

**Cullompton Neighbourhood Plan – 1<sup>st</sup> Consultation Draft – SG Comments Review Feb 2017**

No.	Comment:	Consultant Reaction:	Recommendation:	SG Decision 8/2/17
<b>Cullompton Town Council Sept. 2016:</b>				
1	The Plan can't prevent development from happening but it can influence the infrastructure to be provided.	Incorrect. It can prevent the wrong type of development happening.		
2	Need to ensure that developers are conditioned to put in sufficient money/development contributions to support the new development.	You could include a policy in the Neighbourhood Plan relating to developer contributions. It would be a generalised position statement without much clout unless it related to an approved Infrastructure Plan.	Could include a new general policy along the lines of: <i>"Financial contributions will be required, as appropriate, from each developer of major* residential developments to mitigate the impact of the development on essential infrastructure such as....."</i>	Consider additional policy regarding infrastructure and relate it to new policy on GVI
3	Consider including a policy that provides for the construction of a cycle path from J27 to Cullompton and cycle routes/tracks around the town. Update the Council's multi-use cycle route document.	You cannot include a policy that involves land outside of the neighbourhood area.		
4	Include provision for the railway station within the Plan.	This would require a fully consulted feasibility study before a specific site could be allocated in the NP.	Make it a condition of a new GVI policy	
5	Sprinter bus service to take people to where they work e.g. Exeter/Sowton industrial estates.	Not a planning policy		
6	Find out what % of the traffic leaving Cullompton in the morning goes to Exeter.	Useful additional, up-to-date, quantifiable evidence is always welcome.	Review available evidence and add anything additional and relevant to the supporting statement of Policy C/SD01	It's though the Town Clerk may have some recent monitoring figures. LM to check with Devon CC whether there's any additional evidence available. Add reference to any new evidence to support statement of Policy C/HT01
7	Consider the added impact that additional traffic has on the town when the M5 is closed and traffic diverted through the town.	Useful additional, up-to-date quantifiable evidence is always welcome.	Review available evidence and add anything additional and relevant to the supporting statement to Policy C/HT01	LM to check whether there's any additional evidence available. Add reference to any new evidence to support statement of Policy C/HT01

No.	Comment:	Consultant Reaction:	Recommendation:	SG Decision 8/2/17
8	Include, within the Plan policies that encourage renewable energy provision such as solar energy and grey water collection when building new houses.	Not a Neighbourhood Plan matter. Deregulation legislation says you should not set standards of construction, internal layout or performance of new dwellings		
9	Ensure that developers are conditioned to make contributions to a "town bus service", through s.106 Agreement or similar.	This could be part of a developer contributions policy relating to an Infrastructure Plan (as referred to at 2 above).	See 2 above	Include in an additional policy on infrastructure as agreed at 2 above
10	Policies that provide for car parking within the curtilage of new homes and sufficient for the size of the house, based on number of bedrooms.	Current policy C/HO4 does this – I'm not sure therefore what the 'issue' is?	No change required to Policy C/HO4	No change
11	Policy that ensures that there is sufficient parking for visitors, delivery vehicles, refuse collection etc.	Current policy C/HO4 does this – I'm not sure therefore what the 'issue' is?	No change required to Policy C/HO4	No change
12	Engage with MDDC re housing needs and affordable housing policies.	Town Council should remain in regular dialogue with MDDC over housing need and affordable housing policy and provision.	Reinforce message in supporting statement to Policy C/H01	Add reference to this message in supporting statement to C/H01
13	Play areas should be very visible and not tucked away in corners.	This is covered by policy C/WL02	No change required to Policy C/WL02	No change
14	Define the definition of green space more clearly	You must use criteria in NPPF. It may help to add further description and justification about individual sites to show that they meet NPPF criteria.	Ensure supporting statement of Policy C/EN02 justifies every site	Review supporting statements to ensure final list all meet the criteria of NPPF
15	Include policies that protect the local water courses and main rivers. This included the Mill Leat, the leat the flows along Meadow Lane towards the CCA Fields and the leat that runs alongside Millennium Way. Concern that proposed new development will create backwash pollution into the rivers and waterways. Vital that the waterways are protected.	If there is evidence that it is a real threat, then a policy could be included to ensure pollution is avoided. Local Plan Policy DM4 covers this threat (in a non-specific way).	Consider whether the potential threat to local watercourse warrants a new policy regarding their pollution	Consider need for criteria regarding pollution prevention in the GVI policy
16	Look at including the fields at Upton Lake to be preserved as an amenity for the town. (Page 32).	You should only include this area in policy C/EN01 if the Devon Wildlife Trust or Natural England identify it as having 'ecological significance'.	No change to the policies – no part of Upton Lakes is identified as being of ecological significance	No change

