

## Lympstone Neighbourhood Plan Responses to Consultation (1) – from individuals

*This is a summary of the 111 individual responses to the six week consultation which was carried out in line with the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012. Full details of all the individual responses are available. Please note that the Plan has been revised in response to consultation, and therefore the Policy Numbers in this document may not correspond to those in the updated Plan. Please refer to the Changes Map for an overview of all changes. Abbreviations: NP = Neighbourhood Plan, EET = Exmouth Estuary Trail 'the cycle path', PC = Parish Council, GF = Goodmores Farm, BuAB = Built up Area Boundary Line*

Consultee	Policy number	Summary of issues raised	Working Party response
Ackland Mrs J		Concern about traffic speed in Hulham Road Suggestion of 20mph speed limit	Accepted. Relevant CAP amended to read Parish rather than village. 20mph rejected by DCC but still an option within the plan
ALLAIN, Karen		Residents of Higher Hulham Road have not been consulted about the Plan. The whole parish should be consulted and the plan re-written to include traffic problems outside the village.	All parish residents and interested parties had the opportunity to contribute to the draft plan through meetings and focus groups (see the Consultation Statement). The WP has made changes in response to consultation. These are summarised in the <i>Changes Map</i> attached to this document. New section on Goodmore's Farm inserted
ALLAIN, Karen	CAPS 6, 9,10,12, 14-8,23 H1, H2 Disagree	Impact of GF development have been ignored. The development should be resisted. PC has already approved coalescence.	The GF proposals pre-date this Plan and form part of the East Devon Local Plan. The revised Plan specifies changes to mitigate the impact of this development. New section on Goodmore's Farm inserted
ALLAIN, Mr Alexander "Moose"		The NP reflects the interests of those who live in the village centre and appears to ignore and potentially exploit those living in the outlying parts. It has been difficult to respond fully to the consultation within the time scale; the draft document is poorly organised and hard to read and the consultation form is not designed for lay people. Definition of 'Lympstone' is muddled. Information about GF is hidden. Opposed to GF development.	All parish residents and interested parties had the opportunity to contribute to the draft plan through meetings and focus groups (see the Consultation Statement). The WP has made changes in response to consultation. These are summarised in the <i>Changes Map</i> attached to this document. New section on Goodmore's Farm inserted
ALLEN, Jenepher	CAP 7 p21	Need for parking eastern end of Longmeadow Road – suggest negotiation with Saddlers Arms	

Responses to consultation (individuals) v2 27/8/13

BAILEY, W.J.	CAP7 GA/P1	No land will be available unless the BuAB is extended. Off road parking necessary for any new development.	Off-road parking for new development is catered for in the plan. More land for housing is not needed IF the requirement for 40 new homes can be accommodated within the BuAB – or with only minor amendments
		On p 13 W119 & W337 are contradictory. Could green space be used for burial ground/parking. Centre of village should have been taken from Church/School.	Table removed. We chose the junction of Station Hill and The Strand as that area contained more of the village facilities on which “sustainability” is based
BARTRAM, Aileel & Graham		Re-route EET out of village centre. Suggests risk assessment and working party to address issues	Response to consultation shows the serious concern about the current route and growing impact of the EET. We have therefore amended CAP 8 to propose PC support for an alternative route and traffic management measures in the lower village.  The Working Party has produced a separate leaflet to address this complex issue.
BENNETT, JD&M	CAP1&2	Additional housing is inevitable. These policies need teeth.	Several Community Polices have been recast as Development Management Policies to give them more weight in the planning process. The WP has also revised the original section 11 and Appendix J to clarify where responsibility lies under the Plan
	CAP6 CAP7 GA1	Promote 20mph limit. Detailed suggestions about changes to parking fees for visitors, and allocating reserved parking for residents. Need for more enforcement of parking regulations.	Section 8 amended Detailed suggestions for consideration by PC – certainly a consideration IF the PC takes over Underhill Car Park from EDDC Currently enforcement is with EDDC.
	CAP8 Disagree	Need to re-align EET	Response to consultation shows the serious concern about the current route and growing impact of the EET. We have therefore amended CAP 8 to propose PC support for an alternative route and traffic management measures in the lower village.  The Working Party has produced a separate leaflet to address this complex issue.
	CAP9	No more tarmac on footpaths – creeping urbanisations	Accepted
BOURNE, M	H1	Concerned that development to the south of Lymptone	Covered by Green Wedge and Coastal Preservation Area policies.

Responses to consultation (individuals) v2 27/8/13

	Agree	(east of rail line) would have effect on view of village from estuary and Exmouth	
		Inaccurate description of W125 and W69 in Appendix A	These descriptions were agreed and signed off in December 2012 after the Village Boundary Line exercise.
BRASSINGTON, Mr & Mrs J		Re-route the cycle track along the railway line	Response to consultation shows the serious concern about the current route and growing impact of the EET. We have therefore amended CAP 8 to propose PC support for an alternative route and traffic management measures in the lower village.  The Working Party has produced a separate leaflet to address this complex issue.
BREWER, Angela	GA1 Agree	Extra parking provision is needed at top end of the village	Accepted – now a DMP
BURTON, Sally	CAP6	Disagrees that re-routeing EET will be detrimental to village economy. Actively seek re-routeing away from Sowden Lane	Response to consultation shows the serious concern about the current route and growing impact of the EET. We have therefore amended CAP 8 to propose PC support for an alternative route and traffic management measures in the lower village.  The Working Party has produced a separate leaflet to address this complex issue.
BUTCHER, Anne		Concerned about impact of new houses on parking, traffic, primary school, medical centre, and flooding.	Accepted but already covered by CAPS 6, 7, 16, 18, 21
BUTCHER, Edward		Make more user friendly (e.g. explain how calculations are arrived at – p13)	Significant editorial changes made.
BUTCHER, Edward		Suggests 20mph limit. Concerned about problems wheelchair users have in travelling in the village. Suggest Nursery purchased by e.g. Bicton College to provide employment and education to young people	See revised section 8  This is private land – we cannot dictate who it may be sold to
CAMERON, Ron and Moira		Paddock in front of their property has covenant restricting building and this will reduce the planned nos of houses in the Parish	This refers to the proposed development at GF, so is not relevant to Lymstone’s target for new housing set by EDDC
CAMERON, Ron and Moira		Dinan Way Extension will ruin the Wotton Valley	CAP 10 seeks to minimise the detrimental effects of this potential development
CARROL, Brian	CAP8	Re-route EET along the railway line	Response to consultation shows the serious concern about the current

