

**NEWTON POPPLEFORD AND HARPFORD NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN V4
PUBLIC CONSULTATION 1st November until 31st January 2020**

NUMBER	PUBLIC COMMENT	NHP Section	ACTION TAKEN (NCR = no change required)
R01	It is a great pity that CDE and Cavanna Homes seem to care so little for the village now that they have got 'their way'. It seems that these days that promises and commitments are just words.	General	<i>NCR – emphasises lack of trust in developers</i>
R01	As residents of NP and also with our 'OVA' hats on we have also studied the proposed Neighbourhood Plan and congratulate everyone who contributed to it. It really feels as though people are now prepared to fight the NP corner and ensure that the village retains its heritage, character and amenities.	General	<i>NCR – support for NHP</i>
R01	As you can imagine we are very pleased that the ancient orchard adjacent to Down Close is mentioned on more than one occasion as being of importance. It is a pity that the land is now so overgrown with brambles that the old apple trees are being overwhelmed but on the positive side we can report that the land is home to much wildlife including, this year, a family of polecats which were filmed by our neighbours playing in their log pile!	TH1, EP1, HQD1, App 3, App 8	<i>NCR – support for TH1, EP1, HQD1, App 3, App 8</i>
C01 R02	Agree that there is too much traffic. It can be impossible to turn out their drives onto the A3052 and there should be a 20mph speed limit through the village	T2	<i>Support for T2</i> <i>New wording added to end of T2: 'The introduction of a 20mph speed limit along the A3052 through Newton Poppleford would be supported.'</i>

			<p><i>Added to T2 Policy Overview: '...and a 30mph speed limit which is often exceeded,....'</i></p>
C01 R05	<p>Would a Neighbourhood Plan have stopped the victorian school being demolished. Would like the NHP to prevent other beautiful old buildings from being damaged</p>	HQD1	<p><i>No change made.</i></p> <p><i>Specific buildings of heritage value can be nominated in future using the EDDC 'Listing of Local Heritage Assets' process.</i></p> <p><i>Also, recently the 'Highlands, Capper Close' appeal was dismissed with the main issue being the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area, which included the impact on the steetscene.</i></p>
C02 R03	<p>Like the plan, in particular agree with the need for double yellow lines on Meadow View junction with A3052</p>	T2	<p><i>NCR – supports policy T2</i></p> <p><i>Double yellow lines not added to NHP policy as this is already a law is and is already being dealt with by Parish Council.</i></p>
C02 R04	<p>The policies are not always clear, e.g. 'it is supported' – what is 'it'. Some of the bullet points don't follow on correctly.</p>	General	<p><i>Policy bullets reviewed and reworded where relevant</i></p>
C02	<p>Plan is really good and the people who put it together are to be congratulated</p>	General	<p><i>NCR – support for NHP</i></p>
C02	<p>Sceptical that the planning system will take any notice of Neighbourhood Plans. Developers will find ways of getting round it.</p>	General	<p><i>NCR – emphasises lack of trust in developers and planning system</i></p>

C02	Support for the doctor's surgery	M1	<i>NCR – support for M1</i>
C03 R06	Need to add support for making East Devon into a National Park	new	<i>Added to the end of EP1: 'The creation of a new National Park which covers this parish would be supported' Reference to the Glover report has been added to Appendix 7.</i>
C03 R07	Agree that we need more truly affordable housing in the Parish. I like the sound of having a Land Trust if that means local people are able to build their own affordable house	Section 7.3 TD2	<i>NCR – supports section 7.3 NCR – supports TD2</i>
R08	-Why are new houses being allocated one parking place. A young couple usually has two cars. This is why the roads are overloaded with parked cars often half parked on Pavements. - You plan in future for people to walk on the old railway line. There are notices saying that the line is private. This was left over from when we had foot and mouth problems. - It is marked that Glebelands is not a parking problem, it is. It is not marked in purple. I have spoken to the neighbour policeman and he came to have a look. Unfortunately it was half term so few cars were around. It needs double yellow lines at the top to prevent cars parking at the junction with School Lane. It is impossible to see traffic coming up School Lane when coming out of	T1 T3 T1 and Map 3b	<i>EDDC has provided new wording which makes it clearer that it is actually 1 parking space per bedroom that is being proposed. NCR – lack of confidence that the railway line can be reopened. This would have to be negotiated. Glebelands added as a parking issue to Map 3 Double yellow lines not added to NHP as this is already a law and is already being dealt with by Parish Council.</i>

	<p>the road. Also at weekends and evenings at the bottom of the road people park opposite one another with half the wheels on the path. It would be impossible for a fire engine to get through and very difficult for an ambulance. There are garages behind numbers 5,6,&7 with spaces in front of them, these are not used.</p>		
	<p>- It would help to see the roads that would be affected by floods if the roads were marked on top of the blue water.</p>	Map 6	<i>Main roads added to Map 6</i>
R09	<p>I am writing to let you know that I am in agreement with the very comprehensive Neighbourhood Plan for Newton Poppleford.</p>	<i>General Comment</i>	<i>NCR – support for NHP</i>
	<p>Very important to me is the wildlife and conservation element that has been included in the Plan.</p>	<i>EP1, EP5, EP8, EP9, HQD1, GS1, TH1</i>	<i>NCR – support for EP1, EP5, EP8, EP9, HQD1, GS1, TH1</i>
	<p>Also the extension of cycle routes and the very obvious requirement to open up the old railway line as a walking and cycling route. I asked for this 20 years ago and my now adult learning disabled child is now obese.</p> <p>Exercise for us at King Alfred Way means lots of walking beside a busy main road or taking out the car and there is no opportunity for safe cycling from home.</p>	<i>T3</i>	<i>NCR – support for T3</i>
	<p>I hope that the improved walking provision in the village will include a dog walking path behind the new development at King Alfred Way, as people used to walk their dogs where the development now stands, but I understand this would need the cooperation of Clinton Devon Estates.</p>	<i>T3</i>	<p><i>T3 ‘A the future Parish ‘Footpath and Cycling Strategy’ will be supported, subject to consultation and agreement.’</i></p> <p><i>T3 Policy Overview – list of potential improvements to footpath and cycling routes added</i></p>

	I am very appreciative of all the hard work that has been put into the development of our Neighbourhood Plan and trust that now our village can now be protected and developed with respect to our needs as a community.	General Comment	<i>NCR – support for NHP</i>
R10	Thank you for distributing the Neighbourhood Plan for the parish of Newton Popleford and Harpford. I have read through the full document and have just three comments relating to Venn Ottery:	General	<i>NCR – support for NHP</i>
	1. Page 51: Under the section 'Grade II Listed Buildings', the table should also incorporate the following: Venn Ottery Barton Minors (thatched house) Elliott Farm/Venn Ottery House	App 2	<i>Add: '57 buildings in the Parish are protected by Grade II listing. The following were specifically identified by residents for protection.' Add following to Appendix 2: Venn Ottery Barton Minors Elliott Farm</i>
	2. Page 70-71: Cherished views/key vistas: I believe that the very significant view from the road down to Venn Ottery just after emerging from the trees near the quarry, looking east from Venn Ottery Common should also be incorporated. (2 nd email received) Attached is the photo that we mentioned in our previous e-mail, showing the significant view that we think needs to be protected. It shows the view from the road down to Venn Ottery just after emerging from the trees near the quarry, looking east	Map 9	<i>Resident provided a photo which was included under Map 9</i>

