

East Budleigh with Bickton Neighbourhood Plan



**Public Consultation on Draft Plan
(Response to Community Representations)
14th April to 20th June 2016**

Responses to Comments Received

Summary of representations received from the Community

- 31 representations and 68 comments

Number	Representation Number	Policy/Community Action/ Paragraph/ Other	Support/ Object/Comment
1	RN002-01	Chapter 14,Development of the Parish paragraph 14.38	Support
2	RN003-01	Policy D2 criteria a)	Object
3	RN003-02	Policy N2	Object/ Comments
4	RN004-01	n/a	Comment
5	RN005-01	Whole Document	Support
6	RN005-02	Front cover	Comment
7	RN005-03	Chapter 3, Spatial Profile	Comment
8	RN005-04	Appendix B	Comment
9	RN005-05	n/a	Comment

Number	Representation Number	Policy/Community Action/ Paragraph/ Other	Support/ Object/Comment
10	RN005-06	Proposals Map	Comment
11	RN004-02	Proposals Map	Comment
12	RN008-01	Policy D2 criteria b)	Support
13	RN008-02	Policy D2 criteria a)	Object
14	RN009-01	Whole Document	Support
15	RN013-01	Chapter 3, History of the Parish, paragraph 3.5	Comment
16	RN013-02	Appendix C	Comment
17	RN013-03	Chapter 3, History of the Parish	Comment
18	RN013-04	Chapter 3, History of Parish	Comment
19	RN013-05	Chapter 3, History of Parish	Comment
20	RN013-06	Photograph page 75	Comment
21	RN014-01	Chapter 14, Development of the Parish	Support
22	RN015-01	Policy D2 criteria b)	Comment

Number	Representation Number	Policy/Community Action/ Paragraph/ Other	Support/ Object/Comment
23	RN016-01	Chapter 3, History of Parish	Comment
24	RN016-02	Chapter 3, History of Parish , paragraph 3.5	Object/Comment
25	RN016-03	Chapter 8, Worship, paragraph 8.19	Object/Comment
26	RN016-04	Chapter 8, Worship, paragraph 8.20	Object/Comment
27	RN016-05	Chapter 8, Worship, paragraph 8.21	Object/Comment
28	RN017-01	Policy D2 criteria b)	Comment
29	RN008-03	Policy D2 criteria b)	Support
30	RN018-01	Policy D2 criteria b)	Support
31	RN019-01	Chapter 4 - Objectives	Objecting
32	RN019-02	Photographs	Objecting
33	RN020-01	Photographs	Objecting
34	RN020-02	Photographs	Comment
35	RN020-03	Whole document	Comment

Number	Representation Number	Policy/Community Action/ Paragraph/ Other	Support/ Object/Comment
36	RN021-01	Whole document	Support
37	RN026-01	Policy P1	Comment
38	RN026-02	Policy P2	Comment
39	RN027-01	Chapter 13, Flood Management and Protection	Support
40	RN028-01	Chapter 11, Natural Environment, paragraph 11.7	Comment
41	RN028-02	Chapter 14,Development of the Parish	Object
42	RN028-03	Chapter 14, Development of the Parish, paragraph 14.37	Object
43	RN029-01	Whole document	Support
44	RN030-01	Whole document	Support
45	RN031-01	Chapter 14,Development of the Parish paragraph 14.19	Comment
46	RN032-01	Chapter 14,Development of the Parish paragraph 14.19	Comment
47	RN033-01	Chapter 9, Leisure and Tourism, paragraph 9.5	Support/Comment
48	RN033-02	Proposals Map	Support/Comment

Number	Representation Number	Policy/Community Action/ Paragraph/ Other	Support/ Object/Comment
49	RN034-01	Chapter 10, Getting Around the Parish, paragraph 10.17	Comment
50	RN035-01	Whole Document	Support
51	RN035-02	Chapter 4 – Objectives	Support
52	RN035-03	Policy G1	Support
53	RN035-04	Community Action 18	Support/Comment
54	RN035-05	Policy N1	Support/Comment
55	RN035-06	Policy N2	Support/Comment
56	RN035-07	Policy N4	Support/Comment
57	RN035-08	Policy D1/B3	Support/Comment
58	RN035-09	Policy D2	Support/Comment
59	RN035-10	Chapter 14,Development of the Parish paragraph 14.19	Comment
60	RN035-11	Chapter 14,Development of the Parish paragraph 14.30 & 14.31	Support
61	RN035-12	Community Action 29	Support/Comment

Number	Representation Number	Policy/Community Action/ Paragraph/ Other	Support/ Object/Comment
62	RN036-01	Whole Document	Support/Comment
63	RN037-01	Chapter 13, Flood Management and Protection	Comment
64	RN039-01	Community Action 18	Support/Comment
65	RN040-01	Chapter 10, Getting Around the Parish, paragraph 10.17	Comment
66	RN040-02	Chapter 10, Getting Around the Parish, paragraphs 10.17 & 10.18	Comment
67	RN041-01	Chapter 14, Development of the Parish paragraph 14.11	Support
68	RN042-01	Chapter 14, Development of the Parish paragraph 14.11	Comment

