challenging to find additional space, especially for a natural burial area. It was queried if the cycle path would be kept and it was highlighted that for hundreds of years the church has occupied a rural position in peace and tranquillity. The site was highlighted as already being prone to flooding.
Allocations	Objection	20	Land at St John's (Exmo_20 the proposal is to allocate Exmo_20b as shown on the Policies Map)	1	Concerns raised over viability of access to the site.
Economic impacts	Objection	20	Jobs	5	Concern about lack of job opportunities, including better paid jobs, and that without extra jobs in the town people will continue to commute out and

Subject at: Exmouth	Type of comment	Policy or reference	Category	Number of similar comments	Summary of comment
					suggestion that homes should only be built where there are jobs. There was a call for office development at and near to the town centre.
Economic impacts	Objection	20	Tourism	1	It was suggested that more houses will damage the tourism industry.
Plan process	Objection	20	Plan vision	3	Objection that the plan does not set out a vision or strategy for Exmouth and that proposals for the town do not tie into the objectives.
Plan process	Objection	20	Consultation in general	2	Two respondents advised " <i>It's a disgrace</i> ".
Plan process	Objection	20	Local engagement	2	A respondent called for more engagement and working with the community. And there was suggestions about making the engagement more accessible and meaningful with a call to more fully hear the voices of the people of Exmouth. It was suggested that the current consultation was inaccessible to many.
Plan process	Objection	20	Developer led development	1	Concern that developers change plans, as proposals progress, to suit their financial interests.
Plan process	Objection	20	Listening to local people	1	Considered that outcomes are already determined so responding to the consultation is a waste of time.
Strategy	Objection	20	Types of new homes - pre fab	1	Provision should be made for modern pre-fab locally built homes as an affordable housing option. Also more use should be made of turning ex-commercial buildings into housing.
Strategy	Objection	20	Types of new homes - retirement homes	2	There should not be extra retirement homes as these place excess pressure on medical services.
Strategy	Objection	20	Types of new homes - affordable homes	5	There should be more social housing with one respondent saying not affordable housing as children cannot afford to buy homes. But also submissions saying more affordable housing and a comment made that lack is hindering ability of employers to recruit staff and young people are leaving the town. Concern was also raised that housing schemes often fail to not meet specific

Subject at: Exmouth	Type of comment	Policy or reference	Category	Number of similar comments	Summary of comment
					target levels of provision and it was questioned how many affordable house go to local people.
Strategy	Objection	20	Agricultural land loss	3	Development will lead to agricultural land loss. More use should be made of Brownfield land for development.
Strategy	Objection	20	Biodiversity adverse impacts	5	Concern about impacts on wildlife and biodiversity from all the development proposed in the plan. Especially losses where development is planned.
Strategy	Objection	20	Countryside and green space - adverse impacts	6	Loss of countryside including the green gap between Exmouth and Lypstone. And also adverse impacts on the AONB. Respondents were concerned about loss of green space and wanted more provision.
Strategy	Objection	20	Infrastructure - flooding	2	Concern that development of green fields will lead to flooding impacts and concerns.
Strategy	Objection	20	Infrastructure - medical facilities	3	Development should not precede new provision of medical facilities and there is insufficient to meet current needs.
Strategy	Objection	20	Infrastructure - pedestrian accessibility/town centre	2	The plan does not promote green credentials in not encouraging people to walk into the town centre. The question was raised of why the town centre is not being regenerated and that as planned new houses will be remote from the centre of town.
Strategy	Objection	20	Infrastructure - links to Exeter	1	Lack of reference / provision for links to Exeter.
Strategy	Objection	20	Infrastructure - footpaths	4	Lack of footpath provision and agreements for provision at Plumb Park have not been met. There was a challenge around where the Exmouth circular cycle path/footpath was and the path at Withycombe and Littleham Brook?
Strategy	objection	20	infrastructure - road capacity and access	8	Concern that road capacity in the town, in general, is inadequate to cope with proposed extra levels of development and there was concerns about the impacts that new development will place in respect of requirements for new roads and impacts that these would generate (noting that any many site