	<p>from Venn Ottery Common.</p> <p>We hope that you might also agree that this view is spectacular and worth including in the Neighbourhood Plan for the parish of Newton Poppleford and Harpford.</p>		
	<p>3. Page 20: Environmental protection, section 7.2: I believe that the report should refer specifically to the importance of the RSPB Reserve, including the future planned adopted area of the old quarry.</p>	EP1	<p><i>The RSPB sites of Aylesbeare and Harpford commons are already included.</i></p> <p><i>New wording added to end of EP1: There is support for the RSPB to take over management of the Old Quarry in Venn Ottery.</i></p>
R11	<p>I am emailing to express my confusion over page 35 of 45 in the plan summary. Maps 2a,2b,2c and 2d do not seem to have a key so that the maps do not mean anything. This is of HARPFORD WOODS AND ANCIENT WOODLANDS.</p> <p>MOREOVER MAP 2D IS UPSIDE DOWN.</p> <p>There is no indication as to which areas are to be preserved and saved from building. I feel strongly that the whole area should be exempt from any planning permission since we have already lost a lot of our parishes to building land and this would represent a significant loss of habits, history and biodiversity and adversely effect the environment, and the community, at every level.</p>	<p>Maps 2a, 2b, 2c and 2d</p> <p>Map 2d</p> <p>Policies TH1 and EP1</p> <p>Symptom of</p>	<p><i>A key has been added to these maps</i></p> <p><i>Map 2d has been turned the right way up and it made clear which areas should be exempted.</i></p> <p><i>NCR – TH1 shows the whole of Harpford Woods is ancient woodland and therefore automatically protected</i></p> <p><i>NCR - Symptom of lack of trust in the planning</i></p>

	<p>At best this INCOMPETENCE and at worst DELIBERATE in order to conceal the truth and I have little trust in the publishers.</p> <p>Please put my mind at rest and dispel my fears, by publishing a document to be distributed which points out the errors and puts them right, explaining their consequences to the village plan ...</p>	<p>lack of trust in the planning system? (see second email below)</p>	<p><i>system (see further email below)</i></p>
R11	<p>Thank you so much for your prompt reply.</p> <p>I am sorry if I offended you!</p> <p>It is fantastic that there are such caring people such as yourself in the village and I very much appreciate your time and effort in tackling this matter which very much concerns us all.</p> <p>Moreover you have more than satisfied me as to the intentions of the plan, and hope that it will be noted and acted upon by the planning advisory bodies.</p>	<p>General</p>	<p><i>NCR – support for NHP</i></p>
C04 R12	<p>I like the plan and am particularly concerned about parking problems. Because some people living on the main A3052 have nowhere to park their cars they park on the corner of Meadow Drive and the A3052, dangerously blocking the view of people entering/exiting the A3052.</p>	<p>T1</p>	<p><i>NCR – support for NHP, in particular T1</i></p>
C04 R13	<p>There's no pavement outside our house and the traffic is so busy I can't even stand outside my house to wash my windows, and we can't even get across the road as there are no safe places to cross near our house. We need all the traffic calming we can get, for instance 20mph speed</p>	<p>T2</p>	<p><i>New wording added to end of T2: 'The introduction of a 20mph speed limit along the A3052 through Newton Popleford would be supported.'</i></p>

	limit.		<i>Added to T3 Policy Overview: '...and a 30mph speed limit which is often exceeded,....'</i>
C04	I'd really like Clinton to reopen the railway line to Colaton Raleigh, it always used to be open and was only closed because of foot and mouth, but then never re-opened	T3	<i>NCR – support for T3</i>
C04	I like that developments are being ring-fenced by the village boundary	BUAB	<i>NCR – support for Built-up area boundary</i>
C04 R16	We need lots of benches along the A3052 not just for mothers of young children like myself but also for old people. We also need more benches in the dog walking field, you can't get to the two that are there because the grass is too long.	CF1	<i>This is a Parish Council issue rather than a planning issue</i>
R14	Just a note to thank you for the hard work and research that went into our excellent Parish Plan. The Plan covers all important issues for Newton Poppleford . I do not know what weight the Plan carries with the District Council or how far it is possible to implement the traffic calming, flood protection and the environment protection and I compliment the section on going for a higher quality of building design. Thank you for this excellent Parish Neighbourhood Plan.	General T2 EP1, EP2, EP3, EP4, EP5 and EP6 HQD1	<i>NCR – support for NHP</i>
R15	Church Green should be protected, is it included as part of St Lukes Churchyard and cemetery?	GS1	<i>Church Green is shown as 'Village Green' under Community Facilities in Appendix 2.</i>
R16	Wish we'd done this earlier then we could have stopped the development of KAW!	General	<i>NCR – support for NHP</i>

R17	When the new development next door to me broke the conditions on their planning the East Devon Planning Officers didn't enforce the planning conditions, they just said 'oh it looks okay to me' and 'we can't do anything about it now'. If the planning officers don't enforce planning conditions now, I don't think they will bother to enforce the Neighbourhood Plan.	General	<i>NCR – emphasises lack of trust in planning system</i>
C05	All 16 visitors to the first Open Day said that in general they liked the NHP	General	<i>NCR – support for the NHP</i>
C05	As pensioners medical facilities are critical to us. It is ridiculous to have to travel 7 miles to the doctors. The Beacon in Sidmouth 2.5 miles away would not take us and said we had to use Ottery St Mary (Coleridge) a 3 hour round trip on the bus. It was pleasing to hear a new surgery was part of the plan for a new housing estate – unfortunately corporate greed won over community needs.	M1	<i>NCR - Support for M1</i> <i>Note- The developers decided not to build the new surgery.</i>
C05	Badly in need of a Doctor's full time surgery. We're also pensioners and will soon give up our car and use buses. At the moment we have to travel to Ottery St Mary!	M1	<i>NCR - Support for M1</i>
C05	Improve the existing surgery by building a small waiting room at the side near the front door. That would provide for a nurse in the existing waiting room	M1	<i>Added to M1</i> <i>An upgrade of the existing surgery building would be supported.</i>
C05	I support all the above.	M1	<i>“ “ “</i>
C05	So do I!	M1	<i>“ “ “</i>
C05	Have never seen much maintenance/management going on in Harpford Woods (our garden adjoins). Maybe there	TH1	<i>This is not a planning issue. This is likely to be a discussion issue between the Parish Council and</i>

	is work further away. Are there any formal arrangements in place with CDE in relation to this		<i>other bodies such as District Council or Highways.</i> <i>There is recognition that work in Harpford Woods by the landowner has resulted in flooding in Harpford. E.g. larch removal in 2012.</i>
C05	Would be helpful to have the list of green spaces to be numbered and cross referenced to map 5a for complete clarity as to what is what	Map 5a	<i>Green spaces now numbered on Maps 5a and 5b</i>
C05 R19	Val answered all my questions	General	<i>NCR</i>
C05	(Traffic) An important issue for a small village. Bus services are only just adequate and it still takes 2 buses to get to the doctors	<i>T2 and M1</i>	<i>NCR – supports T2 and M1</i>
C05	It is good to hear plans to lower the speed limit and double white lines on Four Elms hill. This must be expedited as there are routinely accidents	<i>T2</i>	<i>NCR – supports T2</i>
C05	Parking in the village is an issue for various reasons. Without improved parking it is almost impossible for business to develop and grow. It is not good from a road safety aspect either.	<i>T1</i>	<i>NCR - Supports policy T1</i>
C05	Parking on any new development should be considered and the proposal for 'one space per bedroom' is just common sense in this age where personal transport is expanding	<i>T1</i>	<i>NCR - Supports policy T1</i>
C05	Parking on pavements is a health and safety issue and should be acted on.	<i>T1</i>	<i>Parking on existing pavements is a Devon County Council issue.</i>