Responses to Representations

Response by Policy

Representation Number	Paragraph/ Policy/ Community Action	Objecting/ supporting/ comment	Comments(summary)	Response to Comments	Plan changes
Policy P1					
RN026-01	Policy P1	Comment	Home working: No mobile signal in Yettington and broadband slow & unreliable. Makes working from home difficult and experiences problems on a daily basis.	It is acknowledged that mobile signal and broadband are particularly slow in some parts of the Parish. This can hinder the development of sustainable economic growth in the rural area and in particularly small businesses. Working at home in the Parish is a major contributor to this sustainable growth. Policy P1 seeks to facilitate this objective in conjunction with Policy P2 that addresses the issues of poor mobile signals and slow broadband speed.	No changes. Changes are proposed in response to representations RN024-04 by EDDC and RN038-07 by Natural England.
Policy P2					
RN026-02	Policy P2	Comment	Need a good mobile signal and at least 1Mb broadband in Yettington to meet P2 objective.	It is acknowledged that mobile signals and broadband are particularly slow in some parts of the Parish. Policy P2 supports the development of new communications infrastructure including access to superfast fibre optic broadband and mobile Technologies.	No changes.

Representation Number	Paragraph/ Policy/ Community Action	Objecting/ supporting/ comment	Comments(summary)	Response to Comments	Plan changes
Policy G1					
RN035-03	Policy G1	Support	Supports the protection and enhancement of footpaths in the Parish and suggests if development is proposed adjacent to a footpath, a green space should be created as a buffer zone to protect the rural character of the path.	<p>Support for the Policy is noted and welcomed.</p> <p>It is the intent of the Policy to protect and enhance public rights of way. This is to ensure they are retained as recreational routes, are not urbanised and their biodiversity is protected and enhanced. This is in accordance with the NPPF para 75 and the Local Plan Development Management Policy TC4.</p> <p>The Policy also supports the creation of green infrastructure adjacent to rural footpaths, particularly where these footpaths are under threat from urbanisation/ development e.g. via green wildlife corridors and informal open space to act as a buffer zone.</p>	<p>Textual changes to Policy G2 to ensure any development adjacent to a public right of way protects the rural setting and biodiversity through the creation of informal green space.</p> <p>Changes are proposed in response to representations RN024-11 by EDDC.</p>
Policy N1					
RN035-05	Policy N1	Comment/ Support	Supports the protection of AONB, particularly wildlife habitats and their incorporation into new developments.	Support for the Policy is noted and welcomed.	<p>No changes.</p> <p>Changes are proposed in response to representations RN024-13 by EDDC, RN012-03 by the Environment</p>

Representation Number	Paragraph/ Policy/ Community Action	Objecting/ supporting/ comment	Comments(summary)	Response to Comments	Plan changes
					Agency, RN038-08 by Natural England and Community representation RN003-02.
Policy N2					
RN003-02	Policy N2	Objecting	Object to developing Frank's Patch. Doesn't tally with Policy N2. Trees, owls an issue. Should be made into Community asset e.g. Nature Reserve.	<p>Frank's Patch does not meet the definition of an important local green space as detailed in NPPF paragraphs 76 and 77.</p> <p>It is however acknowledged that as identified in the supporting document "Landscape Sensitivity Assessments" the site has several mature trees and potentially protected species on site. EDDC has confirmed there are two important trees on the site - a Robinia on the south-east corner and a Red Oak to the north of the site. It is recommended in this document that a condition of any development and to be included in Policy D2 and Policy N1 would be a requirement for a biodiversity appraisal (to include a detailed tree survey) to be a material part of any application. This to ensure there is no significantly adverse impact on the biodiversity on the site.</p>	<p>Textual changes to Policy N1 f) to include a requirement for a biodiversity appraisal (including, detailed tree survey) on proposed development sites where appropriate. This to be reiterated in textual changes to Policy D2 by the inclusion in Policy D2 of a requirement for applicants to prove that any development would not have an inappropriate adverse impact on the landscape of the AONB and biodiversity/ protected species.</p> <p>See changes in response to representation RN025-05 from CDE.</p>

Representation Number	Paragraph/ Policy/ Community Action	Objecting/ supporting/ comment	Comments(summary)	Response to Comments	Plan changes
RN035-06	Policy N2	Comment/ Support	Supports the protection of local green space from the threat of development.	Support for the Policy is noted and welcomed.	No changes See changes in response to representation RN025-05 from CDE.
Policy N4					
RN035-07	Policy N4	Comment/ Support	Supports the green corridor and agrees that the local green space Area 6 (in Policy N2) is incorporated into the corridor.	Support for the Policy is noted and welcomed. It is also agreed that Area 6 (Policy N2) adjacent to East Budleigh Footpath EB14 should be incorporated into the Green Corridor.	Area 6(Policy N2) to be included in the Green Corridor. See changes in response to representation RN024-016 from EDDC.
Policy D1/B3					
RN035-08	Policy D1/B3	Comment/ Support	Supports the BuAB as the village is inappropriate for larger scale development. In particular agrees that large gardens should not be included in the BuAB (reasons cited).	Support for the Policy is noted and welcomed. The Parish Council agree that the boundary should not be changed or should be tighter to protect the village from inappropriate development. Policy D1 is in conformity with Strategy 6 and 27 of the Local Plan and paragraph 6.22. Paragraph 6.22 states "In a number of cases <i>Built-up Area Boundaries cut across</i>	Changes to Policy D1 to reflect comments made and the inappropriate nature of 'back land' development. Changes to Policy B3 to reiterate inappropriate 'back land' development is not acceptable and private amenity should not significantly and adversely be impacted upon.