No.	Comment:	Consultant Reaction:	Recommendation:	SG Decision 8/2/17
		Alternatively, if the area is regularly accessible to the public they could be included in C/WL01, although there may be objection from owner.		
17	Concern about the wording of 10.12 – the policy to make Fore Street one-way is too specific as there maybe alternative ways to resolve the traffic problem, can this be reworded?	I think the comment relates to para. 10.11. This paragraph reflects the views expressed in a Town Council paper. If this is not, or is no longer, the view of the Town Council then the wording should be changed. The policy, C/THC03, makes no reference to “one-way”.	Need confirmation of TC’s current view on one-way – amend para. 10.11 accordingly but no change to Policy C/THC03	LM to check that NP text reflects current TC position
18	10.17 Rewording required as the Town Council only owns St Andrews car park (not Forge Way or Higher Bullring). Also, include the Hayridge car park to ensure that this site is protected from development.	The wording should be changed to reflect actual ownership situation. Owners should be written to, to be made aware of the draft policy and its implications. Would including Hayridge site go against the agreement with the owner?	Need guidance on ownership of sites and confirmation of which sites to include in Policy C/THC04	LM to confirm ownership. MDDC own Forge Way DCC own Bull Ring
19	Improved tourist destination signage to encourage visitors into the town centre.	Not a planning policy		
20	Attractive feature adjacent to the M5 junction, a talking point, something that motorists will notice when driving past J28. Reflects the distinctiveness of the local area.	Such a landmark feature could be cited as an example in the supporting text, if that is the view of the Town Council.	Could include reference in supporting text for public art policy C/THC05	No change
21	Visitors park in Tesco car park and walk their dogs in the CCA Fields to break their journey, attract these people into the town centre. Signs from the CCA Fields that lead visitors into the main street to use the coffee shops etc.	Not a planning policy		
22	Transport links to Tiverton Parkway railway station.	Not a planning policy		
23	Superfast Broadband to encourage businesses to set up in Cullompton.	Already covered by policy C/SD05 Connectivity is this not considered adequate?	No change required to policy C/SD05. Could add reference in supporting text.	Add additional reference to encouraging business start-ups
24	Protect the area of land in Tiverton Road formerly occupied by the scout	Community buildings could be added to the	No additional policy required	No change