			<p>Following words added T3: <i>'Roads on new developments must be sufficiently wide to allow two vehicles to pass without mounting the pavement.'</i></p>
C05	Would be helpful for <u>all</u> maps to show the BUAB	All maps	<p><i>Request not carried out because adding the BUAB to the maps will obscure the intended content for each map.</i></p>
C05	On the map 'the lack of pavements' is not comprehensive. E.g. Lower Way shows two lines and higher way only shows one line when it should have two lines. Also no pavement anywhere on those roads or, e.g. Back Lane.	Map 3c	<p><i>Map 3c changed to only show where there are no pavements along the A3052 in Newton Popleford. Map 3c also extended west of B3178/A3052 roundabout</i></p>
C05	Map 3c needs extending further west to show unsafe crossing across A3052 west of the mini roundabout (e.g. crossing from Parsons Close/Parsons Barn to catch bus to Sidmouth.	Map 3c T2	<p><i>NCR – there is no crossing west of the roundabout to put on the map. As with many places along the A3052 the pavement just ends and pedestrians are forced to dodge the traffic to get across the road as best they can with no assistance. This supports the requirement to provide more safe crossings.</i></p>
C05	Bus services, while reasonably regular are prohibitively expensive for those who have to pay.	T1	<p><i>NCR - Supports policy T1</i></p>
C05	Car park should remain free. If not, parking will move onto road	T1	<p><i>Added to T1 'Charges for parking in car parks will not be supported.'</i></p>
C05	Live in western end of village on Exmouth Road. Would	T2 and T3	<p><i>Map 3c shows the lack of pavements on the</i></p>

	love to use the facilities in the village but <u>cannot</u> walk to village shop, hairdresser, pub, village hall etc due to no pavement at the Toll House end of the street. We <u>have</u> to use the <u>car</u> ! It's madness. Even to walk the dog means jumping in the car firstly to travel out of the village. In some ways we feel cut off.		A3052. <i>T3 'A the future Parish 'Footpath and Cycling Strategy' will be supported, subject to consultation and agreement.'</i> <i>T3 Policy Overview – list of potential improvements to footpath and cycling routes added</i>
C05	Same thing applies for people in Harford as you can't walk safely over the bridge on the main road. Perhaps there should be a lower speed limit <u>and</u> signage to caution drivers.	T2 and T3	<i>Supports T2 and T3</i> <i>New wording added to end of T2: 'The introduction of a 20mph speed limit along the A3052 through Newton Poppleford would be supported.'</i> <i>Added to T2 Policy Overview: '...and a 30mph speed limit which is often exceeded,....'</i> <i>T3 'A the future Parish 'Footpath and Cycling Strategy' will be supported, subject to consultation and agreement.'</i> <i>T3 Policy Overview – list of potential improvements to footpath and cycling routes added</i>
C05	The Plan embraces this issue. It is critical in these environmentally challenged days to ensure all our "AONB" sites are protected for the good of the nation not just our own quality of life.	EP1	<i>NCR - Supports policy EP1</i>

C05	Over development and “squeezing” properties into an area detract from the building on areas that are potentially likely to flood should never be approved. Where this is happening in other parts of the country he houses are being flood more frequently and they cannot get insurance	EP2	<i>NCR - Supports policy EP2</i>
C05	Love the green areas in our village. Let’s keep it that way!	EP1 and GS1	<i>NCR - Supports policies EP1 and GS1</i>
C05	Preservation of trees and hedgerows: fine as long as they are maintained and not allowed to become too high and wild (too high ??? to hedgerows)	TH1	<i>Maintenance of existing trees and hedges is already covered in legislation and not a planning issue.</i>
C05	Map 6 and Map 7. It is important that the roads and homes can be seen.	Map 6 and 7	<i>Roads added to map 6 (flood zones) as they can’t currently be seen and it is important to see which streets are at risk of flooding.</i> <i>However, change not made to Map 7 as the roads can be made out.</i>
C05	The housing development area proposed is good and will not lead to overdevelopment of a small village in an AONB.	BUAB	<i>NCR – support for Built-up area boundary</i>
C05	The house styles proposed are also well chosen.	Preferred housing styles	<i>NCR – support for Preferred housing styles</i>
C05	It is important that future generations can get to see and appreciate the 800 + years of heritage in this area	HQD1	<i>NCR – supports HQD1 bullet which says “conserve or enhance heritage assets in the parish”</i>
C05	Love the way social houses and private housing have been tastefully built in Badger Close. It works well and	Section 7.3	<i>NCR - Support of 7.3</i>

	looks neat and smart.		<i>The EDDC Local Plan already supports pepper-potting and tenure blind housing.</i>
C05	I concur with the above comment as it builds and integrates a community	“ “	“ “ “
C05	Would like to see (HQD1 xxi) greater emphasis on energy efficiency and making it a legal requirement to ensure best practise is applied to all new homes.	HQD1 xxi)	<i>This requirement has been delivered by partial rewording already done to HQD1 by EDDC.</i> <i>e.g.:</i> <i>New bullet ii) ‘mitigate fuel poverty’</i> <i>new bullet xxii) ‘...sustainable methods must now be incorporated (rather than simply encouraged)</i>
C05	Really like to provision for smaller homes and especially the small build	H1 and TD2	<i>NCR – supports policies H1 and TD2</i>
R19 C06	Urgently need a safe crossing to get to the Village Hall. It’s so dangerous especially for older people	T2 e)	<i>T2 Policy Justification - Village Hall now added to crossings needed</i>
C06	To squash so many houses into the new King Alfred Way site the developers put a pavement on only one side of the road and made the road so narrow that cars can’t drive past parked cars. Now the cars park on the pavement and pedestrians have to walk in the road. Ridiculous. Also, they didn’t give enough private parking space so residents have to park on the road.	T1	<i>Support for T1</i> <i>Following words added T3:</i> <i>‘Roads on new developments must be sufficiently wide to allow two vehicles to pass without mounting the pavement.’</i>
R20	We definitely need a new surgery. I have to go to Ottery Coleridge surgery but there’s no bus and it’s too far away.	M1	<i>NCR – support for M1</i>