Responses to consultation (individuals) v2 27/8/13

	Disagree		<p>route and growing impact of the EET. We have therefore amended CAP 8 to propose PC support for an alternative route and traffic management measures in the lower village.</p> <p>The Working Party has produced a separate leaflet to address this complex issue.</p>
CARTER, Judith		<p>Concern that the increasing cycle traffic is unsafe and is damaging the village community, and that it will continue to increase. The Plan should state that the PC will make it a priority to work with DCC/Network Rail/and Sustrams to reroute the EET along the railway line.</p>	<p>Response to consultation shows the serious concern about the current route and growing impact of the EET. We have therefore amended CAP 8 to propose PC support for an alternative route and traffic management measures in the lower village.</p> <p>The Working Party has produced a separate leaflet to address this complex issue.</p>
Chilton, Russell		<p>Frequent visitor to Lympstone, wishes to protect the community. Concerned that PC represents broad spread of ages, and safety issues re the EET.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Response to consultation shows the serious concern about the current route and growing impact of the EET. We have therefore amended CAP 8 to propose PC support for an alternative route and traffic management measures in the lower village.</p> <p>The Working Party has produced a separate leaflet to address this complex issue.</p>
CLARK, Jenny		<p>General support for the NP but points out that it needs to be a working document, adapted as circumstances change. Concern about the 'reasonable responsibilities' of the PC, and public money not invested assisting economic and environmental developments.</p>	<p>See Delivery and Monitoring Strategy Appendix J</p>
CLARK, Jenny	CAP8	<p>EET needs optional bypass along the railway line through the village</p>	<p>Response to consultation shows the serious concern about the current route and growing impact of the EET. We have therefore amended CAP 8 to propose PC support for an alternative route and traffic management measures in the lower village.</p> <p>The Working Party has produced a separate leaflet to address this complex issue.</p>

Responses to consultation (individuals) v2 27/8/13

COLES, Mrs Angela	CAP6 Agree	Chapter 8 should use the word pedestrian. 20 mph limit. Need more pavements.	Noted
COLLINGWOOD, A.G.		Disagrees because of road traffic via Wotton Lane	CAP 6 refers to traffic management measures
CRISP, Richard	GA/P1	Delete 'unless it can be demonstrated that occupiers are unlikely to rely on the private car' since this could not be sustained after a change of occupant	Requires developer to demonstrate – ie. Accommodation for the elderly
CRISP, Richard	GA/P2	Insert 'off street' between new and parking.  Concerned about problems with on street parking especially delivery lorries, residential parking permits might be considered	Accepted  No support for permits in community consultation – but an item IF the PC takes over the Underhill Car Park.
CRISP, Richard	CAP 6	Concern about additional developments increasing car travel to Lymptone shops and Pubs Disagrees with action 3	CAP6 supports this view, also H1 and CAP2  Strong support for action 3 in the infrastructure focus group
CRISP, Richard	CAP8 Disagree	Concerned about safety where the EET goes through the village. Reroute along railway line.	Response to consultation shows the serious concern about the current route and growing impact of the EET. We have therefore amended CAP 8 to propose PC support for an alternative route and traffic management measures in the lower village.  The Working Party has produced a separate leaflet to address this complex issue.
CRISP, Richard	CAP6?	Text on p 20 refers to need to increase services and facilities but no CAP refers to this.	Noted
CRISP, Richard		Suggested areas for speed calming measures and concern about 30mph limit	Section 8 amended
CRISP, Richard		Need to define limits to developmental sprawl and resist local plan assumptions	The NP has identified suitable sites for development, in line with EDDC LP as is required.
CRISP, Richard		Impressive plan, undermined by some weak/compromising/conflicting language – more robust statements needed	Significant editorial changes
CRUM, Gregor		Re-route EET along the railway line	Response to consultation shows the serious concern about the current route and growing impact of the EET. We have therefore amended CAP 8 to propose PC support for an alternative route and traffic

Responses to consultation (individuals) v2 27/8/13

			management measures in the lower village.  The Working Party has produced a separate leaflet to address this complex issue.
DAVIES, Clem & Sara	CAP8	Concerned about increasing use of EET and safety issues and that the diversion of the trail along rail line has been dismissed without a formal assessment.	Response to consultation shows the serious concern about the current route and growing impact of the EET. We have therefore amended CAP 8 to propose PC support for an alternative route and traffic management measures in the lower village.  The Working Party has produced a separate leaflet to address this complex issue.
DAY, Viv		Supports the plan	Noted
DENNIS, Gail	CAP8 Disagree	Re-route EET along the railway line.	Response to consultation shows the serious concern about the current route and growing impact of the EET. We have therefore amended CAP 8 to propose PC support for an alternative route and traffic management measures in the lower village.  The Working Party has produced a separate leaflet to address this complex issue.
	CAP9	Concerned about tarmac on bridleway at top of Church Path. Not suitable for horses.	Accepted
DENNIS, Kevin	CAP8 Disagree	Re-route EET along the railway line through the village	Response to consultation shows the serious concern about the current route and growing impact of the EET. We have therefore amended CAP 8 to propose PC support for an alternative route and traffic management measures in the lower village.  The Working Party has produced a separate leaflet to address this complex issue.
DIMOND, Helen	H/P6	Omit since this will occur in line with planning policies	Accepted
	CAP5 Agree	Should be a DMP or refer to policy E5 of EDDC Local Plan	Accepted and actioned, where appropriate
	GA/P1 P2 Disagree	1 bed properties should have 1 parking space; 2 or more bedrooms should have min of 2 spaces. Delete reference to private cars and delete P2 which conflicts with reducing car	Accepted and actioned, where appropriate

Responses to consultation (individuals) v2 27/8/13

		use	
	CAP20 Agree	First and third statements should be DMPs not CAPs	Accepted
	CAP22 Agree	Protection of East Devon Way should be a DMP	Accepted
	CAP23	Statement about village green will be redundant when Nursery site planning brief prepared	Statement of intent
		DMPs must be clear and watertight and agreed with EDDC. Concerned that CAPs may not happen – possibly need wider group than PC to take them forward.	Accepted
		Final version should omit any reference to the boundary line and simply state sites to be allocated for development, and the policies on location, design etc. Move background to supporting documents.	Accepted
		Maps need to be improved, starting with a simple map showing the area covered.	Accepted
		Should possible sites for sports pitch/car parking be considered now?	Included, where known
		Edit out repetition e.g. p25 which refers to policy covered earlier	
DIXON, Alan		Rerouting EET should be high priority.	Response to consultation shows the serious concern about the current route and growing impact of the EET. We have therefore amended CAP 8 to propose PC support for an alternative route and traffic management measures in the lower village.  The Working Party has produced a separate leaflet to address this complex issue.
DOAK, Chris & Jacqueline		Document is well presented. Drainage and sewerage system in Longmeadow Road is already overloaded, problems with flooding health risk and this should restrict further	Some CAP 21 moved to DMP for greater effect

		development	
	CAP8	Re-direct EET along the railway line avoiding village streets	<p>Response to consultation shows the serious concern about the current route and growing impact of the EET. We have therefore amended CAP 8 to propose PC support for an alternative route and traffic management measures in the lower village.</p> <p>The Working Party has produced a separate leaflet to address this complex issue.</p>
	CAP19	Consider possible closure of Marine Camp due to defence cuts	There is no evidence of this action
	HP/1 Disagree	More consideration should be given to brown field sites outside BuAB	All development outside of the BuAB had to be submitted to the SHLAA process for evaluation. If a land owner did not submit it was not considered – landowners are not forced to submit into this process. Where submitted brownfield sites were considered alongside others submitted.
EASTLEY, Mr & Mrs Richard & Carol		Indigenous Lymptonians have made little input to the draft plan. Needs more involvement of Land Owners and general public.	Mr Eastley chaired the Lymstone Landowners Association and represented them on the Working Party. He is also a Parish Councillor.
		Disagree with 2.2.1(?) referring to LDF panel Meeting held 11/10/11 when EDDC agreed to adjust the north and south BuAB to meet housing demand as required	This is part of the Village Boundary Exercise. The WPhould this be WP? was able to find the required housing mostly from within the BuAB thus not necessitating a need for a large extension.
		The Village boundary line exercise as submitted to East Devon District Council by the working party, was submitted without consultation with the Land Owners in Lymstone .	The exercise was carried out within the EDDC guidelines and all landowners were able to attend the open meeting.
		Proposed housing development will eliminate all existing green spaces with the village boundary	Incorrect – see CAP 23 in draft plan. This has been reinforced after the consultation comments with a DMP.
		Marine accommodation gives imbalance to a normal village age profile. No consideration in NP to meet needs of elderly in respect of downsizing and NHS care	The Royal Marines are a part of our Community. Acknowledgement of the elderly and their special needs are considered in The Plan. Advice is being sought from EDDC on our ability to dictate housing for the elderly.
		Re-route EET through centre of village	Response to consultation shows the serious concern about the current route and growing impact of the EET. We have therefore amended CAP 8 to propose PC support for an alternative route and traffic management measures in the lower village.