Representation Number	Paragraph/ Policy/ Community Action	Objecting/ supporting/ comment	Comments(summary)	Response to Comments	Plan changes
				<p><i>the rear gardens of properties, rather than following defined garden areas or property boundaries. This is to ensure that inappropriate 'back land' development does not occur and lead to urban sprawl on the edge of settlements. Furthermore the rear gardens of properties, especially large gardens, can be more akin to the open countryside in character, rather than the built environment and also can provide a 'soft' landscape edge to settlements"</i></p> <p>Policy D1 makes it clear the rural character of areas on the edge of the village will be protected and gardens and former gardens will not necessarily be assumed to fall within the developable confines of the village.</p>	
Policy D2					
RN003-01	Policy D2 a)	Objecting	Object to developing Frank's Patch. No impact on affordable housing; generate more traffic and parking problems; increase danger to cyclists and pedestrians.	<p>Frank's Patch has been identified in the site sustainability appraisal (see supporting documentation) as the most sustainable site for residential development. This site was assessed against the sustainability objective used during the Local Plan process.</p> <p>A Landscape Appraisal undertaken during the Neighbourhood Plan process concluded the</p>	Inclusion in Policy D2 a requirement for the applicants to prove that any development would not have an inappropriate adverse impact on the landscape of the AONB and biodiversity/ protected species.

Representation Number	Paragraph/ Policy/ Community Action	Objecting/ supporting/ comment	Comments(summary)	Response to Comments	Plan changes
				<p>development of the site would have low landscape sensitivity due to the topography and as the site is enclosed, contained and not highly visible from view points within the AONB.</p> <p>The site is also in close proximity to the existing built form of East Budleigh and retention of existing boundary vegetation will help mitigate the impacts of development.</p> <p>It is however recognised that the site is covered with vegetation and there are a number of mature trees. It is also possible there are a number of protected species within the site. A key part of any development proposal would be the requirement for a biodiversity assessment and where appropriate, the adoption of measures to mitigate any adverse impact on significant biodiversity that may be identified on the site.</p> <p>Affordable housing to be included on site under Policy D2. On-site parking required for all new residential development under Policy G2.</p>	
RN008-01	Policy D2 b)	Support	We support Carter's Yard for residential development.	<p>Support for Carter's Yard is noted and welcomed.</p> <p>It is considered that Carter's Yard is the</p>	<p>No changes.</p> <p>See changes in response to</p>

Representation Number	Paragraph/ Policy/ Community Action	Objecting/ supporting/ comment	Comments(summary)	Response to Comments	Plan changes
				<p>second most sustainable site (after Frank's Patch) in relation to the site sustainability objectives used within the Local Plan (see site sustainability appraisal included as supporting evidence).</p> <p>While it is recognised that all sites including Carter's Yard would have an adverse impact on the AONB landscape the individual site appraisals undertaken as part of the landscape appraisal undertaken as part of the East Devon Draft Villages Plan 2014 indicated that the Carter's site has a sense of enclosure and dense hedgerows which would help to mitigate the impacts of development.</p> <p>In representation RN024-20 East Devon District Council suggest the site is reduced in size to the existing footprint of Carter's Yard to reflect the current level of need in the village and to minimise the impact on the landscape. The working party is supportive of this position. However it is now acknowledged that despite the site being put forward by the landlord in the SHLAA for development by 2016/17 the landowner has now indicated that the site is not available (see Representation RN025-009)</p>	<p>representation RN025-09 by CDE stating Carter's Yard is no longer available.</p>
RN008-02	Policy D2 a)	Object	We are worried about	It is acknowledged that Middle Street is a	No changes.

Representation Number	Paragraph/ Policy/ Community Action	Objecting/ supporting/ comment	Comments(summary)	Response to Comments	Plan changes
			<p>the parking & congestion at Frank's Patch now and feel it would only be made worse if built on.</p>	<p>narrow road and dwellings along the road have limited on-site parking leading to parking along the road.</p> <p>DCC highways in the East Devon Villages Plan – Draft for Consultation 2014 stated <i>“The principle of using Frank’s Patch for residential is fine, but the parking in the area is at such a premium, three new properties may cause some issues in that regard. It might be difficult to fit three properties on there with off-street parking facilities”</i>.</p> <p>However under Policy G2 off road parking is required as part of any development and it is considered by the landowner a design could be developed to accord with this policy and allow development for up to 4 dwellings.</p> <p>See also response RN003-01.</p>	.
RN015-01	Policy D2 b)	Support/ Comment	<p>The best place to build the new houses is Carter’s Yard.</p> <p>Brownfield site that will not impact the unspoilt nature of the rest of the Village. Also has access to and from Budleigh Salterton Road that is</p>	<p>Support for the development at Carter’s Yard is noted and welcomed.</p> <p>See also response to RN008-01</p>	<p>No changes</p> <p>See changes in response to representation RN025-09 by CDE stating Carter’s Yard is no longer available.</p>