	Also, it's difficult to get an appointment and that's getting worse because of all the new houses they're putting up at Ottery and they'll build even more houses when they move Tipton School to Ottery.		
R21	Overall I liked the plan. I like the way it is put together, it was very easy to read.	General	<i>NCR – support for NHP</i>
	I'm not happy about the number of houses being built, there's too many. How many will they put at Waterleat now? There's already too much traffic and new houses will just make it worse. What about services like water, there isn't enough even without the new houses?	4.5 Future Development 2 nd para	<i>NCR – supports 4.5</i>
B01	<p>We act on behalf of [REDACTED] and the extent of the site they occupy in the village is shown edged red on the attached Land Registry Title Plan.</p> <p>You will obviously be aware that this part of the village has been excluded from the Build-Up Area Boundary under the EDDC Villages Plan, where in our view and that of [REDACTED], the site may ultimately lend itself, as an established brownfield site, the future development for residential purposes.</p> <p>[REDACTED] has no immediate plans to cease trading from the site but a number of the buildings are vacant and have been in that state for several months & without any interest in occupation from potential tenants on an existing use basis.</p> <p>I am not sure whether your parish council have yet committed to the production of a Neighbourhood Plan but it does seem to me that that plan may possibly benefit from the inclusion of this land as an exception site and potentially for providing a significant contribution to the</p>	<p>Section 2 The Neighbourhood Plan Area</p> <p>Map 1b</p>	<p><i>No change to be made</i></p> <p><i>At the 7/12/19 Open Day, it was explained to [REDACTED] that:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>- the BUAB is set by East Devon District Council and can't be changed by the Neighbourhood Plan and;</i> <i>- the process for defining an exception site is to (a) define a local need for affordable housing (b) make a call for available land and (c) assess any land submitted to identify the most appropriate.</i>

	Affordable Housing stock in East Devon.		
R06	<p>Page 7 Policy T3 – Rights of Way</p> <p>Add a comment that a solution needs to be found to provide a safe pedestrian route on or alongside the A3052 bridge over the river Otter. There is not a safe pedestrian route from Northmostown Lane to the village denying the people of Northmostown. Walkers seeking to access Rights of Way east of the river have to negotiate the dangerous narrow bridge where drivers are habitually exceeding the thirty miles per hour speed limit.</p>	T3 and T2	<p><i>T3 ‘A the future Parish ‘Footpath and Cycling Strategy’ will be supported, subject to consultation and agreement.’</i></p> <p><i>T3 Policy Overview – list of potential improvements to footpath and cycling routes added</i></p> <p><i>Added to T2 Policy Overview: ‘...and a 30mph speed limit which is often exceeded,....’</i></p>
	The last paragraph ‘re-opening of the railway line between Newton Poppleford and Colaton Raleigh as a walking and cycling route’ needs to say ‘re-opening of the railway line between Newton Poppleford and Otterton and beyond’.	T3	<p><i>T3 ‘A the future Parish ‘Footpath and Cycling Strategy’ will be supported, subject to consultation and agreement.’</i></p> <p><i>T3 Policy Overview – list of potential improvements to footpath and cycling routes added</i></p> <p><i>Rewording ‘re-opening of the railway line between Newton Poppleford and Colaton Raleigh Otterton and beyond’.</i></p>
	Full pedestrian access to be established from Northmostown Lane along Calm Lane, Houghton Lane, Halse’s Lane and Hillway Lane to Mutters Moor. These lanes have public access and were traditionally used as through routes, but now access is denied at the eastern end of all these lanes by blockages.	T3	<p><i>T3 ‘A the future Parish ‘Footpath and Cycling Strategy’ will be supported, subject to consultation and agreement.’</i></p> <p><i>T3 Policy Overview – list of potential improvements to footpath and cycling routes added</i></p>

	<p>Page 8 Policy EP1 – Conservation and enhancement of the East Devon AONB and Natural Environment.</p> <p>The recently published Glover Report into the relevance of AONB's and National Parks considered that a new Dorset and East Devon National Park should be a serious consideration. This new Park would roughly encompass the Dorset and East Devon AONB's. There is a group actively working towards creating this vision and the new status would bring greater land protection and increased government financial support as well as the opportunity to enhance tourism to the area.</p>	EP1	<p><i>Added to the end of EP1: 'The creation of a new National Park which covers this parish would be supported'</i></p> <p><i>Reference to the Glover report has been added to Appendix 7.</i></p>
	<p>The map on page 74 shows the permissive bridleway through Harford Woods as 'Traffic Free National Cycle Route Network'. Is this statement correct? It is a part of a proposed cycle route from Sidmouth to Feniton along the old railway line and although there is a group actively promoting this route, it is a very long way from completion.</p>	Map 4	<p><i>NCR - Clarification from Claire Rodway EDDC "The National Cycle Route network is an initiative introduced by Sustrans, the sustainable transport charity. The bridlepath you refer to is shown on the NCR map (below) and the text says that Route 248 will connect Honiton and Sidmouth. Most of the route is still under development. https://osmaps.ordnancesurvey.co.uk/50.70384,-3.29202,13 .</i></p> <p><i>I think your Plan wording is correct because, although the complete route is not yet in place, this section is being used and will eventually form part of the overall network of cycle/foot paths.</i></p>
C07	<p>Of the 10 visitors to the second Open Day, 6 said that in general they liked the NHP and 3 said they did not (note - these were local landowners)</p>	General	<p><i>NCR – 6 support the NHP</i></p> <p><i>NCR – 3 do not support the NHP</i></p>

C07	<p>Better design of new housing eco-friendly – not tarmac drives, carports not garages as most aren't used as such, either made into another room or storage. Better Parking.</p> <p>New housing to have spaces for birds to nest – there are special bricks for this and artificial marting and swift nests</p>	<p>HQD1 xix)</p> <p>HQD1 vi)</p>	<p><i>New wording added 'with carports preferred to garages'</i></p> <p><i>NCR – support for HQD1 vi)</i></p>
C07	<p>I agree high quality design and high quality build.</p> <p>I don't see much evidence of 'sense of space' houses are very close together with not enough parking</p>	HQD1	<i>NCR – support for HQD1</i>
C07	<p>King Alfred's Gate [Alfred's Gate] is a prime example of Developers wantonly disregarding standards and building regulations for greed and profit. They have squeezed in as many houses as they can into the space. The houses are not far enough apart – have insufficient parking, inappropriate gardens and design for young families or mobility impairments. The houses themselves look directly into each others windows</p>	T1, H2 and HQD1	<i>NCR – support for T1, H2 and HQD1</i>
C07	<p>Fencing and buildings need to encourage habitats / traffic of animals / birds etc. e.g. holes in fence kickboards for hedgehogs, bat boxes etc.</p>	HQD1 (new) vi	<i>NCR – support for HQD1 (new) vii</i>
C07	<p>KAW [Alfred's Gate] is claustrophobic! And hideous</p>	HQD1	<i>NCR – support for HQD1</i>
C07	<p>New Doctors surgery/pharmacy is an <u>absolute</u> necessity in this village. Old folk <u>don't</u> drive, young mums with children find it difficult to go to OSM [Ottery St</p>	M1	<i>NCR – Support for M1</i>