Responses to consultation (individuals) v2 27/8/13

			The Working Party has produced a separate leaflet to address this complex issue.
ELLIS Charlotte and Bruce	CAP8	Reroute EET along railway line	Response to consultation shows the serious concern about the current route and growing impact of the EET. We have therefore amended CAP 8 to propose PC support for an alternative route and traffic management measures in the lower village.  The Working Party has produced a separate leaflet to address this complex issue.
ESTCOURT, Rory		Supports plan as a whole. Wishes more people could have been involved, especially long established residents.	All parish residents and interested parties had the opportunity to contribute to the draft plan through meetings and focus groups (see the Consultation Statement). The WP has made changes in response to consultation.
	CAP3 CAP10 Agree	Need traffic lights to ease access to A376 from Nutwell Road?  Broadband is too slow and BT should be approached.	Would not be support by DCC (Highways) currently.  Accepted
	CAP6 CAP7 Agree	Concerns about increase in nos. of cars using village, speed and damage to parked cars. Need for 20mph limit. More off street parking needed at top end of village.	Accepted  Rejected by DCC but still an option Accepted and new DMP introduced.
Farmer, Claire	CAP8 Disagree	Reroute EEC along the railway line through the village	Response to consultation shows the serious concern about the current route and growing impact of the EET. We have therefore amended CAP 8 to propose PC support for an alternative route and traffic management measures in the lower village.  The Working Party has produced a separate leaflet to address this complex issue.
Farmer, Claire	P12?	Land at bottom of Courtlands Lane/Longbrook Lane unsuitable for development	Accepted - not included.
FARMER, Mr & Mrs Kenneth		Draft is too long and lacks clarity. Lack of clear planning maps.	Significant editorial changes made
FERGUSON,	CAP8	Divert the EET along the railway line	Response to consultation shows the serious concern about the current

Responses to consultation (individuals) v2 27/8/13

R.G.	Disagree		<p>route and growing impact of the EET. We have therefore amended CAP 8 to propose PC support for an alternative route and traffic management measures in the lower village.</p> <p>The Working Party has produced a separate leaflet to address this complex issue.</p>
FREEMAN, Miles		An easy read and comprehensive	Noted
	CAP8 Strongly disagree	Economic benefits of EET overstated. Reroute along the railway embankment	<p>Response to consultation shows the serious concern about the current route and growing impact of the EET. We have therefore amended CAP 8 to propose PC support for an alternative route and traffic management measures in the lower village.</p> <p>The Working Party has produced a separate leaflet to address this complex issue.</p>
	CAP 7	Specify parking opportunities as part of the plan e.g. Rory Estcourt offer as part of his submission to encourage debate and ideas.	DMP now included
	CAP5 Agree	Be more specific about employment e.g 12 villagers at Londis	Have now amended this to a DMP
		Should have a section on how we support and protect the village shop since the tenancy is tenuous and it is essential to the wellbeing of the community, especially once the PO is incorporated into it	Noted, but this is commercial issue and one outside the scope of the Plan
GRIFFITHS, Liz	CAP8 Disagree	Reroute the EET along the railway line	<p>Response to consultation shows the serious concern about the current route and growing impact of the EET. We have therefore amended CAP 8 to propose PC support for an alternative route and traffic management measures in the lower village.</p> <p>The Working Party has produced a separate leaflet to address this complex issue.</p>
HARDMAN, Karen		Disagrees with various issues on p12 and 13.	Noted
		Concerned about inadequacy of 56 bus service	Accepted See CAP12

Responses to consultation (individuals) v2 27/8/13

HARDMAN, Richard		Disagrees with various issues on p11 & 12	See new section – spreadsheet removed as confusing. Only part of the Churchill Court development – 4 out of 9 – counts – to homes in the new local plan
HEBDRIDGE, Adrienne	CAP8	Reroute the EET along the railway line	Response to consultation shows the serious concern about the current route and growing impact of the EET. We have therefore amended CAP 8 to propose PC support for an alternative route and traffic management measures in the lower village.  The Working Party has produced a separate leaflet to address this complex issue.
HICKSON, Paul & Alison	CAP8 Disagree	Reroute the EET along the railway line	Response to consultation shows the serious concern about the current route and growing impact of the EET. We have therefore amended CAP 8 to propose PC support for an alternative route and traffic management measures in the lower village.  The Working Party has produced a separate leaflet to address this complex issue.
HOLBRIDGE, Lin	CAP 8 Disagree	Reroute the EET along the railway line. Concerned about increased car traffic EET brings to village.	Response to consultation shows the serious concern about the current route and growing impact of the EET. We have therefore amended CAP 8 to propose PC support for an alternative route and traffic management measures in the lower village.  The Working Party has produced a separate leaflet to address this complex issue.
HOLMES, CW	CAP8	Reroute the EET along the railway line	Response to consultation shows the serious concern about the current route and growing impact of the EET. We have therefore amended CAP 8 to propose PC support for an alternative route and traffic management measures in the lower village.  The Working Party has produced a separate leaflet to address this complex issue.
HORWOOD, Julie	DMP6? Disagree	Housing at Lypstone Nursery would spoil this part of village – if development here it should be a car park.	The site was included as part of an assessment of suitable sites based on objective criteria. A design brief is being prepared and will be made public.

Responses to consultation (individuals) v2 27/8/13

HORWOOD, VL	CAP8 Disagree	Reroute the EET away from the village roads. Gives detailed suggestions for re-wording this objective.	Response to consultation shows the serious concern about the current route and growing impact of the EET. We have therefore amended CAP 8 to propose PC support for an alternative route and traffic management measures in the lower village.  The Working Party has produced a separate leaflet to address this complex issue.
Hughes, Chris & Susan	H1/P2 Agree	Concern that GF development not in line with this policy	The GF proposals pre-date this Plan and form part of the East Devon Local Plan. The revised Plan specifies changes to mitigate the impact of this development.
Hughes, Chris & Susan	CAP 10	Agree. GF development should be conditional on the widening of Summer Lane	New insert re Goodmore's Farm
Hughes, Chris & Susan	CAP2	Agree. Concern that new pre school nursery in Upper Hulham Road is not sustainable because of lack of pedestrian access	Planning Application stated the parents arrive by car and therefore the location out of the village centre made sense.
Hughes, Chris & Susan		Concern about increased traffic on UHR following GF development	Done - Change CAP6 to read 'Traffic through the <b><i>Parish</i></b> must be managed to reduce speeds and increase public safety'
HUMPHRIES, Sid		Important to preserve the green space on the 'estate'	Agreed
INGHAM, Ben		Avoid coalescence by extending green wedge (1) east of Exe view road throughout parish (2) south of Hulham road throughout Parish. Remove proposed mixed use and employment allocations south east of Hulham Road. Lobby to amend map 3 p7	Your position as a District Councillor noted
		Suggested rewording to 5.6 (needs clarification). Various other detailed suggestions regarding wording.	Done
		Omit any site outside BuAB from PreferredList on p11	Amended
	CAP10 (11?) Disagree	Delete 'upgrade to a 15 minute service' and insert 'request for/support extra carriage to trains during rush hours and Exeter Chief rugby matches'	Amended
		Reroute EET along the railway line from Sowden Railway bridge to the station	Response to consultation shows the serious concern about the current route and growing impact of the EET. We have therefore amended CAP