Subject at: Exmouth	Type of comment	Policy or reference	Category	Number of similar comments	Summary of comment
					specific comments also relate specifically to site capacity and access issues). Comment was made about the delayed failure to complete Dinan Way and also congestion outside of the town was highlighted, specifically on roads to Exeter.
Strategy	Objection	20	Infrastructure - school	6	Existing schools were described as over subscribed and cannot cope with extra development. A need for a 2nd secondary school was identified. Development should not precede new provision of school spaces.
Strategy	Objection	20	Infrastructure - sewage and water capacity	2	Sewage system cannot cope with existing population and will not cope with extra development.
Strategy	Objection	20	Infrastructure - green energy production	5	New homes and buildings should all incorporate solar panels and use heat pump technology. High green standards should feature in new homes.
Strategy	Objection	20	Shops	1	Development should not precede new provision of additional shops.
Strategy	Objection	20	Should build elsewhere	3	There were representations seeking to build elsewhere away from Exmouth. More and speedier development at the new town was highlighted in representation thus lessening the need to build in Exmouth. An Exmouth respondent questioned the credibility and suitability of any of the site options highlighting traffic congestion issues and challenges.
Strategy	Objection		General about all matters	1	In general comments about East Budleigh it was advised that Salem Chapel is an important historic listed building that should remain outside the settlement boundary with green space all around.
Strategy	Objection		General about all matters	1	In general comments about Otterton it was stated that - it is too full already, there will be environmental impact (from development) and there is no mains gas.

Subject at: Exmouth	Type of comment	Policy or reference	Category	Number of similar comments	Summary of comment
Strategy	Objection		General about all matters	3	In comments about Lympstone it was advised that proposals for Lympstone negatively impact on all plan objectives bar 3. There were also concerns flagged for Exmouth that development north of Exmouth would erode the important gap between the town and Lympstone.

**Paper slip comments from the Honiton consultation event on the 7 December 2022**

Subject at Honiton	Type of comment	Policy or reference	Category	Number of similar comments	Summary of comment
Strategy	objection	--	upottery classified as unsustainable	2	Object upottery classed as unsustainable, more development should be placed in the area to support the school and local business
Allocations	Objection	21	Gitti_05	1	Object the development, concerned about the drainage system in the area as local resident. Also more dentist and doctor needed in Honiton area, as local people not have access to density service in Honiton.
Allocations	Objection	21	Gitti_05	1	Access via Hayne lane is not suitable for the current amount of traffic in the area, more housing development will bring the traffic to completely unacceptable level.
Allocations	Objection	21	GH/ED/39(A)	4	Upset about the proposed development GH/ED/39A which next to ottery valley park. Concerned about the safety and security issues. Also, the development will affect the views and quiet characteristics of the area.
Allocations	Objection	21	GH/ED/39(A)	2	access road not good enough for any extra traffic in the area.
Allocations	Support	21	Plymtree	1	support no allocation in Plymtree
Flooding	objection		Flooding	2	Flooding issue not consider carefully, esp. A30.

Subject at Honiton	Type of comment	Policy or reference	Category	Number of similar comments	Summary of comment
Access	objection		traffic	1	The Roundabout get into Honiton cannot take all the traffic, as it is already very busy.
Housing	Objection		Affordable housing	1	Not enough affordable housing in Honiton
AONB	Objection		AONB	6	Sites fall within AONB should not be allocated, in order to protect the wildlife, biodiversity and landscape. It is the charter of Honiton.
Drainage	Objection		Drainage	2	Drainage should be consider before any allocations as it is a problem to honiton even without extra hosuing development.
Town Boundary	Question		Town Boundary	1	Question about the town boundary and is it up-to-date and reflecting the ture.
			affordable housing	1	25% affordable housing still subject to the planning permission which is unacceptable
			Housing	1	We do not need the large amount housing in other area, when we have a new settlement under development.
			Honi_01	1	Access is unsafe and unachiveable; very limted infrasture in the area and without local shop except the farm shop.
			public event		Poorly planed and not enough information and maps, staff unable to answer all the questions during the event.