	Mary]/Sidmouth. It is needed.		
C07	(Environmental Protection) Areas of natural beauty, green spaces and recognised flood-risk land needs to be protected against development. Any development needs to have measures to address additional stress on the environment & local infrastructure (traffic/amenities etc).	EP1, GS1 and EP2 Numerous parts of the NHP	<i>NCR – support for EP1, GS1 and EP2</i> <i>NCR – support for NHP</i>
C07	(Environmental Protection) Protection protection protection and not nibbled into for building. Planting more trees & hedges. Flower meadows	EP1, TH1	<i>NCR – support for EP1 and TH1</i>
C07	How many TPOs are needed to protect existing tree cover	TH	<i>Assigning TPO’s are not an issue for the NHP.</i> <i>The Parish Council and Ward Councillor have repeatedly asked residents to nominate trees for new TPOs.</i>
C07	Parking is a joke – on pavements, on road corners, but nothing is done. New houses don’t seem to allow for more than one car. 20mph is essential and must be enforced.	T1 T2	<i>NCR – supports T1 requirement for 1 parking space per bedroom</i> <i>New wording added to end of T2:</i> <i>‘The introduction of a 20mph speed limit along the A3052 through Newton Poppleford would be supported.</i> <i>Added to T2 Policy Overview:</i> <i>‘...and a 30mph speed limit which is often exceeded,....’</i>

	No more housing to be built off the main road as to much traffic	T2	<i>This issue would be covered by Highways.</i>
C07	I agree policy T1, T2 and T3	T1, T2 and T3	<i>NCR – support for T1, T2 and T3</i>
C07	We need more leisure & facilities for youngsters which in turn will bring more families to the village. Make it a more vibrant village rather than large expensive homes for older folks	CF1, CF2 and CF3	<i>NCR – supports CF1, CF2 and CF3</i>
C07	All this new development has put addition strain on amenities and infrastructure which has not been addressed by developers. Need leisure facilities, traffic calming (village bypass) + doctor's surgery. These were needed before, now there's more people they are needed even more! Back Lane needs better night lighting/lamps – dangerous for pedestrians in places	4.5 2 nd para CF1, CF2, CF3, T2 and M1 T3 2 nd para	<i>NCR – supports 4.5 2nd para</i> <i>NCR – supports CF1, CF2, CF3, T2 and M1</i> <i>No change made as lighting up country lanes would be contrary to maintaining dark skies (Policy EP7).</i>
C07	Ancient or vetran trees need to be registered as such – maybe via woodland trust – to aid their protection	TH1	<i>The ancient woodland is defined in Maps 2a,b,c and d, and protected.</i> <i>EDDC Local Plan defines veteran tree as 'A tree which, because of its great age, size or condition is of exceptional value for wildlife, in the landscape, or culturally.'</i> <i>The registration of veteran trees could be a Parish Council action but is not part of a NHP.</i>

C07	I'm amazed at how little green space there is in this village area.	GS1	<i>NCR – supports GS1</i>
C07	T.P.O. should be put on a lot of trees. Plant more trees esp around playing fields. Stop using herbicide.	TH1	<i>Parish Council are already planning to plant more trees.</i>
C07	Need to promote areas which will bring back endangered breeds and species – not remove their habits [habitats?] by building. Endangered such as hedgehogs/bats and various insects would be encouraged by more wild areas and protected buildings (old) and habitats.	EP1 b), EP5, EP8, EP9 ii a) and HQD1 vi)	<i>NCR – wildlife would be supported by policies EP1 b), EP5, EP8, EP9 ii a) and HQD1 vi). Endangered species are protected by specific laws. Protecting old buildings – if the old building is also of heritage value it can be nominated in future using the EDDC 'Listing of Local Heritage Assets' process.</i>
R22	So many other villages already have traffic calming (e.g. 20mph) and Newton Poppleford urgently needs traffic calming as well. We seem to be the only village that doesn't have it.	T2	<i>New wording added to end of T2: 'The introduction of a 20mph speed limit along the A3052 through Newton Poppleford would be supported. Added to T2 Policy Overview: '...and a 30mph speed limit which is often exceeded,....'</i>
	East Devon have exempted the car park behind Temple Street from car park charges and they should exempt the Newton Poppleford car park behind the Church as well. Newton Poppleford already has a major parking problem and if they start making charges on that car park it will only drive more people to park on the streets.	T1	<i>Added to T1 'Charges for parking in car parks will not be supported.'</i>
R23	Parking in the Village is a problem and parking on the	T1	<i>This is covered by existing wording</i>

	<p>pavement in the High Street should be stopped before an accident occurs. The Local Plan should look to provide facilities for people who live in the High St, who do not have parking, rather than approve more housing that will exacerbate the issue.</p>		<p><i>“The Neighbourhood Plan will look favourably upon developments which recognise the considerable pressures faced by Newton Poppleford with respect to traffic congestion and on-road parking.”</i></p>
	<p>It is also noted that more people are now using tarmac to upgrade drives that moves away from the traditional look and appearance of the village. The plan should look to encourage existing residents, not just new developments to use more permeable surfaces and refrain from using unsightly tarmac.</p>	<p>EP3 a)</p>	<p><i>NCR – supports EP3 a)</i></p> <p><i>Not an NHP issues as existing residents would not require planning permission to tarmac an existing drive.</i></p>
	<p>Although in principle the suggestion of retaining all existing hedgerows and Trees to retain the rural feeling of the Village makes sense, this should however be done in a considered manner. Some of the hedgerows are scruffy and due to lack of care and maintenance over the years, have grown out of control and do not enhance the appearance of the village. An expert approach to what should be retained, what should be removed and replaced will add longevity to the plan & future appearance of the village.</p> <p>Likewise with trees, some are aged and offer potential risk to walkers so should be removed or maintained as appropriate. This is needed especially on the footpaths, e.g footpath1, which we should be encouraging children and parents to use away from the main road. Recently we have had trees fall on this path and so others that impact safe passage should be maintained properly or removed.</p>	<p>TH1</p>	<p><i>This is not a planning issue. This is likely to be a discussion issue between the Parish Council and other bodies such as District Council or Highways.</i></p>

	<p>A plan to replant more trees in more appropriate places should be drawn up to once again add longevity to the AONB, rather than just dealing with the here and now.</p>	<p>TH1</p>	<p><i>Parish Council are already planning to plant more trees.</i></p> <p><i>This is partially covered by the revised TH1 3e) which applies to all development: "should maximise opportunities for 'greening' the built environment through <u>planting of trees and shrubs appropriate to the local area and prevailing site</u>"</i></p> <p><i>However, as 3e only 'maximises opportunities' the following added for major developments to ensure additional planting: 4. Proposals for major developments should incorporate the planting of additional trees and shrubs appropriate to the local area and prevailing site conditions.</i></p>
<p>R24</p>	<p>There has obviously been a huge amount of work put into the Neighbourhood Plan for which we should all be very grateful.</p> <p>However there are a couple of points that I would particularly like to comment upon because the Plan does not adequately forbid building development outside the BUAB. In my view this is one of the key safeguards of the Neighbourhood Plan and without it the Plan largely fails:</p> <p>Section A:</p>		<p><i>Wording provided by Claire Rodway (in quotes below) has been inserted above Map 1b in Appendix 6</i></p> <p>We have some NP's which establish their own BUAB's using the Villages Plan methodology (Payhembury, for example) but NP's for settlements which already have BUAB's have used the Villages Plan boundaries as they have been rigorously assessed at Inquiry. An Examiner of your Plan will take the Boundary (and all the evidence behind it) as read because it is a strategic Policy of the Local and Villages Plans.</p> <p>If you want to strengthen the reasons for your</p>