Responses to consultation (individuals) v2 27/8/13

			<p>8 to propose PC support for an alternative route and traffic management measures in the lower village.</p> <p>The Working Party has produced a separate leaflet to address this complex issue.</p>
		Objects to GF development and this should be incorporated in the NP	The GF proposals pre-date this Plan and form part of the East Devon Local Plan. The revised Plan specifies changes to mitigate the impact of this development.
		Needs policy statement stating opposition to any change in the Parish Boundary in favour of Exmouth/to the detriment of Lympstone Parish residents	There is no intent to change boundary. See EDDC response.
		All development within the next 5 years must take place within the current BuAB; additional considerations can take place at review in 2019.	The allocations cover us to 2026
Johnson, M	H/P1 H/P2 H/P3 H/P7 GA/P1 GA/P2	Suggests detailed changes to wording to strengthen these policies for the avoidance of doubt	This response covers a wide remit – I believe the changes made to the policies mentioned cover the majority of these issues .
Peter Johnson		Concern about lack of consultation about the proposed Goodmores Farm Development and the failure of the Parish Council to object	All parish residents and interested parties had the opportunity to contribute to the draft plan through meetings and focus groups (see the Consultation Statement). The WP has made changes in response to consultation.
Peter Johnson	H/P1 Disagree	Concern that PC agreed to GF development to gain CIL funding to improve train station	See new insert re Goodmore's Farm
Peter Johnson	H/P2 Disagree	There is no need for more housing in Lympstone and GF development should be resisted	The GF proposals pre-date this Plan and form part of the East Devon Local Plan.
Peter Johnson	CAP5 Disagree	Light industrial units should be located in the proposed nursery site to avoid travel between village and GF development	Would not be permitted on an exception site basis in a conservation area – and remember it depends on what the owner wants.
Peter Johnson	CAP 6 Agree	Concern that GF development will place undue pressure on the existing road network.	The revised Plan specifies changes to mitigate the impact of this development.
Peter Johnson		Concern about traffic in Hulham Road	Accepted

Responses to consultation (individuals) v2 27/8/13

JOSS, Andrew		Good document with proactive approach to development. Concerned about air of inevitability about GF development and that NP is about the 'village' not the 'parish'. The NP should address the significance of the proposed GF development including the inevitability of the Dinan Way extension which will undermine the Green Wedge, the threat of further development down the Wotton Valley, the threat of coalescence with Exmouth. Need to clarify how GF development will be mitigated for residents in the immediate vicinity. No change to Parish boundary.	The GF proposals pre-date this Plan and form part of the East Devon Local Plan. The revised Plan specifies changes to mitigate the impact of this development. New insert re Goodmore's Farm
Karkeek, R&JP		Concern that GF development will encroach on the Green Wedge	The GF proposals pre-date this Plan and form part of the East Devon Local Plan. The revised Plan specifies changes to mitigate the impact of this development. New insert re Goodmore's Farm
Karkeek, R&JP		Concern about traffic in Hulham Road	See change to CAP6
LLOYD, Denise		Found document difficult to follow. Concerned about cost implications. Need for more transparency and clarity	Significant editorial changes
LLOYD, Nick		Plan not easy to follow. Not sure what control PC will have over housing development. Failure to notify all landowners.	Significant editorial changes have been made to the draft.  All parish residents and interested parties had the opportunity to contribute to the draft plan through meetings and focus groups (see the Consultation Statement).
LONGHURST, Rob	H1 GA1 Agree	Crucial to defend the Green Wedge. Supports the extension of the CPA. Plan ensures development is small, dissipated and contained. Lymptstone Nursery site development will retain the open space opposite the Church, and the old oak, in perpetuity. Need to increase off road parking. Concerned whether the PC and community have the determination to achieve the objectives – this will depend on community support.	Noted
	CAP 8 Disagrees	Against PC policy and public opinion.	Response to consultation shows the serious concern about the current route and growing impact of the EET. We have therefore amended CAP

Responses to consultation (individuals) v2 27/8/13

	very strongly		8 to propose PC support for an alternative route and traffic management measures in the lower village.  The Working Party has produced a separate leaflet to address this complex issue.
		Would have liked to see more objectives for renewable energy	Noted
Lyon, Linda		Supports the plan	Noted
MALTBY, Prof. Edward & Mrs Rosemary	CAP8	Reroute the EET to avoid using the main street	Response to consultation shows the serious concern about the current route and growing impact of the EET. We have therefore amended CAP 8 to propose PC support for an alternative route and traffic management measures in the lower village.  The Working Party has produced a separate leaflet to address this complex issue.
MATHER, Frederick Brian		In broad agreement with the plan and commend the work of the group who prepared it. Concerned that the Dinan Way extension will increase traffic problems on the A376 and whether the NP will be considered in planning decisions	SSE changes to Section 11 and Appendix J
MATHER, Jennifer M	CAP1- CAP 24 inclusive Agree		Noted
MCILVEEN, N.D*.		Failure to consult with landowners when drawing up the draft plan	All parish residents and interested parties had the opportunity to contribute to the draft plan through meetings and focus groups (see the Consultation Statement).
MCILVEEN, N.D.		Landowner and objects to the proposals in the NP to: Hard surface on the footpath on his land Including his land on the east side of Courtlands Lane in the Coastal Preservation Area (CPA)	Agreed. First action CAP9 withdrawn  Extension of CPA is included in EDDC Local Plan and NP has to follow this
MCILVEEN, N.D.	CAP3 CAP6 CAP7 Agree		Noted
MILDENHALL,		Concern about ability and role of PC. Plan needs editing,	Agreed – See Appendix J