**Paper slip comments from the Ottery St Mary consultation event on the 30 November 2022**

Subject at Ottery St Mary	Type of comment	Policy or reference	Category	Number of similar comments	Summary of comment
allocations_GH/ED /27, Otry_10	Objection	22	allocations - landscape	1	Visual prominence of these sites is no different to Otry_01 from a distance. Adverse visual impact from footpath users through the site.

allocation s_genera l	Objection	22	infrastructure - public transport	5	No more housing until public transport is improved.
allocation s_genera l	Objection	22	employment - job opportunities	1	There is little work locally so people have to travel outside Ottery to work.
allocation s_genera l	Objection	22	environment - design	2	The style of housing recently approved has not been sympathetic to the town.
allocation s_GH/ED /29	Objection	22	allocations - transport	2	Development would cause increased traffic at the junction with Tip Hill.
consultati on	Comment	22	consultation	1	The thoughts of local residents are largely ignored.
allocation s_genera l	Comment	22	infrastructure - transport	1	Quarry plans at Straightgate (nr Daisymount) will have a severe effect on traffic on the main road from Ottery to the A30.
allocation s_Otry_0 1	Comment	22	housing - location	3	Housing should be located on the west side, along the road to Exeter, to avoid traffic issues in the town centre.
allocation s_GH/ED /29, 30	Objection	22	allocations - location	3	No new housing at Gerway due to traffic issues, flooding.
allocation s_genera l	Comment	22	non planning related - transport	1	There should be a 20mph speed limit in Ottery and permit parking to make the roads safer.
allocation s_Otry_1 5	Objection	22	allocations - transport	1	The road south of the five-way junction of Slade Road, Knightstone Lane, Chineway Gradens is a narrow, single track, winding road.
allocation s_GH/ED /29	Objection	22	allocations - transport	1	No pedestrian access to the town.
allocation s_West_ 01	Objection	26	allocations - location	1	Allocating West_01 is inconsistent with Neighbourhood Plan aim to resist infill development
allocation s_West_ 01	Objection	26	allocations - flood risk	1	Development at West_01 will cause more flooding in the lower areas.
allocation s_West_ 01	Objection	26	allocations - trees	1	The site is protected by TPOs and housing will destroy the tree roots.

Paper slip comments from the Seaton consultation event on the 15 December 2022

Subject at Seaton	Type of comment	Policy or reference	Category	Number of similar comments	Summary of comment
allocation_s_general	Comment	23	environment - design	3	Ensure new buildings are of a high environmental specification e.g. solar, rainwater harvesting, insulation, heat pumps.
consultation	Comment	23	consultation	2	Extend the consultation period and give residents more of a say.
allocation_s_general	Objection	23	housing - need	4	Too many houses are planned.
allocation_s_general	Objection	23	housing - affordability	5	Houses are too expensive for local people, need more affordable housing.
allocation_s_general	Objection	23	infrastructure - health	4	Lack of access to health services.
allocation_s_general	Comment	23	Land availability	2	How do we know if local landowners are selling their land for development?
allocation_s_Seat_03, 05	Objection	23	allocations - transport	2	Allocations will cause congestion and safety issues on Seaton Road and junction with A3052, Popes Lane, and Wetlands entrance.
allocation_s_Seat_03, 05	Objection	23	green wedge	6	Seat_03 and 05 are within the Green Wedge.
allocation_s_Seat_08	Support	23	allocations - transport	1	Extra traffic along an inadequate road (Churston Rise).
allocation_s_Seat_08	Support	23	allocations - landscape	1	Adverse landscape impact as houses would be higher than the natural top of the hill.
allocation_s_Seat_08	Support	23	allocations - biodiversity	1	Wide range of wildlife exist on the site.
allocation_s_Seat_03, 05	Objection	23	allocations - biodiversity	2	This land is vital for wildlife, especially bats, owls, local flora and fauna.
allocation_s_general	Objection	23	brownfield first	4	Brownfield sites should be used first.
allocation_s_general	Objection	23	infrastructure - general	21	There is not enough infrastructure to support 217 more houses in Seaton - school, doctors, hospital, dentists, sewerage.