Formatted: Font: 11 pt, Italic

<p>I do not accept the very weak statement “there is an assumption that development will not be supported” outside the BUAB. Whose assumption is being called upon and if the assumption is incorrect, will there be development outside the BUAB? I believe that the principle of not building outside the BUAB should be a specific policy in the Plan, it should be unambiguous and state that the EDDC <u>will not</u> permit any development outside the BUAB unless imposed by Government.</p> <p>Policy H3:</p> <p>This policy is saying that where development outside the BUAB is permitted; it must comply with the Policies applied to development inside the BUAB. This gives the impression to landowners and potential developers that the BUAB is not necessarily a legal constraint to development in the Newton Poppleford and Harpford area. Policy H3 must be amended to say something like “if any development outside the BUAB is imposed by Government then it shall comply in all respects with the established planning policies within the BUAB”.</p> <p>These are my own personal views and are not written on behalf of the Harpford PCC!</p>	<p>BUAB position, the approach we would prefer is for you to include some explanatory text, based on the Villages Plan methodology, in your reasoned justification to the housing section. This is a slightly amended section of the Villages Plan which you could include:</p> <p><i>“The Built-up Area Boundary for Newton Poppleford is taken from the adopted East Devon Villages Plan. The Built-up Area Boundary was based on a detailed assessment and supporting evidence and was subject to a Planning Inquiry, following which it was adopted in 2018. Given the topography and layout of the village, as well as considering the built-form, character and setting of Newton Poppleford, an assessment was also undertaken of walking distance and ease of walking, especially in respect of access for the disabled/those with limited mobility and for parents/carers looking after children (for example pushing a buggy). This information was used to inform land areas recommended for exclusion from the Built-up Area Boundary on the basis of constrained pedestrian accessibility.</i></p> <p><i>The village extends for around 1.8 km (1.1 miles) from east to west and the majority of services and facilities are located in the east. The lack of footways on the A3052 near its junction with the B3178 and the limited alternatives for pedestrian access from that part of the village to the west of this point limit the appeal to pedestrians of accessing the facilities on foot. This was a critical</i></p>
--	---

			<p><i>issue in an appeal for new housing off Down Close, the Inspector concluding that 'the narrow road and lack of pavements on the High Street, east of its junction with Exmouth Road, make it an unattractive and substandard route for pedestrians and, since it is the busy A3052 Exeter-South Coast road, for cyclists too'."</i></p> <p><i>Also added "The appeal for Badger Close also cited this reasoning in addition to the adverse effect on the AONB." to emphasise that that the BUAB also is there to protect the ED AONB.</i></p>
R25	<p>'I spent two hours standing outside Newton Poppleford Village Hall on 12th December as it's the Polling Station on election days. There's no pavement leading to the hall and no crossing so people have no choice but to dodge the A3052 two-way traffic to get there. Able bodied people are able to run across between the speeding cars and lorries but I saw many old people and people with young children dicing with danger and struggling to get across. There needs to be more safe crossings on the A3052, and especially outside the Village Hall', and more traffic calming'.</p>	T1 and T2	<p><i>Supports T1 and T2.</i></p> <p><i>'Village Hall ' now added as a crossing needed to T2 Policy Justification</i></p>
R26	<p>I am very pleased with the draft Neighbourhood Plan and wholeheartedly commend the work of all those involved in producing it.</p> <p>It was also extremely useful to attend the consultation event at the Pavilion and to obtain further insight directly from members of the Steering Group.</p>		<p><i>NCR – support of NHP</i></p>

	In addition to the comments made then, I attach further points I would like to raise		
	In the first paragraph, the word “hamlets” to be replaced by “localities”. As both Harpford and Venn Ottery have churches, I am sure that many residents (including myself) consider these places to be villages. .	Section 2 item a)	<i>All references to hamlets have been changed to villages rather than localities.</i>
	Better wording - “young and old” to read “residents of all ages”	5.1 Vision	<i>Change made as requested</i>
	Reference to “villages” is not consistent with that on page 5 (7?), first paragraph. Change to “area”.	T2 c)	<i>All lists of the outlying villages changed to be in the same order. All references to villages have been left rather than changing some to ‘area’ and some to ‘localities’</i>
	Better wording - The last phrase should be stronger, i.e. “... proposal makes such routes appropriate.”	T2 d) (now e)	<i>Change made as requested.</i>
	This paragraph should be renumbered , moved to the end of the section and reworded: “Proposals that will generate” and as shown	T2 f)	<i>Change already made by EDDC</i>
	Renumber (f) and reword: “when they take the safety ...” and as shown	T2 g)	<i>Reworded to make bullet read correctly</i>
	Renumber (g) and reword: “when they are designed” and as shown	T2 h)	<i>h) was previously combined with a)</i>
	Remove (c) and move to end of section.	EP1 c)	<i>No change made as c) is not standalone but is relevant to the introductory sentence “All developments, including for agriculture and</i>

			<p><i>extensions to existing buildings, should:.....”</i></p> <p><i>Also, c) has now been changed by EDDC to “not include the netting of trees and hedges to facilitate development will not be permitted;</i></p>
	Renumber sub-paragraphs (d) – (h) to be (c) – (g)	EP1	<i>No change required as c) has not been moved to end of section (see above)</i>
	<p>Delete “usually”.</p> <p>Add: “subject to the provisions of policies EP3 – EP6.” This is clearer and stronger.</p>	EP2	<p><i>No changes made because EDDC thought our original strong wording of ‘Proposals for development on floodplains will not be supported’ would be unacceptable and they replaced it with current wording, including ‘usually’</i></p> <p><i>No change made as all policies are subject to all other policies, as relevant.</i></p>
	Replace the second group of words in brackets with “from the relevant bodies with statutory responsibility for such assessments”. This allows for any future changes in structures.	EP4	<i>Change made as requested</i>
	<p>In 3rd paragraph, delete “they”.</p> <p>Reword i): “they will have ” and as shown.</p> <p>Reword ii): “they will have ” and as shown.</p>	EP7	<i>Change made as requested</i>
	Typo - “93m*” should presumably read “93m ² ”.	H1	<p><i>Leave * in place as it references a note below.</i></p> <p><i>All references to 93 square metres changed to</i></p>