No.	Comment:	Consultant Reaction:	Recommendation:	SG Decision 8/2/17
	and RAOB huts, if cleared this would provide a link through from Tiverton Road to the old cinema building and the rear of High Street (archway between Chic Hairdressers and Heyford House). Can this land be added to the community asset register?	community asset register, but not a cleared site or a potential 'link' to a community facility. A specific policy could be written relating to the future use of the site, if consultation has taken place and the use is appropriate and justified.		
25	Other areas to consider for protection: New Cut, Ye Olde Tea Shoppe, the Old Tannery site opposite Aldi and the picnic area alongside the leat in the CCA Fields (currently leased to MDDC).	What is it that they are to be protected for or against? Whoever is proposing "protection" will need to be specific about each of the sites to understand how best to 'deal' with them. The picnic area may qualify as a local green space to be included in C/EN02.	Need decision on use and status of "picnic area" site and whether it meets the criteria to be designated as a local green space and be included in Policy C/EN02.	No change
26	Add River Drive play area to the list on page 50. (12.6).	Could add it to policy C/WL01 if it is a public play area	Need decision on use and status of site and whether it should be added to C/WL01 as a protected recreation area	Add River Drive to recreation areas to be protected
27	Include a policy that ensures that, should a relief road be constructed through the CCA Fields and impinges on the sports clubs then those sports clubs receive sufficient compensation to enable them to relocate to suitable alternative sites.	There is no policy in the Neighbourhood Plan relating to a relief road.	Add criteria to C/WL01 in case any recreation site is developed	Include criteria as part of a new CCA Fields policy (see below)
28	As Mid Devon will not be adopting any new play areas or open space consider including a policy that provides the opportunity for the Town Council to take on the responsibility for any new play areas/public open space and also enables the Town Council to have input into the design and play equipment to be provided. Commuted sum to be provided to the Town Council as a condition of planning agreement as a contribution towards the cost of running the play area/public open space should it be agreed that the Town Council will adopt it.	Maintenance arrangements alone are not a planning policy. Could add clause to C/WL02 to cover maintenance	Add clause to C/WL02 to cover maintenance	Add maintenance clause and clause relating to consultation with the users

No.	Comment:	Consultant Reaction:	Recommendation:	SG Decision 8/2/17
29	Allocate a site for a swimming pool that is of sufficient size to provide ample car parking.	You could add criteria to policy C/WL04. At the moment, this policy is an expression of support in principle. Planning conditions are easier to justify when related to a specific site.	Re-draft policy C/WL04 to reflect latest situation and preferred site.	Draft new policy for Swimming Pool
<b>Website Comments:</b>				
30	Better traffic management. The high street cannot cope with the volume of traffic at the moment and this will only get worse as more houses are built. A new junction south of the town would be best, or a bypass through the CCA fields. A new park would then be needed for recreation instead of the CCA fields.	Supportive of policy approach taken in the Plan	No changes required	No change
31	More importantly let's support Cullompton being a more family orientated, less traffic dominated, central shopping and other services Town.	Supportive of policy approach taken in the Plan	No changes required	No change
32	All new houses in the town should be forced to have at least two parking spaces for houses and more if the house is a large house	2 parking spaces for 1 bed houses will not be accepted by developers – policy C/HO4 is as close as you can get to this suggestion	No change required	No change
33	Stop building houses.	Comment noted – but suggested policy does not comply with the NPPF	No change required	No change
33a	Don't allow parking on Willand Road. Make Riverton Road, Crow Green, New Street one way.	Parking restrictions and traffic management measures do not translate into planning policy	No changes required	No change
34	The proposed relief road plan is pathetic.	Comment noted	No change required directly as a result of this comment	No change
35	wonderful job done by the team	Supportive of policy approach taken in the Plan	No changes required	No change
36	the millstream needs protection as an amenity	Comment noted Stream does not qualify as an amenity area It could be protected by policy if it is considered at risk	Need decision as to whether additional NP policy is necessary	Add criteria to GVI policy
37	we need to ensure the town water courses are maintained & protected for the amenity benefit	Same reaction as to comment 36. There could be a policy if the water courses are	As per 36 above, need decision as to whether additional NP policy is	Add criteria to GVI policy