Representation Number	Paragraph/ Policy/ Community Action	Objecting/ supporting/ comment	Comments(summary)	Response to Comments	Plan changes
			more visible from approach and exit to the Village and therefore safer.		
RN017-01	Policy D2 b)	Support/ Comment	Supports Carter's Yard as best way forward if there has to be any development in East Budleigh. To avoid spillage into the adjoining fields, strongly suggests the development is limited to 5 or 6 dwellings of 1, 2 or 3 bedrooms.	Support for the development at Carter's Yard is noted and welcomed. See also response to RN008-01.	No changes. See changes in response to representation RN025-09 by CDE stating Carter's Yard is no longer available.
RN008-03	Policy D2 b)	Support	Would support 5 houses on Carter's Yard as long as it is not turned into a large development.	Support for the development at Carter's Yard is noted and welcomed. See also response to RN008-01.	No changes See changes in response to representation RN025-09 by CDE stating Carter's Yard is no longer available.
RN018-01	Policy D2 b)	Support	Would support 5 houses on Carter's Yard but strongly suggest it should be limited to a small scale development (5 or 6 houses).	Support for the development at Carter's Yard is noted and welcomed. See also response to RN008-01.	No changes. See changes in response to representation RN025-09 by CDE stating Carter's Yard is no longer available.

Representation Number	Paragraph/ Policy/ Community Action	Objecting/ supporting/ comment	Comments(summary)	Response to Comments	Plan changes
RN028-03	Policy D2 b)	Object	Strongly disagrees with Carter's Yard for housing on visibility and being detrimental to surrounding area and AONB. Points out that EDDC had previously not supported this site for that reason.	<p>The Working Party does not agree that Carter's Yard is unsuitable for development. In the SHLAA in 2012 when the site was put forward by the landowner for the first time, EDDC concluded the site could be developed for up to 9 dwellings by 2016/17.</p> <p>In choosing the site for development account was taken of the sustainability objectives used in the East Devon Local Plan. As detailed in the Neighbourhood Plan supporting documentation the document entitled "site sustainability appraisal' Carter's Yard was identified as the second most sustainable site after Frank's Patch. The Draft East Devon Village Plan in 2014 stated that the site performed better in relation to the sustainability objectives compared to the field below Syon House.</p> <p>In a landscape appraisal conducted for the Draft East Devon Village Plan the Plan concluded all sites would be sensitive to change due to their location in the AONB. The Draft East Devon Village Plan preferred the field adjacent to Syon House to Carter's Yard due to the latter's being more elevated and in a more prominent position in the</p>	<p>No changes.</p> <p>See changes in response to representation RN025-09 by CDE stating Carter's Yard is no longer available.</p>

Representation Number	Paragraph/ Policy/ Community Action	Objecting/ supporting/ comment	Comments(summary)	Response to Comments	Plan changes
				<p>AONB and as a site was needed at the time(no longer a requirement) for 15 dwellings However an individual landscape appraisal of Carter’s Yard stated that the site has a sense of enclosure due to dense hedgerow vegetation and boundary trees and the overall conclusion was “ <i>the site is in close proximity to the existing built form of East Budleigh and retention of existing boundary vegetation will help mitigate the impacts of development</i>”</p> <p>In light of new information, and given the advice of East Devon District Council (Representation RN024-26) the site at Carter’s Yard, if included in the Plan, would have been reduced in size to the brownfield footprint to meet identified need ensuring minimal impact on the character of the area.</p> <p>The site also received the most support among the village community for affordable housing if local need was identified.</p>	
RN035-09	Policy D2	Comment/ Support	Does not support development in the village unless it meets an affordable housing need and is small in scale. The 'exception	The approach outlined in the Neighbourhood Plan is to support small scale development for affordable housing that meets an identified local need in the Parish. This need to be met through the identified exception sites.	Textual change to Policy D2 to support small scale exception sites of 5 or less dwellings.

Representation Number	Paragraph/ Policy/ Community Action	Objecting/ supporting/ comment	Comments(summary)	Response to Comments	Plan changes
			<p>site' only approach should be the criterion and preference is for small scale development up to 10 dwellings to minimise impact on AONB.</p>	<p>This approach is supported by representation RN024-024 by EDDC. This representation states Policy D2 is in general conformity with the Local Plan strategy 6, 27, which allow Neighbourhood Plans to allocate land for development outside of the built-up area boundary. The identification of exception sites requiring 66% affordable housing conforms with Strategy 35 of the local plan, which allows for exceptions housing to come forward beyond the boundary where there is a demonstrated affordable housing need.</p> <p>National and local guidance does not support development in an AONB stating such land should be protected and that land should only be released in exceptional circumstances and where there are no sites elsewhere. It is therefore agreed preference should be for small scale development of up to 10 dwellings to minimise the impact on the AONB landscape.</p>	

Other Comments

Representation Number	Paragraph/ Policy/ Community Action	Objecting/ supporting/ comment	Comments(summary)	Response to Comments	Plan changes
Whole document					
RN005-01	n/a	Support		Support for the Plan is noted and welcomed.	No changes.
RN009-01	n/a	Support		Support for the Plan is noted and welcomed.	No changes.
RN020-03	n/a	Comment	Should be similar to Lympstone NP which was passed by the same inspector that will be looking at ours. Do not think we should be having talks with CDE.	There is no set format for a Neighbourhood Plan and the East Budleigh with Bicton Neighbourhood Plan is a legitimate Planning document and will be examined once submitted by an independent examiner (yet to be appointed) who will judge the Plan on whether it meets basic conditions set out in paragraph 8 of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990(as amended). CDE is represented on the Working Party (Ms James) and have been kept fully informed and have been encouraged to contribute at all stages of the Plan preparation process. CDE have also been officially consulted as part of the consultation process.	No changes.
RN021-01 (Otter Valley Association)	n/a	Support	A very detailed and comprehensive Plan. OVA support this Plan.	Support for the Plan is noted and welcomed.	No changes.