			<i>93sq.m to standardise with Guidance Note 3.</i>
	"Strategy 36" should presumably read "Local Plan Strategy 36".	H2	<i>Change made as requested</i>
	"Strategy 48" should presumably read "Local Plan Strategy 48".	TD1	<i>Change made as requested</i>
	Typo - In first bullet point, "swift brick" to read "swift box".	HQD1 bi)	<i>No change made as the swift 'brick' is an actual brick which is built into a wall rather than a box which would be attached to a wall (note – original wording provided by RSPB)</i>
	Typo - "none-designated" to read "non-designated"	HQD1 x)	<i>Change made as requested</i>
	Typo - Final word should be "discreetly".	HQD1 xxi)	<i>Change made as requested</i>
	In advance of this paragraph, there should be a statement that a list of Community Facilities is presented at Appendix 2.	CF1	<i>Reference to Appendix 2 made</i>
	<p>"Proposals which seek to enhance or improve NPH parish's existing local community facilities, amenities or assets will be supported unless:</p> <p>a) There is no demonstrable need for them, or</p> <p>b) They have an adverse impact on the special character of the area's natural and built environments.</p> <p>This change to wording will, in my opinion, make it easier to defend facilities etc. from degradation.</p>	CF1	<i>No change made, both wordings give the same meaning to the policy and the existing wording passed East Devon review as legally enforceable.</i>
	<p>Reword end of first paragraph to "... will be supported unless:"</p> <p>Reword sub-paragraphs:</p> <p>"a) they create unacceptable ... unsociable hours"</p>	CF2	<p><i>No change made, both wordings give the same meaning to the policy and the existing wording passed East Devon review as legally enforceable.</i></p> <p><i>Note - Rather than making 'And should meet Policy</i></p>

	<p>“b) they do not meet Policy EP5 – “Protect Tranquillity and Dark Skies””</p> <p>“c) the use of any floodlighting does not have mitigation ...” and as existing sub-para b)</p> <p>“d) new sites are not easily accessible ...” as existing sub-para c)</p> <p>This change to wording will, in my opinion, make it easier to defend facilities etc. from degradation.</p>		<p><i>EP7 – Local Amenity’ a separate bullet, this bullet has already been deleted as all policies must also meet all other relevant policies</i></p>
	<p>The abbreviation “NPPF” needs clarification.</p>	<p>GS1</p>	<p><i>A Glossary has been added</i></p>
	<p>I am afraid I do not know the location of Down Close. However, I believe this reference should follow subparagraphs (a) to (e), as otherwise it may look as though these provisions apply only to Down Close, and not more generally.</p>	<p>TH1</p>	<p><i>If we move the Down Close reference to the end, we’d need to do the same with the ancient trees reference.</i></p> <p><i>Instead the policy has been renumbered to make it clearer.</i></p>
	<p>In fifth bullet point, replace “providing” with “employing”.</p>	<p>EM2</p>	<p><i>Alternative wording was also provided by East Devon District Council “Developments which use sustainable forms of construction, providing energy conservation measures and renewable energy will be encouraged.”</i></p> <p><i>EM2 now changed to “Developments which use sustainable forms of construction and provide energy conservation measures and renewable energy will be encouraged.”</i></p>
	<p>Typo - Heading of Section 3 should read “Non-designated”</p>	<p>Page 26 (36?)</p>	<p><i>Change made as requested</i></p>

	<p>The following should be added to the list of Community Facilities:</p> <p>The Cannon Inn Harpford Village Hall St Luke's Church St Gregory's Church St Gregory the Great Church Telephone Kiosk</p> <p>It cannot be sufficient to have them listed as assets alone on the previous page.</p>	Page 7	<p><i>All these locations are included in Appendix 2 as Community Facilities.</i></p>
	<p>Have these suggestions in response to the survey been analysed? Surely there should be some degree of prioritisation? In any case, not all suggestions are features to be protected (e.g. Himalayan Balsam).</p> <p>Much of what is suggested is already covered in sections on Green Spaces and Trees & Hedgerows.</p>	Pages 28 – 31	<p><i>NCR – this appendix is a copy of parishioners responses to Q4.6 of the Community Survey and it would not be appropriate to edit their views.</i></p> <p><i>However, the survey responses were analysed and used to draft the NHP</i></p>
R27	<p>The work you and your team have done is impressive and pretty comprehensive so that any comments we raise now will seem rather minor.</p>	General	<p><i>NCR – support for NHP</i></p>
	<p>Parking spaces for dwellings should be "off road".</p> <p>Similarly Charging points should allow for charging "off road"</p>	T1 summary	<p><i>T1 policy wording changed to 'All developments must provide adequate off-road parking.....</i></p>
	<p>e) please include traffic "noise."</p> <p>Also "easy access for emergency vehicles"</p>	T2	<p><i>e) change made as requested</i></p> <p><i>Change not made as access for emergency vehicles is covered by para 110 in the NPPF.</i></p>

	Bus stops should have laybys	T1	<p><i>There is already a process for improving bus stops in consultation with the bus companies and EDDC.</i></p> <p><i>The last sentence of T1 now says "The Neighbourhood Plan will look favourably upon developments which recognise the considerable pressures faced by Newton Poppleford with respect to traffic congestion and on-road parking and highway safety".</i></p>
	Presumably this is 93 "square metres".	POLICY H1	<i>Change made as requested</i>
	<p>Loss of "view" also to be taken into account.</p> <p>Also add "Services, such as power and telephone land lines, should be underground"</p>	HQD1	<p><i>The NHP is able to protect 'cherished public' views but not an individual's view (e.g. from a resident's property).</i></p> <p><i>Added as a new bullet to HQD1</i></p>
	Flats/Maionettes could have option for communal gardens.	GUIDANCE Note 3	<p><i>Change not made.</i></p> <p><i>At the moment the NHP says balcony or private space to be provided at ground level minimum 10sq.m. If we allow communal gardens developers would probably prefer that as they could probably provide less space.</i></p>
	Material options. Should " Slate tiles" also include "Slate effect tiles"?	PAGE 19	<i>Slate effect wasn't an option on the Housing Styles survey and to introduce this change would mean that other materials (e.g. brick, etc) should also be changed (e.g. 'brick effect').</i>

			<i>A submission for slate effect tiles could considered as part of an application, e.g. on environmental grounds.</i>
	CF1 Add "School playground and dog walking field," CF2 "with parking facilities"?	PAGE 20	<i>School Playground and Webber's Meadow are listed in Appendix 2 so a reference to Appendix 2 has now been inserted.</i> <i>No change made. All policies apply to all developments and T1 states that "All developments must provide adequate off-road parking".</i>
	Add Green Bank and its flower beds and the the shrubbery bed by Kirby's.	GS1	<i>Added to GS1 and Appendix 4:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Green Bank, High Street (0.03)</i> • <i>Shrubbery, Station Road, opposite Oak Tree Villas (0.01)</i>
	Whilst appreciating the importance of trees, it is important to recognise some trees can outgrow their location and become a danger to nearby houses and the public e.g. the Church Green oaks.	POLICY TH1	<i>This is not a planning issue. This is likely to be a discussion issue between the Parish Council and other bodies such as District Council or Highways.</i>
	Include mobile phone reception	POLICY EM3	<i>'mobile phone reception and' added to EM3</i>
	Add: Milestone (Half burried by Riverside cottage"). Flag Poles (Green Bank) Oak Tree Garage petrol pump. Public seats and	App 2	<i>Changes made as requested</i>