Subject at Seaton	Type of comment	Policy or reference	Category	Number of similar comments	Summary of comment
allocations_general	Objection	23	housing - need	2	Maximise use of existing stock by discouraging holiday lets, using empty homes, and provide flats for downsizing.
allocations_general	Objection	23	flooding	5	Need to consider the flooding impact of 217 more houses and associated concrete.
exhibition	Comment	23	exhibition	1	Would be useful to have a plan showing where planning permission has been granted to get a full picture.
allocations_general	Objection	23	environment - agricultural land	2	Place greater emphasis on the preservation of agricultural land.
allocations_general	Objection	23	infrastructure - open space	2	Provide green space within and between development.
exhibition	Comment	23	exhibition	4	Generally EDDC try hard in difficult circumstances, pleased with the exhibition but not enough staff present and need more maps.
allocations_general	Comment	23	car parking	1	Object to overnight parking of camper vans, especially at the Underfleet car parks.
allocations_general	Objection	23	allocations - landscape	2	Colyford will lose its identity.
allocations_general	Objection	23	infrastructure - playing pitches	2	Need a new football pitch for team to be upgraded.
allocations_general	Objection	23	environment	6	Adverse impact upon the Wetlands.
allocations_general	Objection	23	allocations - landscape	1	The AONB needs to be protected.
allocations_general	Objection	23	allocations - landscape	1	Coastal protection should be upheld.
allocations_general	Objection	23	infrastructure - general	3	New infrastructure should come before new housing.
allocations_general	Objection	23	allocations - transport	2	The roads are too small to sustain the extra traffic from proposed new housing.
allocations_general	Objection	23	employment - job opportunities	4	There are not enough jobs for residents of housing, need employment land.
allocations_general	Objection	23	retail	3	Lack of shopping facilities, need to revamp the town centre.

Subject at Seaton	Type of comment	Policy or reference	Category	Number of similar comments	Summary of comment
allocations_general	Objection	23	infrastructure - utilities	2	Need to water supply, electricity and gas supply can sustain the extra houses.
allocations_general	Objection	23	environment - renewable energy	1	Do not agree with solar energy allocations around Holyford Woods.
allocations_general	Objection	23	environment - renewable energy	1	Do not agree with wind energy allocations around Holyford Woods. Position of turbines would be very low so not effective.
allocations_Seat_05	Objection	23	allocations	1	Shocked to see Seat_05 proposed as it has been dismissed three times, even by the Planning Inspectorate at appeal.
allocations_general	Objection	23	biodiversity - phosphates	1	Need to consider phosphates run-off.
allocations_general	Objection	23	infrastructure - facilities	1	No facilities for young people.
allocations_general	Objection	23	housing - need	1	Build more multi-generational homes to make more efficient use of housing stock.

Paper slip comments from the Sidmouth consultation event on the 6 December 2022

Subject at Sidmouth	Type of comment	Policy or reference	Category	Number of similar comments	Summary of comment
sites(not allocated)_SIDM_25	Comment	24	infrastructure - transport	5	Proposed site unsuitable on highway grounds
sites(not allocated)_SIDM_25	Comment	24	environment - AONB	5	Proposed site unsuitable due to impact on AONB
sites(not allocated)_SIDM_25	Comment	24	environment - Historic	2	Proposed site unsuitable due to impact on historic heritage site (Sand House)
sites(not allocated)_SIDM_25	Comment	24	infrastructure - water	5	Increased rain water flow will cause problems / surface water flooding
sites(not allocated)_SIDM_25	Comment	24	site sustainability	3	too remote
sites(not allocated)_SIDM_25	Comment	24	infrastructure - education	5	lack of school spaces
sites(not allocated)_SIDM_25	Comment	24	environment - farm land	2	loss of agricultural land
sites(not allocated)_SIDM_25	Comment	24	noise	1	Noise impact on neighbours
sites(not allocated)_SIDM_25	Comment	24	environment - biodiversity	2	Adverse impact on biodiversity
new settlement	Comment	8	infrastructure - transport	1	Proposed new settlement unsuitable on highway grounds, already overrun
new settlement	Comment	8	infrastructure - water	1	Increased risk of flooding, what input have SWW had?
general transport	Comment	1	infrastructure - transport	1	Sustainable transport should be prioritised for any allocations
general housing	Comment	24	housing	1	Sidmouth needs new 3 and 4 bed affordable properties. The sooner building can start the better.