Responses to consultation (individuals) v2 27/8/13

Don		proof reading etc and a summary. Exact link with EDLP should be clearer	Significant editorial changes
	CAP 7 CAP9 Agree	Suggests wider/more creative approach and additional action	CAPs amended
	CAP11 Agree	Role of PC is to support ALRUG.	Agreed
	CAP 14 Agrees	Role of PC as enabler.	Agreed
	CAP 6	20mph limit and suggests traffic calming measures	Amended
	H/P3	Wants explicit statements about suitable housing for elderly	Agreed – this to be discussed with EDDC
		Should consider potential redevelopment of the Saddlers Arms. Should it cease trading it would make an excellent site for a mixed development including car parking, affordable housing, and small business/storage units	Note but this is a commercial issue and outside the scope of the Plan
MORRIS, Lucy & Jim		Concern that NP places excessive demands on PC, and sets unrealistic expectations	See revised Section 11 and Appendix J
MOON, Jenny		Re-route cycle path where it passes through village. Sustrans do not view this as a closed issue.	Response to consultation shows the serious concern about the current route and growing impact of the EET. We have therefore amended CAP 8 to propose PC support for an alternative route and traffic management measures in the lower village.  The Working Party has produced a separate leaflet to address this complex issue.
MORRIS, Lucy & Jim	H1 – H/P1	BuBA is obsolete and EDDC will come under pressure to modify it. Suggest remove current BuBA. All proposed sites for sustainable development should be accommodated and other sites that have not come forward.	Disagree. The consultation regarding the BUAB has been approved by EDDC
MORRIS, Lucy & Jim	H2-H/P3 CAP/2 GA1-GA/P1 & P2 Agree	Needs to be adopted in PC responses to planning proposals.	Accepted
MORRIS, Lucy &	H3 – H/P4	Remove 'preferred levels'. Depends on suitability of the	Disagree. Small scale development was clearly favoured in the

Responses to consultation (individuals) v2 27/8/13

Jim	Disagree	site. Require no is to have less than xxxm2 of footprint and garden within the parish to ensure it is not overpopulated with high density housing.	community consultation and this objective was worded with advice from those with planning expertise. This has however been re-worded.
MORRIS, Lucy & Jim	H4-H/P7 Disagree	Excellent objective but too prescriptive – should just refer to the Design Statement	The VDS is now dated but will not be updated until the Conservation Area Appraisal is completed. This detail will form the basis of the revised VDS and will serve in the interim.
MORRIS, Lucy & Jim	H5-H/P8 Agree	Should aim for as high a standard as possible especially with new build	Agreed
MORRIS, Lucy & Jim	CAP 8 Agree		Noted
MORRIS, Lucy & Jim	CAP 9 Disagree	Pavements along roads are a higher priority than footpaths. Ramblers enjoy walking through mud and brambles. Objective is futile.	Disagree. Better provision of footpaths both to encourage pedestrian movement and protect the rural nature of the Parish came out strongly in the community consultation carried out in developing the plan
MORRIS, Lucy & Jim	CAP11 Strongly disagree	Not required and a waste of money. Reroute the EET instead.	CAP11 reflects the DCC Transport Strategy. Response to consultation shows the serious concern about the current route and growing impact of the EET. We have therefore amended CAP 8 to propose PC support for an alternative route and traffic management measures in the lower village.  The Working Party has produced a separate leaflet to address this complex issue.
MORRIS, Lucy & Jim	CAP13 Disagree	Not a reasonable, measurable objective.	Disagree. This issue came out strongly in consultation and ensuring a range of housing types should be achievable.
MORRIS, Lucy & Jim	CAPs 19 & 20 Strongly agree	Should set our climate change sights higher	Agreed but no clear proposals came forward.
MORRIS, Lucy & Jim	CAP 21 Disagree in part	There is a need for regular brook maintenance, planned and budgeted. The Environment Agency should adopt a formal process to action reported issues.	We have tried to bring some structure to a completely unstructured process. The two new flood wardens seem to be working well and we have actions on the PC.
MORRIS, Lucy & Jim	CAP23 Disagree	Unreasonable to put an expectation(provision of green space) on possible development sites that have not applied for full planning permission when similar proposals have been objected to. Why not obtain some of the nursery's	CAP 23 amended  Depends on the owners

Responses to consultation (individuals) v2 27/8/13

		land for green space before any possible development is proposed?	
MORRIS, Lucy & Jim	CAP 24 Disagree	No extension to the conservation area	This is an already agreed EDDC policy – we are awaiting their final ratification
MORRISH, Mr K.J.		Site selection process has been incorrectly applied. There is an issue about windfall and small sites and conformity with the Local Plan Land at Underhill close should be a preferred site for housing for elderly people	The selection of the allocated sites was completed in November/December 2012 within the Village Boundary Line Exercise where all development locations submitted were put through the same evaluation process. All locations outside of the BuAB were taken from locations submitted to the SHLAA process that has been on-going since (I believe) as long ago as 2010. If they were not submitted to the SHLAA process they were not considered. The sites within the BuAB did not need to be submitted to the SHLAA process, since they have deemed development, so that list was put together by local knowledge and the owners contacted regarding their wishes.
MORRISH T		Same issues as Mr KJ Morrish	See response to Mr KJ Morrish.
MOUDRY, Ki	CAP8 Disagree	Extra signage where cyclists join road	Response to consultation shows the serious concern about the current route and growing impact of the EET. We have therefore amended CAP 8 to propose PC support for an alternative route and traffic management measures in the lower village.  The Working Party has produced a separate leaflet to address this complex issue.
	CAP13 Disagree	Include need for elderly to downsize and stay in village	Agreed – we are concerned that the NP does not prescriptively allow for this and we will be discussing with EDDC ways we can strengthen the plan in this area.
	CAP20 Disagree	Need community solar power project	Agreed but no clear proposals came forward
		Comprehensive, he agrees with all other CAPs	Thanks
MOUDRY, Mona	CAP8 Disagree	Better signage, reroute along railway	Response to consultation shows the serious concern about the current route and growing impact of the EET. We have therefore amended CAP 8 to propose PC support for an alternative route and traffic management measures in the lower village.

Responses to consultation (individuals) v2 27/8/13

			The Working Party has produced a separate leaflet to address this complex issue.
	CAP10 Disagree	Will add to traffic congestion on A376, needs safeguards against development	CAP 10 seeks to minimise the detrimental effects of this potential development
	CAP11 Disagree	15 mins in peak times only	Agreed
	CAP12 Disagree	Increased traffic from new housing on Longmeadow Road	Noted
		Agrees with all other CAPs. Comprehensive. Needs to mention need for older people to downsize in village, and disabled parking at the station	Agreed – we are concerned that the NP does not prescriptively allow for this and we will be discussing with EDDC ways we can strengthen the plan in this area.
NIGHTINGALE, Mary	CAP8	Re-route the EET along the railway line	Response to consultation shows the serious concern about the current route and growing impact of the EET. We have therefore amended CAP 8 to propose PC support for an alternative route and traffic management measures in the lower village.  The Working Party has produced a separate leaflet to address this complex issue.
PAINE, Mrs E		Concerned about impact of new development on traffic in the village. As a disabled wheelchair user no longer able to travel to shops independently because of speeding traffic.	Accepted and the Plan seeks to mitigate the impact of traffic
PAINE, Mr P		Concerned that the village will be spoiled if building is allowed to continue. Need to address issues of car parking, traffic speeds, pressure on school and medical centre.	See H1, H3, H4, CAPs 1, 6, 7, 16&18
PARRY-JONES, MJ		Comprehensive document that should protect the Parish from inappropriate development. Concerned that GF development may erode integrity of Green Wedge.	GF was never within the Green Wedge these proposals “draw a line in the sand”.
PARRY-JONES WH		If adopted Plan should ensure retention of rural identity. Concerns about scale of proposed GF development and wording para .5.2 p10 - status of NP in relation to higher level policy documents needs to be verified.	The GF proposals pre-date this Plan and form part of the East Devon Local Plan. The revised Plan specifies changes to mitigate the impact of this development.
	CAPS 1,5, 10	Suggest review whether they should be re-categorised as	Accepted. See <i>Changes Map</i>