No.	Comment:	Consultant Reaction:	Recommendation:	SG Decision 8/2/17
		considered at risk	necessary. This could be linked to a new policy in response to comment 15 above	
38	no idea what the proposed parking standards are - question 1	Comment noted	No change required	No change
39	My concerns are the amount of traffic and our roads in and around Cullompton. The Old Tiverton is too narrow for heavy goods vehicles and buses. Swallow Way in the Kingfisher Reach section is not fit for purpose, and the traffic should be re-directed into Langlands. Parking and road width has been very poorly designed by DWH/Barratts and the road planning dept.	Comment noted. This matter is already addressed in the supporting text to policy C/HO4.	Consider citing specific examples of recent developments as per the suggestion in the supporting text for policy C/HO4.	Cite specific examples as part of evidence for C/HO4
40	Very positive Plan. Let's hope it can be put into practice soon	Supportive of policy approach taken in the Plan	No changes required	No change
41	Cullompton and Mid Devon councils need to be more hands on with the development of housing. Currently Cars, Lorries, and other heavy goods vehicles are parked up on the foot paths. The owners on the property complain they were not advised on the lack of parking. Damage to the roads on Swallow Way and Colebrook lane still not repaired. It appears to be me that the councils are only interested in the income. Go and see the failings of Kingfishers Reach and Swallow way.	Parking is not a planning policy matter although the lessons of recent developments should be heeded.	Consider citing specific examples of recent developments as per the suggestion in the supporting text for policy C/HO4.	Cite specific examples as part of evidence for C/HO4
41a	The swimming pool much talked about but seems far off. Cinema There is a plan on Junction 27 to have a multiplex one which will be up and running bringing Jobs and finance to the region.	Comments noted	No changes required	No change
42	parking in the high street is damaging to the community - especially on Sundays when the town is complete gridlock due to the parking. Personally, I feel that all parking should be stopped in the high street and loading or unloading only done at certain off peak times	Parking and servicing restrictions are not a planning policy matter per se. Comments noted	No changes required	No change
43	Yes, driving through Cullompton when the Manor House was being repaired was the best experience I've ever had in the 50 years I've been travelling through it.	Comment noted	No change to draft NP	No change

No.	Comment:	Consultant Reaction:	Recommendation:	SG Decision 8/2/17
<b>Written Submissions</b>				
44	<p><b>James Quinn 17 Oct 2016</b></p> <p>Part of this plan, I believe, highlights areas to protect as Green Space which would prevent it from future development and ensure the town has areas of natural and strategic beauty within its curtilage</p> <p>If I am correct, could I ask the TC to consider allocating the land presently being used as the Padbrook Golf Course which I have read is to close early next year. This area - beyond the clubhouse etc... - is seen from many points around the town and frames the southern end of the area. So much money has been spent on making it panoramic I just feel it would be a shame to cash in on golfs demise and allow this green area to be swamped with houses etc (if this was ever the plan). Whilst in recreational use the landscape us protected and the green space preserved but with the course shutting, I assume its future is insecure. In a perfect world, footpaths would be introduced around the area to allow the public some kind of open space, but maybe this would be asking too much? Protecting it as Green Space means we could all enjoy it - albeit at a distance- which is what I believe its original purpose was!</p>	<p>Padbrook Golf Course would not meet the criteria of a local green space. It could be given protection as a recreation area under Policy C/WL01. Why was it not included in the first place?</p>	<p>Consider inclusion of Padbrook GC as part of a review of the policy and the sites to be included in Policy C/WL01</p>	<p>LM to write to identify owners and write saying that SG is considering including the Golf Course on the list of recreation areas to be protected. SG to consider after hearing owners' views and intentions.</p>
<b>Ashley Hellier 30 Nov 2016</b>				
45	<p>I believe this is the only or one of the only Neighbourhood Plans that is not just a list of things that local people don't want. I think that this should be specifically brought to the attention of readers as many may be unfamiliar with Neighbourhood plans.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>	<p>No change to draft NP</p>	<p>No change</p>
46	<p>I was a little confused about the Cullompton Community Area Fields (CCA Fields) on page 9. Is this connected to the Cullompton Community Association?</p>	<p>This is a question that can be easily answered</p>	<p>Include clarification in the text of the draft Plan</p>	<p>Include full reference to Cullompton Community Association in the supporting text</p>
47	<p>On page 50 "Our policy is intended to help facilitate the development of the swimming pool as part of a set of new high quality indoor sport and recreation facilities" Is there any specific support for these to be in</p>	<p>This is a matter that will be addressed by updating the evidence included in the draft Plan</p>	<p>Up-date policy C/WL04 and its supporting text</p>	<p>Specific new policy for Swimming Pool</p>