Representation Number	Paragraph/ Policy/ Community Action	Objecting/ supporting/ comment	Comments(summary)	Response to Comments	Plan changes
RN029-01	n/a	Support		Support for the Plan is noted and welcomed.	No changes.
RN030-01	n/a	Support		Support for the Plan is noted and welcomed.	No changes.
RN036-01	n/a	Support	Supports the pre-submission NP document's objectives and policies.	Support for the Plan is noted and welcomed.	No changes.
RN035-01	n/a	Support	The Plan is an excellent planning document that has been well illustrated with photographs adding meaning to the supporting text.	Support for the Plan is noted and welcomed.	No changes.
Document Presentation and photographs					
RN005-02	Front Cover	Comment	Front cover does not convey seriousness of content.	Noted.	No changes.
RN013-06	Photograph (p75)	Comment	Why a picture of Branscombe to illustrate East Budleigh?	Photograph used to show a design concept illustrating how the features of a Devon cottage can be translated into a modern design.	It should be noted the available space for the inclusion for photographs can only be determined once the text of the Plan has been completed. Keeping this proviso in mind the photograph will be replaced with an East Budleigh cottage if space permits once the text

Representation Number	Paragraph/ Policy/ Community Action	Objecting/ supporting/ comment	Comments(summary)	Response to Comments	Plan changes
					of the Submission Plan has been completed.
RN019-02	Photographs	Object	<p>The photos on these pages 52, 64, 66, 67, 75 are almost certainly not of locations in the Parish and should be replaced. Errors of this magnitude will throw doubt on the validity of the whole report.</p>	<p>Disagree that photographs in the Plan cast doubt over the validity of the Plan. There are around 56 photographs in the Plan and these very distinctly illustrate points made in the supporting text.</p> <p>It is accepted that an error was made on page 64 in relation to the picture of the churchyard.</p> <p>The image on page 75 has been legitimately included to illustrate how a traditional Devon cottage can be translated into a modern design. It is however agreed a Devon cottage in East Budleigh can also be used to illustrate this point.</p> <p>In respect of the photographs on pages 52, 66 and 67 (some of the images are in the Parish) these have been legitimately included to illustrate green infrastructure projects proposed in the Plan that do not currently exist in the Parish. It is however intended in the Submission Plan that only photographs in the Parish (other than for the community orchard on page 66) can be used to illustrate the supporting text in relation to the green infrastructure projects.</p>	<p>It should be noted the available space for the inclusion for photographs can only be determined once the text of the Plan has been completed. Keeping this proviso in mind the photograph on page 64 will be replaced with a correct photograph of the Churchyard and the Photograph on page 75 will be replaced with a photograph of traditional Devon cottages in East Budleigh. The photographs of green infrastructure (where not already of the Parish) on pages 52 and 67 will also be replaced by photographs in the Parish that can illustrate the supporting text.</p>

Representation Number	Paragraph/ Policy/ Community Action	Objecting/ supporting/ comment	Comments(summary)	Response to Comments	Plan changes
RN020-01	Photographs	Object	List of photos to be removed. Same list as RN019.	See comments in relation to representation RN019-02.	See comments in relation to representation RN019-02.
RN020-02	Photographs	Comment	Photos of Packhorse Bridge & Remains of Priory should be reinstated.	There is limited space for photographs and the space available can only be determined once the text has been completed. It should be noted the remains of the priory are not a designated historic asset and priority has been given to those that are.	Consideration will be given to including a photograph of the Packhorse Bridge should there be space in the Plan once the text has been completed.
RN035-01	Photographs	Comment	Support photographs in Plan particularly those relating to natural environment in chapter 11.	Support for the photographs in the Plan is noted and welcomed.	No changes.
Proposals Map					
RN005-06	Proposal Map(p2)	Comment	What do numbers on page 2 refer to?	Numbers refer to protected local green space allocated under Policy N2.	Proposals map to be amended to provide greater clarity.
RN004-02	Proposal Map(p2)	Comment	A proper, readable, double page map of the village would be welcome.	A request is to be made to EDDC for them to supply maps with improved definition and clarity.	Proposals map to be amended to provide greater clarity.
RN033-02	Proposal Map(p2)	Comment	No reference to what the numbers mean. Suggest, say, 'refer to page 60'	This is agreed to provide greater clarity.	Proposals map to be amended to provide greater clarity.