Subject at Sidmouth	Type of comment	Policy or reference	Category	Number of similar comments	Summary of comment
general infrastructure	Comment	1	infrastructure	1	Infrastructure needs to be in place before [other] development.
consultation	Comment	n/a	social democracy	1	EDDC suggested as forcing through decisions based on the wants of selected landowners. 'Should have consulted residents first'.
allocations_SIDM_01	Comment	24	environment - biodiversity	1	Concern over impact on AONB
allocations_SIDM_01	Comment	24	infrastructure - all	1	The local infrastructure can't cope with existing residents, new development would add to the strain
allocations_SIDM_01	Comment	24	local amenity	1	Concern over proximity to neighbouring properties on Higher Woolbrook Park
general housing	Comment	3	housing targets	1	Levelling up and regeneration bill noted as allowing a rethink on housing numbers and appropriate locations. New focus should be on urban areas and brownfield sites.

### Paper slip comments from the Clyst St Mary consultation event on the 2 December 2022

Subject at Clyst St Mary	Type of comment	Policy or reference	Category	Number of similar comments	Summary of comment
Allocations	Objection	8	General - Exeter suburb/expansion	2	The development will become a suburb of or part of Exeter.
Allocations	Qualified support	8	General about all options	4	Whilst new community not supported it was suggested it was a better option (with scope for infrastructure provision and proximity to Exeter) than bolting housing onto existing settlements. Highlighted that employment land provision needs to be part of the discussion. Also suggested that

Subject at Clyst St Mary	Type of comment	Policy or reference	Category	Number of similar comments	Summary of comment
					any road should be past (east) of Westpoint in order to relieve A3052 traffic levels.
Allocations	Objection	8	General about Clyst St Mary	1	Positive that land areas bordering Clyst St Mary are rejected for development.
Allocations	Objection	8	Odours from Hill Barton	2	Considered that house building is inappropriate in proximity of Hill Barton on account of bad odours from Hill Barton.
Allocations	Objection	8	Site Option 1	10	Option 1 highlighted as inappropriate with poor infrastructure. Capacity of the A3052 was challenged. Also suggested proximity to Cranbrook was inappropriate and loss of prime farmland would be significant. Preferred status of this option was questioned with a respondent stating " <i>preferred by who...</i> " A land owner advised that their land was shown in this option but they did want it to be so.
Allocations	Qualified support	8	Site Option 1	2	This site was suggested as the best option. With matters raised including potential for to access the A30 and A35.
Allocations	Objection	8	Site Option 3	2	Objection to this option with adverse traffic and environmental impacts highlighted.
Allocations	Qualified support	8	Site Option 3	3	This option was seen as less bad than others given existing developments at and around the sit and generally better infrastructure and less adverse environmental impacts. Roads were considered to be better.
Economic impacts	Objection	8	Jobs	2	It was questioned where the jobs were for any new residents of the proposals.
Economic impacts	Objection	8	Tourism	3	Development will discourage tourist from coming to East Devon, with 15 years of building congestion, and instead they will go elsewhere (Inc. Cornwall).
Plan process	Objection	8	Compensation	1	Suggested that there should be compensation for existing residents.
Plan process	Objection	8	Consultation in general	1	Considered that the consultation process was ill thought out.

Subject at Clyst St Mary	Type of comment	Policy or reference	Category	Number of similar comments	Summary of comment
Plan process		8	Developer led development	6	Considered that the proposals are developer led and this is inappropriate. Also highlighted that there was confusion given development proposal material that was presented to committee. Also lack of trust in quality of some house builders products and suggestion that developers are greedy.
Plan process	Objection	8	Knowledge of officers at the exhibition	1	Considered that staff at the exhibition could not answer questions asked.
Plan process	Objection	8	Listening to local people	5	Views of local people are not being taken into account and are likely to be ignored in decision taking. Development is being imposed and will adversely impact on quality of life of local people.
Plan process	Objection	8	Trust in the Council	7	Suggested that the process being followed indicates public distrust of East Devon District Council. One respondent wrote " <i>They have radicalised GESP</i> ". It was also suggested decisions have already been taken and considered the approach of new town provision showed laziness from the Council. The (deliberate) lack of information on a possible new road from the A30 to A3052 was stated as a concern.
Strategy	Objection	8	Adverse impacts on existing villages	1	New community development will have will have adverse/destroying impacts on existing settlements.
Strategy	Objection	8	Adverse impacts on listed buildings	3	New community development will have will have adverse/destroying impacts on listed buildings.
Strategy	Objection	8	Adverse impacts on quiet amenity	2	New community development will have will have adverse/destroying impacts on peace and quiet that exists at present with adverse impacts on existing residents.
Strategy	Objection	8	Agricultural land loss	7	Development will result in loss of agricultural land with adverse impacts occurring, specifically including food supply..