Responses to consultation (individuals) v2 27/8/13

	22,24	DMPs	
PERRY, Ken		Rather a weighty tome. Some of the planning policies are a bit 'lightweight'; there are more CAPs than planning policies and the former would be better supported if the latter were stronger. Could have been stronger in challenging EDDC policies	Accepted. Editorial changes. Some CAPs changed to DMPs, and changes to Section 11 and Appendix J
POWLEY, Jeffrey	CAP3 Disagree	What about the 25% who will NOT get high speed broadband in Q2 2013? Need to add Broadband access to the action	Noted
	CAP8 Disagree	Traffic is not the greatest issue facing the village – dangerous cycling is. Need enforcement of highway regulations for cyclists	Response to consultation shows the serious concern about the current route and growing impact of the EET. We have therefore amended CAP 8 to propose PC support for an alternative route and traffic management measures in the lower village.  The Working Party has produced a separate leaflet to address this complex issue.
	CAP9	Suggest new aim – encourage CTCRM to interact more with village (e.g. provide fitness training)	Noted CTCRM did not respond to consultation
	CAP4	Promote tourism. Also encourage Stuart Line drop off at Lympstone	Noted
PRICE, Jeremy & Ann	CAP 6	Should cover the whole Parish. Concern about increased traffic on Hulham Road (B3180). Appendix F should include B3180 which should be even more of a priority than the A 376. B3180 not considered in Section 8 and Appendix E 'Getting Around' and encouraging non car use	Agreed – amended. B3180 now included for action and Section 106 money from Goodmore's Farm
ROGERS, Mr Bill		Disagrees with various issues on p12 and 13 and suggests amendments.	This section has been extensively re-worked as a result of the consultation
		The plan is out of date and is just about Courtlands, not the whole village.	The plan has been updated following consultation and covers the key issues across the Parish as identified by the community. See consultation statement.
ROGERS, Mrs K		Disagrees with various issues on p12 and 13 and suggests amendments	This section has been extensively re-worked as a result of the consultation
RUSSELL, Barry	CAP 5	Concern that Exmouth will take the CIL funding for the GF	Our portion of GF remains in Lympstone Parish – our objectives

		development by taking all the housing on their side of the boundary leaving Lymestone with the commercial premises which do not attract CIL. Suggest identify other employment sites in the NP	specifically retain housing.
	CAP 6 Agree	20mph speed limit in built up area	Not supported by Highways but can be included with “traffic calming measures”
	CAP 10 CAP11	CIL money should not be used to subsidize Network Rail responsibilities.	Amended
	CAP22	Quotes from EDDC Local Plan Strategy 44 defining the CPA and questions justification of some of the land included. Feels CAP 4 contradicts this. Suggests CAP 22 should be revisited and anomalies deleted – the CPA should revert back to the EDDC Local Plan July 2006 (Map 34)	CPA is a Local Plan Policy that has gone through consultation and is with the Inspector. CAP 4 has to work within the CPA. CAP 22 amended and some of the policies now DMPs.
		The plan should consider the implications of CTCRM closing.	There is no evidence of this for us to consider. See provision for updating the Plan
		Scoring matrix disallows some development that would meet the needs and expectations of some long established landowners and these should be incorporated in the Plan	The matrix was used as an impartial measure of the sites put forward. “long established” does not have a legal basis within planning law. It makes sense to try to achieve our commitment to 40 homes by using development land within the BuAB first.
SALTER, Susan	CAP 8	Re-route EET along railway line	Response to consultation shows the serious concern about the current route and growing impact of the EET. We have therefore amended CAP 8 to propose PC support for an alternative route and traffic management measures in the lower village.  The Working Party has produced a separate leaflet to address this complex issue.
Scott, Ian		Little mention of tourism which brings economic benefits	The general thrust of the plan, to preserve our values and traditions, retain our rural identity, and avoid coalescence encourages tourism. Specific reference to economic benefits of visitors in CAP8; also suggestions to improve transport infrastructure will encourage tourism.
RICHARDSON, Mary	CAP10 CAP 17 CAP 18 Disagree	There is no mention of leisure activities (play areas and footpaths) at GF. Difficult access to village from GF. Extra pressure on school from GF development. Need for a bridleway/cycle path along proposed route of Dinan Way	This will form part of the Outline Planning and is covered by the EDDC Local Plan The majority (if not all) of the GF will fall outside the Lymestone Primary School catchment area.

Responses to consultation (individuals) v2 27/8/13

		extension.	
de la RUE, Diana		Re-route EET along the railway line	Response to consultation shows the serious concern about the current route and growing impact of the EET. We have therefore amended CAP 8 to propose PC support for an alternative route and traffic management measures in the lower village.  The Working Party has produced a separate leaflet to address this complex issue.
SEARLE, John	CAP6 CAP8 CAP10 Agree	Objects to GF Development. Need to provide Dinan Way extension to cater for increased traffic. Consider provision of path/cycle way along the waterfront and from top of Wotton Lane to Pine Ridge.	The GF proposals pre-date this Plan and form part of the East Devon Local Plan. The revised Plan specifies changes to mitigate the impact of this development.
SEARLE, Margaret	CAP5 CAP3 CAP6 Agree	Opposition to proposed GF development Concerns about traffic on upper Hulham Road, and increase in HGV to proposed industrial units. Also flooding. Need for footpath/bridleway and controlled crossing at Pine Ridge.	The GF proposals pre-date this Plan and form part of the East Devon Local Plan. The revised Plan specifies changes to mitigate the impact of this development. See new section on GF
SMITH, Claire		Building at Jackson Meadow 2 is inappropriate	This is a potential development site within the BUAB
	GA/P1 P2 Agree	A well produced plan	Noted
SMITH, Grahame	CAP6 Disagree	PC have abdicated their responsibilities by approving GF development. Concern about traffic problems on Hulham Road.	The GF proposals pre-date this Plan and form part of the East Devon Local Plan. The revised Plan specifies changes to mitigate the impact of this development.  See new section on GF
SMITH, Rosemary		Vision, of retaining rural identity and preventing coalescence Is excellent	Noted
	CAP 8	Disagrees with social and economic benefits of EET. It is destroying the village as a community and needs re-routing along the railway line.	Response to consultation shows the serious concern about the current route and growing impact of the EET. We have therefore amended CAP 8 to propose PC support for an alternative route and traffic management measures in the lower village.  The Working Party has produced a separate leaflet to address this