Representation Number	Paragraph/ Policy/ Community Action	Objecting/ supporting/ comment	Comments(summary)	Response to Comments	Plan changes
Chapter 3					
RN013-01	History	Comment	No mention of Village connection to Roger Conant founder of Salem Mass USA, which is connected to Salem Chapel. His home is in the Village. Mrs Moyle has an archive on him and is in touch with the USA.	It is acknowledged that Roger Conant, founding father of the city of Salem, Massachusetts, was also born in East Budleigh in 1592. The Neighbourhood Plan is however a planning document and is limited in the historic content it can include.	Textual change to paragraph 3.4 to briefly refer to Roger Conant connection to East Budleigh.
RN013-03	History	Comment	No mention of Admiral Preedy who laid the Atlantic cable. Window dedicated to him in church.	This historic point is noted. However the Neighbourhood Plan is a planning document and is limited in the historic content it can include.	No changes.
RN013-04	History	Comment	Rudolphe Node tried to fly from the church tower to Tidwell Mount in 16th Century. His memorial stone was against the church porch but recently stolen.	This historic point is noted. However the Neighbourhood Plan is a planning document and is limited in the historic content it can include.	No changes.
RN013-05	History	Comment	No mention of the actual holly tree or a plaque placed by the Village	The importance of the 'Mark Tree' in the High Street is acknowledged. However the Neighbourhood Plan as a planning document	Textual change to paragraph 3.2 to briefly refer to the Holly 'Mark' tree.

Representation Number	Paragraph/ Policy/ Community Action	Objecting/ supporting/ comment	Comments(summary)	Response to Comments	Plan changes
			Archives Group explaining why a TPO.	and is limited in the historic content it can include.	
RN016-01	History	Comment	1. Why was the history of the Mark tree at Holly Tree Cottage missed out? 2. Nothing said about Roger Conant, founded Salem in Massachusetts.	It is recognised that Roger Conant, founding father of the city of Salem, Massachusetts, was also born in East Budleigh in 1592. The importance of the 'Mark Tree' is also acknowledged. The Neighbourhood Plan is however a planning document and is limited in the historic content it can include	Textual change to paragraph 3.2 to briefly refer to the Mark Tree and textual change to 3.4 to briefly refer to Roger Conant connection to East Budleigh.
RN016-02	History (para 3.5)	Object/ Comment	The Congregationalist minister did not live in the Old Manse until 1894, and then only owned by the chapel for 50 years. Before that it was called Eden Villa.	Paragraph 3.5 is not inaccurate but it is accepted that the text could be clarified. It is recognised in 1889 the Old Manse was called Eden Villa, and owned by Thomas Havill, a member of Salem Chapel. In 1890 he sold it to the Chapel to provide a residence for their Minister. The Chapel eventually sold The Manse as it was then called in 1956 as a private residence.	Textual change to paragraph 3.5 to provide clarification
RN005-03	Spatial Profile(p12-13)	Comment	Data on pages 12-13 easier to read in table format.	Data presented as graphs in Appendix D.	Data presented as graphs in Appendix D. However in light of EDDC comments in representation RN024-02 the Spatial profile and Appendix D are to be deleted from the Plan and instead incorporated into a supporting

Representation Number	Paragraph/ Policy/ Community Action	Objecting/ supporting/ comment	Comments(summary)	Response to Comments	Plan changes
					document.
Chapter 4					
RN019-01	Objectives	Object	Objectives 1, 2 & 3 should conform with the wishes of the Parish as defined in the Questionnaire: Objective 1 - Preserving the character of the Parish; Objective 2 - Location of new development; Objective 3 - Flood risk. To effectively have Job Creation as the first Objective is both wrong and a gift to developers.	<p>The Objectives have been put in logical order in relation to the Plan Chapters making the Plan easier to read.</p> <p>The wishes of the Parish have been reflected in the objectives which cover social, economic and environmental issues that together provide a basis on which the sustainability performance of the plan can be judged (a key planning requirement).</p> <p>Objectives 8, 9, 10, 11 all seek to preserve the character of the Parish and given the importance of this priority it is considered more appropriate to include several objectives rather than one all-embracing objective that would not cover in depth the various very important considerations to meeting this objective.</p> <p>Objective 12 is concerned with flood risk so this priority is fully covered in the Plan.</p> <p>A key priority as identified in the questionnaire was the design, size and location of development. The design of</p>	No change.

Representation Number	Paragraph/ Policy/ Community Action	Objecting/ supporting/ comment	Comments(summary)	Response to Comments	Plan changes
				development is covered in its own Objective 11 given its importance. The location and size of development is included in Chapter 14 and covered by Objective 13. Objective 13 reflects the wider issues that impact on the size and location of development such as dwelling size as identified by supporting evidence and the level of identified need that impacts on the scale of development and thus the location of any development.	
RN035-02	Objectives	Support	Support the issues and objectives outlined in the Chapter particularly those relating to the preservation of the character and environment. E.g. objectives 8,9,10 and 11. I also support Objective 13 and its emphasis that development should only be supported if it meets identified affordable housing needs in the Parish.	Support for the objectives of the Plan is noted and welcomed.	No changes
Chapter 8					
RN016-03	8.19	Object/	8.19 Incorrect: The	The meaning of Salem is peace but in the	Textual change to paragraph