Subject at Clyst St Mary	Type of comment	Policy or reference	Category	Number of similar comments	Summary of comment
Strategy	Objection	8	Alternative new town options	1	Should consider other new town options such as two new towns each with 4,000 homes.
Strategy	Objection	8	Biodiversity adverse impacts	5	Development will result in loss of features of biodiversity importance and will have adverse impacts on wildlife species.
Strategy	Objection	8	Countryside - adverse impacts	4	Loss of countryside will occur with adverse impacts.
Strategy	Objection	8	Cranbrook completion	2	Cranbrook needs completing before any future new town is considered and more generally considered unfair to have another new town whilst residents are still suffering from Cranbrook development.
Strategy	Objection	8	General - Site assessment process	1	Stated that the site assessment process was too subjective.
Strategy	Objection	8	Housing requirements	8	Imposed housing targets are inappropriate for East Devon. Suggested homes may lay empty and a respondent suggested new homes are too expensive for local people and are being bought as 2nd homes and buy to lets. Also suggested, on a general level, that development is not needed and one respondent advised development would house illegals (assumed illegal immigrants). Suggested Government housing requirements should be challenged and also a CPRE report on housing need was cited as showing that need figures are lower than these being planned for.
Strategy	Objection	8	Infrastructure - fire services	1	Provision is not planned for fire services.
Strategy	Objection	8	Infrastructure - flooding	8	Development will increase surface water run-off and heighten flooding problems. Reference was made to flooding in Farringdon. Also suggested existing flooding problems should be sorted out.
Strategy	Objection	8	Infrastructure - medical facilities	7	More pressure on existing health facilities that are already over-stretched.

Subject at Clyst St Mary	Type of comment	Policy or reference	Category	Number of similar comments	Summary of comment
Strategy	Objection	8	Infrastructure - pedestrian safety and cycle provision	1	Concerns around provision of footpaths and cycle paths and associated safety issues.
Strategy	Objection	8	Infrastructure - public transport and buses	3	Inadequate provision is made noting existing poor public transport.
Strategy	objection	8	infrastructure - road capacity and access	14	Has not taken account of the already congested A3052 and general pressure on roads which cannot cope. Junctions 29 and 30 were considered to be at capacity and could not accommodate more cars, also village access roads and junction congestion was highlighted in comments.
Strategy	Objection	8	Infrastructure - school	5	Lack of provision and concern that provision of new schools will not happen.
Strategy	Objection	8	Infrastructure - sewage and water capacity	3	Insufficient sewage capacity and no powers to require upgrades as part of the development.
Strategy	Objection	8	Infrastructure - shop	1	Concern their would be inadequate shops.
Strategy	Objection	8	Long term impacts	1	Development will have long term negative impacts (destroying Devon).
Strategy	Qualified support	8	Master planning	1	Considered it should be called a new community which should strive to meet as many policy statements as possible and these should inform the masterplan. The idea of 4 garden villages should be considered.
Strategy	Objection	8	Nuclear power station	1	A respondent commented "why don't you build a nuclear power station whilst your on!"
Strategy	Objection	8	Quality of development	1	Suggested a new town will end up being a slum.
Strategy	Objection	8	Should build elsewhere	3	Principle of new town opposed with proposal that there should be development elsewhere in East Devon or provision is just not needed.
Strategy	Objection	8	Wind farms	1	Suggested land would be better used for wind farms.