Responses to consultation (individuals) v2 27/8/13

			complex issue.
		Concern about number of houses being built and the rising traffic, protecting the Green Wedge, and the dangers of flooding. Inclusion of Nursery Field in preferred sites contradicts desire to protect the Church's open view.	The Nursery Field proposal will protect the open view from the church in perpetuity
	CAP13 Agree	Important to consider needs of elderly	Agreed – topic to discuss with EDDC to see how we can strengthen this.
SPEIGHT, Richard	CAP8 Disagree	Keep route along railway as an option for EET	Response to consultation shows the serious concern about the current route and growing impact of the EET. We have therefore amended CAP 8 to propose PC support for an alternative route and traffic management measures in the lower village.  The Working Party has produced a separate leaflet to address this complex issue.
SPENCER, RH		Concern about over reliance on CTCRM in the light of the Strategic Defence Review.	See provision for updating the Plan
		Need for amelioration of negative impact of EET in the village.	Response to consultation shows the serious concern about the current route and growing impact of the EET. We have therefore amended CAP 8 to propose PC support for an alternative route and traffic management measures in the lower village.  The Working Party has produced a separate leaflet to address this complex issue.
		Opposed to hard surfaces on footpaths.	Agreed. Withdraw first action CAP9
		If football pitch is resited can existing location be used for a Parish Eco Camp site or other recreational facility supported by the National Trust?	Not sure it would be allowed within the restrictive covenants. Certain recreation is allowed. This is for future debate.
		Plan should consider the Medical Centre.	See CAP16
SPOKES, Nigel	CAP 8 Disagree	Re-route cycle path away from Sowden Lane	Response to consultation shows the serious concern about the current route and growing impact of the EET. We have therefore amended CAP 8 to propose PC support for an alternative route and traffic management measures in the lower village.  The Working Party has produced a separate leaflet to address this

Responses to consultation (individuals) v2 27/8/13

			complex issue.
SQUIRE, Pat		Wonders whether NP a waste of time since EDDC just pass every planning application	No they have to abide by the DMPs (by law).
		Nos of houses at Churchill Court – 9 on p11, 4 on p13.	Amended
	H4 Disagree	Concerned about design of new house on Cox's hill	Not a reason to disagree with H4
	CAP8	Divert cycle track along railway line	Response to consultation shows the serious concern about the current route and growing impact of the EET. We have therefore amended CAP 8 to propose PC support for an alternative route and traffic management measures in the lower village.  The Working Party has produced a separate leaflet to address this complex issue.
Stamm, Sigrid		Concern that it is a 'plan for the village, rather than the parish' and that the interests of the residents north of the A376 were not considered. Increased traffic is cutting them off from the village centre. Need for traffic restrictions on Wotton Lane and footpath access, including footpath up Hulham Road.	All parish residents and interested parties had the opportunity to contribute to the draft plan through meetings and focus groups (see the Consultation Statement). The WP has made changes in response to consultation. These are summarised in the <i>Changes Map</i> attached to this document.
STEWART, Brian		Comments as Pauline Stewart (below)	See responses to Pauline Stewart (below)
STEWART, Pauline		Failure to consult with landowners	All parish residents and interested parties had the opportunity to contribute to the draft plan through meetings and focus groups (see the Consultation Statement). The WP has made changes in response to consultation. These are summarised in the <i>Changes Map</i> attached to this document.
	CAP3 CAP6 CAP12 CAP15	Reduce speed in village to 20mph	Highways do not accept the need. We have covered this within the "traffic calming measures" so it is not dead.

Responses to consultation (individuals) v2 27/8/13

	CAP18 CAP21 Agree		
STEWART, Pauline	CAP4 Disagree	Need for consultation with farmers before extending the Coastal Preservation area.	Disagree. Extending the CPA is an EDDC policy that NP must follow.
STEWART, Pauline	CAP 8 Disagree	EET should be rerouted where it passes through the village	Response to consultation shows the serious concern about the current route and growing impact of the EET. We have therefore amended CAP 8 to propose PC support for an alternative route and traffic management measures in the lower village.  The Working Party has produced a separate leaflet to address this complex issue.
STEWART, Pauline	CAP9	Hard surface unnecessary	Agreed. Withdraw first action CAP9
STEWART, Pauline	CAP10	Unnecessary	Disagree. CAP 10 is necessary to mitigate impact
STEWART, Pauline	CAP11	Need improved parking facilities for commuters at station	Difficult to see where more land can be made available
STEWART, Pauline	CAP13 Disagree	Young people cannot afford to live here	No action. Don't understand why this should lead you to disagree with this policy.
STEWART, Pauline	CAP20	Opposed to demolition and re-building of properties so they become carbon-neutral	CAP20 does not advocate this – it refers to new properties
STEWART, Pauline	CAP23	Not understood – if Mill/Nursery fields not privately owned would they be built upon?	CAP 23 re-worked
STEWART, Pauline	CAP24 Disagree	Extending the conservation area will make it more difficult for the PC to meet the housing allocation.	Suitable sites for development have been identified through the community consultation. The extension will have little or no effect on additional housing
STRATFORD, Ian & Heather		A well-researched and inclusive Plan with public involvement.	
		Important to safeguard the skyline views both out of and into the village, especially from the estuary (mentioned in Courtlands Inquiry) and this should be included in Appendix D and perhaps H/P5.	We will consider if this needs specific mention.
		There should be more reference to the role of the Churches.	No specific suggestions have been made for inclusion in the Plan

Responses to consultation (individuals) v2 27/8/13

		HP22 is the most important of the Environment policies and should be moved to the top of the table.	Noted
		There should be mention of Lymphstone Common.	Included
		Makes various detailed suggested textual changes.	Actioned
SUTTON, Gill	CAP 6 CAP 21 Disagree	Concerns over impact of GF development on traffic and flooding. Need to retain green wedge. No consultation with residents outside the village.	The GF proposals pre-date this Plan and form part of the East Devon Local Plan. The revised Plan specifies changes to mitigate the impact of this development.  All parish residents and interested parties had the opportunity to contribute to the draft plan through meetings and focus groups (see the Consultation Statement). The WP has made changes in response to consultation. These are summarised in the <i>Changes Map</i> attached to this document. New section on Goodmore's Farm inserted
TARBATH, Myra & Neville	CAP8	Outlines dangers of EET through village and suggests rerouting along railway line	Cap 8 Amended
TRUELL, Lt Col. George		Opposes GF development since this compromises the green wedge. The NP should include a statement on this. Suggests green wedge should go around the entire Parish Boundary. Objects to map on p7 showing GF as 'mixed use allocation'. Concerned about traffic management, light pollution, and the future of the school and the medical centre. Notes importance of tourism and employment to the local economy.	The GF proposals pre-date this Plan and form part of the East Devon Local Plan. The revised Plan specifies changes to mitigate the impact of this development.  GF is "mixed use allocation" within EDDC Local Plan Other aspects are considered in The Plan where possible.
TRUELL, Mary		Ignores the part of the Parish east of the A376. Green Wedge should be extended. Excessive house building will create traffic problems. Unable to download appendices. Opposed to development at GF, and failure to consult	All parish residents and interested parties had the opportunity to contribute to the draft plan through meetings and focus groups (see the Consultation Statement). The WP has made changes in response to consultation. These are summarised in the <i>Changes Map</i> attached to