No.	Comment:	Consultant Reaction:	Recommendation:	SG Decision 8/2/17
	one building or more than one building or no preference.			
	<b>Lightwood Land 22 Dec 2016</b>			
48	We welcome the CNP's endorsement for Cullompton to become a strategic development location (paragraph 3.5) and its support for the proposed strategic mixed use allocation at J28 for which our client controls.	Comment noted	No change required	No change
49	<p>We are in support of the Cullompton Town Council's ambition to seek:  "A cohesive, integrated vision that will self-support long term economic, environmental and employment benefits."  And  The need for an Eastern Relief Road  The need for M5 Junction 28 improvement  The delivery of a new community east of Junction 28 to allow for existing development of the town through to 2036.  J28 and Eastern Relief Road  The CNP at various points gives significant and robust support for the proposed improvements to both J28 of the M5 (Policy C/HT01: Motorway Connection) and the delivery of the Eastern Relief Road (ERR), points which Lightwood Land are supportive of.</p>	Comment noted	No change required	No change
50	<p>Lightwood agree that the delivery of the ERR is essential, a point recognised as part of the sites proposed allocation within the Mid Devon Local Plan Review 2013-2033. However, the CNP also seeks within Policy C/WL01: Existing Recreation Spaces to protect the CCA fields (bullet O). This recreational land is located directly on the alignment of the proposed ERR and these fields would be required for its delivery. We therefore consider there is a direct conflict between the wider aspirations of delivering a suitable and appropriate ERR for Cullompton and the longer term protection of this recreational facility. Whilst we consider recreational facilities to be important generally, we consider that in this instance the delivery of the ERR, as a strategic piece of infrastructure which is key to</p>	Suggestion that a blanket protection of CCA Fields may not meet the basic conditions is one that needs considering especially in light of MDDC comment on same matter.	Consider as part of revisions to Policy C/WL01	Remove CCA Fields from Recreation policy and draft specific new policy for CCA Fields

No.	Comment:	Consultant Reaction:	Recommendation:	SG Decision 8/2/17
	<p>the long term growth of the town must take precedence over the retention of the CCA fields. Accordingly, we therefore object to their retention as part of Policy C/WLO1 and would request that they are removed from the policy prior to its formal submission for examination. We consider that if this change is not made there is a danger that the Plan may not meet the basic conditions for neighbourhood plans as set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4b to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.</p>			
	<p><b>Mid Devon DC 23 Dec 2016</b></p>			
51	<p>As drafted Policy C/WL01's inclusion of land at the CCA fields <u>would be out of conformity</u> with both the adopted Local Plan, and the emerging Local Plan, which identifies this area within the potential area for a town centre relief road as shown on the policy maps and referred to in policies AL/CU/14 and Policy CU19 respectively. This would also form part of the solution to your Policy C/HT01 (Motorway Connection) and the town centre relief road is also the most important proposed measure for tackling air pollution in the town centre.</p>	<p>Including the CCA Fields in a policy that provides a blanket protection does not conform with the strategic policies of the LP.</p>	<p>Need to revisit policy C/WL01 and either remove CCA Fields (there could be a separate policy relating to CCA Fields) or introduce criteria which would enable development of some or all of a listed site under certain circumstances.</p>	<p>Remove CCA Fields from Recreation policy and draft specific new policy for CCA Fields</p>
52	<p>With regard to Policy C/EN02 Local Green Space I would like to bring your attention paragraph 77 of the NPPF which refers to such areas not being designated if they are 'an extensive tract of land'. In light of this it may be worth you reconsidering your proposed designations, particularly the Millennium Way Water Meadow, or refining the area you wish to designate.</p>	<p>Whilst the NPPF is not specific on the definition of an extensive tract, Millennium Way Water Meadow may fail the test particularly if the LPA don't support it.</p>	<p>Revise Policy C/EN02 to remove Millennium Way Water Meadow and review other sites to ensure they meet the criteria.</p>	<p>Remove Millennium Way Water Meadow from list of local green spaces in the policy</p>
53	<p>We understand the Neighbourhood Plan Group intend considering allocating land for development and we therefore look forward to working with you as these proposals emerge.</p>	<p>Offer noted</p>	<p>Need to decide site allocation approach in context of GVI</p>	<p>Prepare draft policy relating to the GVI</p>