Paper slip comments from the Feniton consultation event on the 13 December 2022

Subject at Feniton	Type of comment	Policy or reference	Category	Number of similar comments	Summary of comment
allocations - Feni_05	Objection	26	Allocations	1	Sewage pipes that serve the site are too small with adjoining/close by properties experiencing sewage back-ups/floods in wet weather. New sewage provision is required.
allocations - Feni_05	Objection	26	Allocations	1	Acceptance of this development site.
Strategy - general	Objection	26	Developers and money	2	Concern that the development agenda is about greedy landowners making money.
Strategy - general	Objection	26	Development locations	1	A respondent suggests that if there is a need to build then join up the old and new villages (though in other comments they challenge appropriateness of development).
Strategy - general	Objection	26	Flooding	9	Highlighted that Feniton has existing severe flooding problems that will be exacerbated by further development leading to greater damage.
Strategy - general	Comment	26	House prices	1	Housing costs were identified as too high.
Strategy - general	Objection	26	House sizes	2	Need for smaller homes for the elderly to release family home.
Strategy - general	Objection	26	Infrastructure - buses	4	Bus services are infrequent/poor.
Strategy - general	Objection	26	Infrastructure - medical facilities	7	Medical provision was criticised for being over-subscribed, including GPs.
Strategy - general	Objection	26	Infrastructure - pub	1	Lack of a decent pub
Strategy - general	Objection	26	Infrastructure - railway station and trains	8	Too much weight is attached to the station as a consideration in suitability for development, highlighted that services are poor (a stopping train every 2 hours) and the platform is short.
Strategy - general	Objection	26	Infrastructure - roads	9	Existing narrow lanes, in general, are highlighted as congested and inadequate to cope with existing or extra traffic.
Strategy - general	Objection	26	Infrastructure - roads at	1	Traffic problems and congestion are significant at the railway crossing and more development will lead to greater tailbacks.

Subject at Feniton	Type of comment	Policy or reference	Category	Number of similar comments	Summary of comment
			railway crossing		
Strategy - general	Objection	26	Infrastructure - school	11	The village school is full and the nearest alternative is at Payhembury, accessed by narrow roads.
Strategy - general	Objection	26	Infrastructure - securing new facilities	2	Objection that new development is not accompanied by additional services and facilities and highlighted that an infrastructure plan should precede a development plan.
Strategy - general	Objection	26	Infrastructure - shop	2	There is only one shop in the village.
Strategy - general	Objection	26	Jobs	3	Lack of job opportunities in the area was highlighted as a reasons to oppose new housing development.
Strategy - general	Objection	26	Loss of farmland	3	Objection to building that would see the loss of farmland and consequential reduction in food production.
Strategy - general	Objection	26	Social integration	1	Referencing the super planning appeal concerns highlighted around social integration of possible new population if housing development goes ahead.
Strategy - general	Objection	26	Sustainability	1	A respondent writes "Sustainable ??? Buffoons the lot of you".
allocations - general	Objection	22	allocations - transport	1	Roads are already congested, they were built for cart and horses, and new development would worsen problems .
Development - general	Objection		More building at Cranbrook	1	A respondent (not from Cranbrook) advised that we should be building at Cranbrook only.

At the consultation events there were also comments made about other settlements. Matters raised included:

### **In respect of Chardstock**

- infrastructure – transport - nothing should be developed here because of unsuitable roads and access, environmental impact on roads and hedges and increase in traffic
- infrastructure – transport - 2 mile walk on narrow unlit road to bus route on A358 with no safe pedestrian crossing in Tytherleigh.
- infrastructure – transport - Too much extra traffic on busy roads, especially at school times, traffic gridlock would be worse and dangerous
- housing – need - houses not needed
- housing – affordability - houses would cost more than £500, 000

### **In respect of Cranbrook**

- More building at Cranbrook - A respondent (not from Cranbrook) advised that should be building at Cranbrook only.

### **In respect of East Budleigh**

- In general comments about East Budleigh it was advised that Salem Chapel is an important historic listed building that should remain outside the settlement boundary with green space all around.

### **In respect of East Budleigh**

- In general comments about Otterton it was stated that - it is too full already, there will be environmental impact (from development) and there is no mains gas.

### **In respect of Lympstone**

- In comments about Lympstone it was advised that proposals for Lympstone negatively impact on all plan objectives bar 3. There were also concerns flagged for Exmouth that development north of Exmouth would erode the important gap between the town and Lympstone.

### **In respect of West Hill**

- allocations – location - Allocating West\_01 is inconsistent with Neighbourhood Plan aim to resist infill development
- allocations - flood risk - Development at West\_01 will cause more flooding in the lower areas.
- allocations – trees - The site West 01 is protected by TPOs and housing will destroy the tree roots.