	<p>Bus shelters (primarily of the brick built ones) The wooden railings at the E end of Station Rd on either side of the river, an iconic feature of the village once painted white and app 100 yrs old</p>		
R28	<p>Typos:</p> <p>Page 2 – remove comma after social Page 6 - “The main National Planning Acts” Page 6 – check last quote ‘seeking.....communities’ Page 10 - Apprised should be appraised Throughout - split the two words Red Bridge Page 36 - Separation Distances oOn Sloping Ground: Page 87 - remove gap after “valued , “ Page 7 - (Assuming the Plan is approved in 201920) Page 16 - “the bus service is so limited” Page 48 - (delete space in front of) Developments which use sustainable forms of construction..... Appendix 3 – remove hanging indents Page 62 – insert space in ‘BuiltUp’ Page 62 - Add in paragraph space (blank line) after line 3</p>	Various	<i>Changes made as requested</i>
	<p>The Glover Review highlighted that East Devon and Dorset are prime candidates for a new National Park. I fully support this as the current legislation does not protect the AONB, nor are we providing suitable local housing, nor are we promoting agriculture and small indigenous industry</p>		<p><i>Added to the end of EP1: ‘The creation of a new National Park which covers this parish would be supported’</i></p> <p><i>Reference to the Glover report has been added to Appendix 7.</i></p>
	<p>The RSPB say that they may be interested in taking on the management of the Old Quarry in Venn Ottery when the AI 5year management plan expires. This would include</p>	EP1	<p><i>New wording added to end of EP1</i></p> <p><i>There is support for the RSPB to take over management of the Old Quarry in Venn Ottery.</i></p>

	public access. I would support this		
	I would support structural changes to the existing doctor's surgery to improve the facilities.	M1	<i>Added to M1</i> <i>An upgrade of the existing surgery building would be supported.</i>
	Experience shows that people do not park their car in their garage, instead their garages are used for storage or converted into extensions. Recent construction at Alfred's Gate shows that new garages are often not big enough to park modern large cars forcing residents to park on the street. Provision of carports rather than garages would reduce this tendency.	HQD1 xix)	<i>New wording added 'with carports preferred to garages'</i>
	Delete these words "as the less suitable areas for development"	Page 7	<i>Change made as requested</i>
	Land south of King Alfred Way (Alfred's Gate), when concerns	Page 11	<i>Change made as requested</i>
	Add 53 houses have been built in Newton Poppleford in 2019 alone to the end of it would be inappropriate at this stage to allocate sites for development.	Page 12	<i>Change made as requested</i>
	of the pedestrian Redbridge Add to end which links Newton Poppleford to Harford .	Page 19	<i>Change made as requested</i>
	This was a critical issue... Change to:	Page 20	<i>Change made as requested</i>

	This was just one of the critical issues..		
	Despite this 67 new houses have been authorised in the parish since 2013, with further applications expected. Add in: 53 houses have been built in Newton Poppleford in 2019 alone.	Page 27	<i>Change made as requested</i>
	...Play facilities for children of all ages particularly in the west end of the village across the parish will be supported.	Page 41	<i>Change made as requested</i>
	Gill Cameron-Webb Add in: Steering group lead co-ordinator and liaison member. Document production.	Page 50	<i>Changed as follows: Dr Emma Taylor Gill Cameron Webb Gill Cameron Webb and Dr Emma Taylor (Steering Group co-ordination and document production)</i>
	Play Areas X X There is a cross in the Harpford column – do we have a play area in Harpford??	Page 52	<i>Cross from Harpford column removed</i>
R29	Maps 3a, 3b and 3c are not accurately described in the text in section 7.1	7.1	<i>All references to Maps 3a, 3b and 3c have been corrected and grouped together, with Map 4, under the general section description rather than under Policies T1, T2 and T3.</i>
	All relevant references to land south of King Alfred Way to	General	<i>Change made</i>

	be renamed Alfred's Gate		
	The policies differ in the numbering system used, this should be standardised throughout	All policies	<i>All policy numbering standardised</i>
	The text in relation to crossings is under T3 Policy Overview but the policy dealing with crossings is T2.		<i>Text in relation to 'crossings' moved from T3 Policy Overview to T2 Policy Overview</i>
C08	<p>As Harpford Village Hall is the only community meeting point in the village it is essential for community cohesion between Harpford and the rest of the Parish, that access via the Red Bridge and paths which interconnect the two, are safe and regularly maintained. The current pathways are currently very dangerous and erosion to the Red Bridge access is not being addressed.</p> <p>Access to and from the villages which is impossible for pushchairs, prams and wheelchairs due to the kissing gates. This may limit the suitability of the Hall for those in NP who could use our facility (like Mums and Tots groups or those disabled residents who would like to attend coffee mornings) but cannot access it unless by car.</p> <p>A pedestrian footbridge across the A3052 at Harpford would improve access and safety for connecting Harpford with Newton Poppleford.</p>	T3	<p><i>T3 Policy Overview amended to include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>to ensure that people are able to walk and cycle safely between villages including retention of Red Bridge in its current location;</i> • <i>repairs to Red Bridge;</i> • <i>replacement of kissing gates with gates that allow access to those with limited mobility (e.g. pushchairs);</i>
	We agree that improvements and extensions to HVH facilities should be seen as a priority especially in terms of safe accessibility and disabled provision which we need further funding to achieve.	CF1	<i>NCR – supports policy CF1</i>
	Improvements need to be made to improve the safe entry and exit onto the highway at both Higher and	T2	<i>NCR – supports T2 Policy Overview</i>

	Lower Way by the use of signing and speed restrictions on the A3052 and Four Elms Hill where accidents are a weekly if not daily occurrence.		
	Development in Harpford must be treated as development in the open countryside as per the local plan as it is outside of the designated BUAB.	Section 2 Neighbourhood Plan Area	<i>NCR – supports the Built up Area Boundary</i>
C09	<p>The MUGA (multi-use games area) area is awful .</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It should not be grassed as it cannot be used all year • It needs an artificial surface • It needs to be astro turfed • It needs an all weather surface • The surface should be flat • It should be more like the one we have at school • It should be fenced all around. • More people could use it if changes were done • The surface could be lined for different sports • It should have new goals and nets (football, hockey, basketball, netball) • Variable places for posts could be put in (allowing free tennis practise if tennis nets were put in on occasions) • The size is good. 	<p>Education, community facilities and Leisure Policy Overview</p> <p>4.1 Consultation Process And Appendix 5</p>	<p><i>Added to Policy Overview: In the 2020 Youth Consultation young people requested that any funding available to the parish should be spent on improving the multi-use games area (MUGA), improved play/sports facilities such as a skate park and improving play equipment to suit a wider age range than currently provided. (e.g. an artificial, astro turfed, all weather, flat and fenced surface, lined for different sports and having flexibly positioned goals and nets for a variety of sports such as football, hockey, basketball, netball and tennis).</i></p> <p><i>Add "Youth Consultation (2020) under further surveys</i></p>