Responses to consultation (individuals) v2 27/8/13

		residents concerned. Concern that too many new houses will erode the sense of community, and the infrastructure of Lympstone.	this document. New section on Goodmore's Farm inserted
TRUELL, Mary	CAP 21 CAP22 CAP23	No mention of Lympstone Common	Agreed – included
TYRRELL, Christine		Believes village has to grow to accommodate young people but not necessarily NP way. Concerned about sewage, road parking and access. Suggests EDDC control planning so it is not manipulated by vested interests – cites extension of CPA.	CPA is an EDDC Policy EDDC do control planning Sewage, parking and roads all covered.
UNDERHILL, Richard		Totally agrees with the vision for Lympstone, but concerned about GF development. There was no consultation and it represents a threat to coalescence and sets a precedent for future development e.g. at Courtlands.  Concerned about speeding in the roads outside the village, the A376 becoming a traffic jam, flooding and the increase in children.  Need weight restrictions on Summer Lane and Wotton Lane.	All parish residents and interested parties had the opportunity to contribute to the draft plan through meetings and focus groups (see the Consultation Statement). The WP has made changes in response to consultation. These are summarised in the <i>Changes Map</i> attached to this document. New section on Goodmore's Farm inserted  The GF proposals pre-date this Plan and form part of the East Devon Local Plan. The revised Plan specifies changes to mitigate the impact of this development.
	H/P1 Disagree		Re-worked
	H/P2 Agree		Re-worked
	CAP5	Industrial units in village so people walk to work	No landowner has come forward with any proposals
	CAP6 Disagree	Should include whole Parish	Agreed amended
	CAP22 Agree	Extend Green Wedge to protect the open character	
UNDERHILL, Vanessa		Agrees with most of the Objectives, some of the Policies/Aims but not necessarily the actions.	The WP has made changes in response to consultation. These are summarised in the <i>Changes Map</i> attached to this document. New section on Goodmore's Farm inserted

Responses to consultation (individuals) v2 27/8/13

		<p>Hard to comment positively since it focuses on the village with little reference to, and different rules for, the wider Parish.</p> <p>All Objectives should refer to the whole Parish – particularly notes CAP6, CAP13, CAP21 and CAP23.</p>	
		Poor quality of maps. Map 9 should include the whole Parish	Map withdrawn
	<p>CAP5 CAP6 CAP7 CAP11 Disagree</p>	<p>Improve traffic management throughout the Parish Try to secure more carriages per train.</p>	Accepted – see <i>Changes Map</i>
VILLMETER, GH	<p>H3 Disagree</p>	No opportunity for family owned land to be used in the future – this is preferable to large sites. Windfall sites are better.	Windfall/“family owned land” sites still able to be developed in line with policies.
VILLMETER, GH	<p>H2 Disagree</p>	More consideration needs to be given to needs of elderly	Agreed – on agenda to speak with EDDC as to how we can achieve this
WATTS, Beryl	<p>CAP 6 CAP10 Agree</p>	Dinan Way extension needed before any more development	Noted
WATTS, John	<p>CAP6 CAP10</p>	Objects to proposed GF development	The GF proposals pre-date this Plan and form part of the East Devon Local Plan. The revised Plan specifies changes to mitigate the impact of this development.
WAYLAND, Sharon	<p>CAP 8 Disagree</p>	Re-route EET. Concerned about impact on village life of speeding cyclists.	<p>Response to consultation shows the serious concern about the current route and growing impact of the EET. We have therefore amended CAP 8 to propose PC support for an alternative route and traffic management measures in the lower village.</p> <p>The Working Party has produced a separate leaflet to address this complex issue.</p>
		No mention of dog fouling. Suggests clearer demarcation of	Whilst not specifically mentioned this is covered by a number of policies

Responses to consultation (individuals) v2 27/8/13

		dog walking areas, dog bins, and awareness campaign.	and is an on-going action on the Parish Council
WELLS, Liz		Re-route EET along railway line.	<p>Response to consultation shows the serious concern about the current route and growing impact of the EET. We have therefore amended CAP 8 to propose PC support for an alternative route and traffic management measures in the lower village.</p> <p>The Working Party has produced a separate leaflet to address this complex issue.</p>
WHITER, Claire	CAP1 CAP2 CAP3 CAP7 CAP10 CAP17 Agree	Concerned about disruption caused by contractors lorries at new developments. Supports 20mph limit throughout village	<p>Contractors lorries are inevitable – but they have to operate within H&amp;S guidelines.</p> <p>20 mph limit not supported by Highways but covered under “traffic calming measures” and still a Parish Council policy.</p>
WHITER, Claire	CAP8 Disagree	EET should be rerouted via the railway line	<p>Response to consultation shows the serious concern about the current route and growing impact of the EET. We have therefore amended CAP 8 to propose PC support for an alternative route and traffic management measures in the lower village.</p> <p>The Working Party has produced a separate leaflet to address this complex issue.</p>
WHIPP, John	CAP8 Disagree	EET should be rerouted via the railway line	<p>Response to consultation shows the serious concern about the current route and growing impact of the EET. We have therefore amended CAP 8 to propose PC support for an alternative route and traffic management measures in the lower village.</p> <p>The Working Party has produced a separate leaflet to address this complex issue.</p>
WHIPP, Brenda	CAP8 Disagree	EET should be rerouted via the railway line	<p>Response to consultation shows the serious concern about the current route and growing impact of the EET. We have therefore amended CAP 8 to propose PC support for an alternative route and traffic management measures in the lower village.</p>

			The Working Party has produced a separate leaflet to address this complex issue.
WILKES, Shirley		Action needed to mitigate the danger caused by speeding cyclists through the village	Response to consultation shows the serious concern about the current route and growing impact of the EET. We have therefore amended CAP 8 to propose PC support for an alternative route and traffic management measures in the lower village.  The Working Party has produced a separate leaflet to address this complex issue.
WILSON, Clive	1.11	'Local Authorities'? Question whether CAPs will be used by these authorities in making planning decisions.	The approved NP has to be taken into consideration by DCC and EDDC in making planning decisions. To strengthen this, we have changed a number of the CAPs to DMPs. We have also amended Section 11 and Appendix J
	1.8/1.11		
			No employment plans were submitted to the NP for consideration
	H1/P2 H4/P7 1.12  NPPF?  Sustainability 5.7 6.0 6 page 14	Detailed comments on wording - Generally agree    Priority of EDDC Local Plan 'the plan' Affordable housing	H1/P22 Not accepted – H4/P7 – Actioned in part. This Policy/Objective goes beyond the VDS NPPF – National Planning Policy Framework See Glossary Correct Correct – amended See Glossary
	CAP23		Accepted – reworded
	CAP1 Agree generally	Questions whether VDS can be updated without further consultation	CAP 1 amended in light of advice from EDDC – new VDS needs consultation.
WINKS, Ian		Agrees with most of the Plan but is concerned that it does not take account of proposed GF development. It is a village	The GF proposals pre-date this Plan and form part of the East Devon Local Plan. The revised Plan specifies changes to mitigate the impact of

		plan not a parish plan. No concern about GF in H1 and H2.	this development. These are summarised in the <i>Changes Map</i> attached to this document. New section on Goodmore's Farm inserted
WRIGHT, Irene		Amend reference in 5.2 & 5.7 to priority given to EDDC policies where there are inconsistencies to stress the importance of local views	Where there any currently unforeseen conflicts occur between the two plans the EDDC Local Plan takes precedence as does the National Planning Policy Framework over the EDDC Plan or the Devon Structure Plan
		If GF development is agreed there will be significant over development of housing in the area	The GF proposals pre-date this Plan and form part of the East Devon Local Plan. The revised Plan specifies changes to mitigate the impact of this development.
WRIGHT, Terry		If comments in 5.2 & 5.7 about EDDC document taking priority are not dictated by planning law they should be amended to ensure local views are taken into account.	Where there any currently unforeseen conflicts occur between the two plans the EDDC Local Plan takes precedence as does the National Planning Policy Framework over the EDDC Plan or the Devon Structure Plan
		Can excess housing (GF development) be counted against any targets post 2026?	This decision will be made by EDDC