Representation Number	Paragraph/ Policy/ Community Action	Objecting/ supporting/ comment	Comments(summary)	Response to Comments	Plan changes
		Comment	meaning of Salem is Peace.	Bible Salem is also commonly known to refer to the city of Jerusalem.	8.19 to refer to the two meanings of Salem.
RN016-04	8.20	Object/ Comment	8.20 Incorrect: Some of it was altered in 1813; the schoolroom was built in 1836 and only Dissenters School left in England; housed 2,000 books in library (rare); chapel built around old oak tree (plus further information). 8.20 Incorrect: Some of it was altered in 1813; the schoolroom was built in 1836 and only Dissenters School left in England; housed 2,000 books in library (rare); chapel built around old oak tree (plus further information).	It is recognised that The Neighbourhood Plan presents a brief history and cannot include all information about Salem Chapel. It is also recognised that there were several changes to its structure in the 19th century. According to Historic Chapels Trust, a gallery was added in 1810, and extended in 1814. The most drastic remodelling took place in 1836 with the central column replaced and in 1851 a schoolroom for Sunday school was built.	Textual change to paragraph 8.20 to refer to the various changes made to the structure of the Chapel in the 19th century.
RN016-05	8.21	Object/ Comment	8.21 Incorrect: the Assembly of God tried to get planning permission to build (plus further information); Rare bats in roof and	The content of this paragraph is not inaccurate according to the Historic Chapels Trust. The Neighbourhood Plan presents a brief history and it is recognised it cannot include all information about Salem Chapel. The Historic Chapels Trust guide to the	No changes.

Representation Number	Paragraph/ Policy/ Community Action	Objecting/ supporting/ comment	Comments(summary)	Response to Comments	Plan changes
			very old badger set.	Chapel confirms that in the 1980s the Chapel was owned by the Assembly of God, and was then sold to a private owner who seriously neglected it. In 1996 the perilous condition of the chapel was brought to the attention of the Historic Chapels Trust, and it was transferred to HCT's care in 1998.	
Chapter 9					
RN033-01	9.5	Comment/ Support	Change wording to 'court', Club only has one court	Noted.	Textual change to paragraph 9.5 to correct the wording.
Chapter 10					
RN034-01	10.17	Comment	Suggests a Policy or Community Action statement to address the Bicton Arena generated traffic through Yettington	It is recognised in paragraph 10.17 that there is a problem with large horse boxes and trailers travelling through the village on the way to Bicton Arena. It agreed that the Neighbourhood Plan would benefit from a Community Action for the Parish Council to examine the issues and liaise with the various agencies to develop an action plan to meet and hopefully resolve the concerns of residents.	Textual change to Community Action 22 to incorporate concerns.
RN040-01	10.17	Comment	No Community Action in the NP on para 10.17 regarding horse box traffic. Wishes to see	See comments to representation RN034-01.	Community Action 22 to incorporate concerns.

Representation Number	Paragraph/ Policy/ Community Action	Objecting/ supporting/ comment	Comments(summary)	Response to Comments	Plan changes
			an action point agreed and included in NP		
RN040-02	10.17 /10.18	Comment	Lack of speed restrictions through the centre of Yettington is a problem.	Noted.	This concern to be included in a new Community Action as per RN034-01 and RN040-02.
RN039-01	Community Action 18	Support/ Comment	Supports the provision of permissive paths. Would like a path between Rolle Arms and Brick Cross as walking alongside the main road is difficult, or make the verge more walkable.	Noted, this to be included in the list of permissive paths detailed in Community Action 18.	Community Action 18 to be amended to include reference to this path.
RN035-04	Community Action 18	Support	Supports the creation of new footpaths in the Parish	Support for Community Action 18 is noted and welcomed.	No changes.
Chapter 11					
RN028-01	11.7	Comment	Attended 1st meeting re the community orchard and feels it is not for EB as if you didn't pay into scheme then you couldn't use the facility. It should be for all to use not just those who can afford it.	It is agreed that the Community Orchard should be for the benefit and freely accessible to all members of the Community as this would increase its value as a Community asset and as a venue and focus for Community events.	Paragraph 11.7 and Community Action 26 to be amended to support the Community Orchard being free and accessible to the Community.

Representation Number	Paragraph/ Policy/ Community Action	Objecting/ supporting/ comment	Comments(summary)	Response to Comments	Plan changes
Chapter 13					
RN027-01	Chapter 13	Comment/ Support	Considers the main issue to be flooding particularly in Yettington. Registered his willingness to support any work or dialogue on this issue with all relevant parties.	Comments and support noted.	No changes.
RN037-01	Chapter 13	Comment	Agrees with stated objective but disturbed by absence of specific aims. Flooding 2nd in residents' concerns and other PC's have taken stronger measures. Suggests the NP incorporates flooding history and flood damage risk. (A brief history of both is cited)	A map of the flood risk zones is included in the Plan together with brief planning related information. Any additional information if supplied by the Community could be included in supporting documentation.	No changes.
Chapter 14					
RN014-01	Chapter 14	Support	We think the planning proposals suggested by EBBPC are sensible.	Support for Chapter 14 is noted and welcomed.	No changes.

Representation Number	Paragraph/ Policy/ Community Action	Objecting/ supporting/ comment	Comments(summary)	Response to Comments	Plan changes
RN028-02	Chapter 14	Object	Past housing need survey indicated need for 14-17 dwellings, i.e. more than the 3 outlined in the document. Listed 5 families who, at some time in the past, she suggested left or had difficulty finding a home and suggests there must be many more.	The previous housing need survey in 1998 is out of date and in accordance with paragraph 40 (reference 41-040-20160211) of National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) where neighbourhood plans contain policies relevant to housing supply " <i>these policies should take account of the latest and up-to-date evidence of housing need</i> ". A housing need survey in 2015 has provided more up to date information in the Parish. In accordance with Strategy 35 exception housing will be allowed where there is a proven local need demonstrated through an up to date robust housing needs survey. Anecdotal information is not considered robust evidence to determine the level of housing need in the Parish.	No Change.
RN041-01	14.11	Support	EB does not need any more new housing. However if it must be built would favour Carter's Yard but only 5 or 6 houses.	Support for the approach in Chapter 14 is noted. In light of new information, and given the advice of East Devon District Council (Representation RN024-26) the site at Carter's Yard, if included in the Plan, would have been reduced in size to the brownfield footprint to meet identified need ensuring minimal impact on the character of the area. This would reduce the number of houses on site to around 4-5.	Textual changes to Policy D2 to support small scale development of under 5 dwellings. See changes in response to representation RN025-09 by CDE stating Carter's Yard is no longer available.

Representation Number	Paragraph/ Policy/ Community Action	Objecting/ supporting/ comment	Comments(summary)	Response to Comments	Plan changes
				It should however be noted the landowner has now indicated that the site is not available (see Representation RN025-009).	
RN042-01	14.11	Support	EB does not need any more new housing. However if it must be built would favour Carter's Yard but only 5 or 6 houses.	See response to RN041-01.	See response to RN041-01.
RN031-01	14.19	Comment	Affordable housing should only be for EB residents that are in need and should not be planned for Budleigh Salterton residents.	See response to RN035-10.	See response to RN035-10.
RN032-01	14.19	Comment	Affordable housing should only be for EB residents that are in need and should not be planned for Budleigh Salterton residents. Should be spelt out in NP	See response to RN035-10	See response to RN035-10
RN035-10	14.19	Comment	Affordable housing need in Budleigh Salterton should not be used to justify 'exception sites' in EB. (Reasons cited).	Paragraph 14.29 of the Local Plan groups East Budleigh with Budleigh Salterton. This paragraph states " <i>For affordable housing in rural areas account will be taken of the specific need within the Parish in which the application land is sited and in addition regard will also be paid to need in</i>	Textual changes to insert paragraphs into Chapter 14 to provide justification for why identified need in the town of Budleigh Salterton should not be used to justify a rural exception scheme. Textual

Representation Number	Paragraph/ Policy/ Community Action	Objecting/ supporting/ comment	Comments(summary)	Response to Comments	Plan changes
				<p><i>surrounding Parishes”</i></p> <p>On reviewing the evidence presented in several representations it is considered it would be a robust approach that need in the town of Budleigh Salterton is not used to justify a rural exception scheme in the small village of East Budleigh.</p> <p>This approach is considered justifiable and robust given the advice in the Planning Practice Guidance which requires Neighbourhood Plans to uphold the general principle of the Strategic Policy to ensure conformity and meet basic conditions but permits a distinct local approach if justification can be provided.</p> <p>The representations received have provided this justification as a) Budleigh Salterton is a town of 5,291 people and not a village and is a more sustainable location b) It is not a rural area c) the town can meet its own needs d) the approach is in conformity with the NPPF definition of a rural exception site e) the town does not meet the criteria on Strategy 35.</p>	<p>changes to Policy D2 requiring a robust housing need survey in the Parish to demonstrate need.</p>
RN035-11	14.30/ 14.31	Comment	Agrees with the site sustainability appraisal and community	This support is noted and welcomed.	No changes.

Representation Number	Paragraph/ Policy/ Community Action	Objecting/ supporting/ comment	Comments(summary)	Response to Comments	Plan changes
			preference of sites but only in response to an identified need for affordable housing in the Parish. Order of preference: 1. Carter's Yard 2. Frank's Patch 3. Syon House. Supports the site sustainability appraisal which presents the same order of sites.		
RN035-12	Community Action 29	Support/ Comment	Suggests that the CLT looks at ways to retain and increase social housing without new build to prevent the loss of social housing stock, which could result in affordable housing need being met through loss of land in AONB rather than from existing stock. (ideas to achieve this listed).	Agreed. It is considered that the Plan and the Community Land Trust could have a wider role to identify ways to retain and increase social housing stock rather than through new build alone.	Community Action 29 to be amended to reflect the wider role of the CLT.
RN002-01	14.38	Supporting	None	Support for paragraph 14.38 is noted and welcomed.	No changes

Representation Number	Paragraph/ Policy/ Community Action	Objecting/ supporting/ comment	Comments(summary)	Response to Comments	Plan changes
Appendix B					
RN005-04	Appendix B	Comment	Maps etc. pages 106-109 difficult to read.	It is agreed pages 106-109 need greater clarity.	The information on pages 106-109 will be presented in tabular form to improve clarity. Appendix B is to be removed from the Plan and incorporated into a separate Consultation Statement. This is to meet the requirements of Section 15(2), Part 5 of The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012
Appendix C					
RN013-02	Appendix C	Comment	Village 'Pump' mentioned, thinks it should be the Village Tap at bottom of Middletown Lane	The designated historic assets detailed in Appendix C are those descriptions used on the National Heritage List for England.	No changes.
General					
RN004-01	Not given	Comment	Geoff Botton produced an NP given to PC. None of his	It is understood that Geoff Botton would have passed a Plan to the PC at least 16 years ago and has since died.	No changes.

Representation Number	Paragraph/ Policy/ Community Action	Objecting/ supporting/ comment	Comments(summary)	Response to Comments	Plan changes
			recommendation are in this Plan		
RN005-05	n/a	Comment	Building site CO82 not shown on any plan.	Site map of all sites subject to the sustainability appraisal contained in supporting documentation- site sustainability analysis.	No changes.