

Question 27 - Retaining and refining the existing settlement hierarchy

Chapter 13 of the Issues and Options report considers strategic options for the distribution of new development expressed in terms of a settlement hierarchy. Question 27 sought views on respondents preferred pattern of development.

Option 1 - Some hierarchy as current Local Plan: 7 Towns plus Cranbrook and the 15 villages

Option 2 - A hierarchy that retains the towns and Cranbrook but has a lower number of villages that may accommodate development

Option 3 - A hierarchy that retains the towns and Cranbrook but has a higher number of villages that may accommodate development

Option 4 - Do something different in terms of a hierarchy or not one

Hose that made comments said.

Ref No	Respondent	Q27	Question 27 Comment
FS-Case-2977856 13	Kim Sankey Angel Architecture Ltd	option 2	Dependant on NP proposals
FS-Case-2979495 49	Martin Thurgood	option 1	BUT you correctly identify that the town of Ottery St Mary has uniquely 'accommodated' excessive housing growth in recent years. This is in the order of some 25% - far in excess of any other existing settlement. This requires a bespoke EDDC planning policy that recognises that certain settlements have already expanded to the point that services are stretched, that the surrounding environment is under threat, that wellbeing suffers as a consequence and that such settlements should be protected from further significant growth.
FS-Case-2995213 39	mark readman Rockbeare Parish Council	option 2	Unique characters and physical separateness of villages to be protected. East Devon's character is to be protected
FS-Case-3007147 87	Blank - No Name	option 2	Villages will need more investment for infrastructure. Cranbrook is horrible; it has destroyed so much of the local communities with increasing problems of litter, fly tipping, fast driving, destruction of verges and road edges and general unease. Things are changing socially and locals felt uncared for and unlisted to. More understanding and compassion needed
FS-Case-3011794 21	Mark HUMPHRIES	option 2	Villages should remain villages, if you want large scale development then new towns such as Cranbrook are a better way to go
FS-Case-3013453 04	JANICE ALEXANDER Devon Rural Housing Partnership	option 3	It is important that if a village wants to provide a small number of homes for local people, they should be allowed to do this as long as the community is behind the development and the homes are affordable and for local people and remain that way in perpetuity. The current policy deems many small villages as unsustainable and planning refusal for new homes is automatic. A lot of work has to be done to persuade planners that the village can support a small development and luckily a few have managed to get a small number of homes developed in the last few years but it shouldn't have to be that difficult. I would prefer no villages to be deemed unsustainable but rather that development can be carried out on a small scale if the need is proven in all rural settlements.
FS-Case-3014246 28	ERIC BOWMAN	option 2	A CONTRAVERSAIL ONE BUT TIMES COULD CHANGE
FS-Case-3017029 92	John Stevens	option 4	Cranbrook should not be given high importance, small villages should
FS-Case-3029125 62	Paul Gamble	option 3	There are many villages across the whole of East Devon that could each easily accommodate small developments. The 15 larger Villages with Built-up Area Boundaries in the current local/village plan needs to be comprehensively overhauled. The concept that every other village across East Devon that does not have a boundary (as defined in the Local Plan), and therefore is considered to be "in the countryside" needs to be revisited. If a village for example has a minimum of four of the following

Ref No	Respondent	Q27	Question 27 Comment
			recognised services: School, Village hall, Public transport, Pub, Shop/post office, Doctors surgery, Place of worship, Sports fields, then small scale development should be supported. Priority could be given to villages that have access to public transport within the suggested approx 800m comfortable walking distance, which has routes to larger towns and cities to access larger facilities and services.
FS-Case-303473174	Christopher Bargmann	option 4	The current system isn't working. I live in Ottery st Mary and the town has been failed by the planning process with too many new housing developments for the size of the town, and no infrastructure development to compensate. Development needs to be re-focussed, with Cranbrook perhaps as the obvious core.
FS-Case-303734212	Cassie Thornton	option 2	We shouldn't be impacting villages like Feniton that already have stretched infrastructure and resources. It will take away the village feel, the whole point we live in this village is for the small community and access to the countryside. It will ruin Feniton and what makes it a lovely place to live! By building more around it you will start to make it into a town which no one wants! We also have lots of flooding problems and this will make it worse. Plus more cars on the road etc will add more pollution to our village and nature.
FS-Case-304172022	Eve Bampton-Wilton	option 4	Put the brakes on the development of the 'West end' - it almost feels like quite an out group and the housing is encroaching on surrounding areas - many of the people there live there to enjoy the green space and quiet. Focus more on other towns and villages at a smaller scale which also allows for more options for movement within east Devon - therefore perhaps freeing up some space more centrally.
FS-Case-304210544	David Beazley Sainthill Baptist Church	option 3	Spread the load more thinly but more locally? Benefits and 'burdens' shared among more villages?
FS-Case-305714384	Miles Butler	option 4	A capacity hierarchy needs to be established through an audit of services and facilities available at potential development locations. The objective must be to increase sustainability and reduce the need for travel.
FS-Case-306175815	christopher Burton	option 2	We have lived in Feniton for over 40 years. Although the village has increased in size by 30% in that time there are less facilities now than there were 40 in 1976. I don't believe that adding more houses to villages will improve the availability of facilities but just overpower what we do have. Starting afresh as you have at Cranbrook gives more scope for incorporating facilities into the plan...Ironically there doesn't appear to be much that has been done in respect to this in Cranbrook. It's more about what the local people have done for their community.
FS-Case-306308166	Sylvia Meller	option 4	Stop any developments on green belts no matter where and use existing houses/buildings, no matter where
FS-Case-306915743	Catherine Kingham	option 1	Villages need to be protected from over-development, or they become towns! People like to live in smaller communities - this has never been so pronounced as during the Pandemic. Therefore, any concentration of new building should be in and around towns that already exist. There is also the right infrastructure in current towns (Exmouth is somewhat of an exception as it has grown exponentially, and has a very poor shopping area for a town of this size.)
FS-Case-307126895	Daren Richards	option 4	It should be up to locals to determine this
FS-Case-307389332	Stephen Crook	option 4	Stop building on greenfield sites.
FS-Case-307482014	G. Millard	option 3	Development within the 'seven towns' should be proportional to their present size, and also to the facilities and infrastructure within each town.
FS-Case-307683611	Dan Lakeman	option 4	Cranbrook is a huge mistake. Stop trashing east Devon and actually stand up for your residents! We live here because it's rural and it shouldn't change from that.
FS-Case-307991316	Susan Cooper	option 2	The settlement hierarchy does not consider environmental sustainability (sensitivity of the landscape and biodiversity). A better hierarchy would be:-

Ref No	Respondent	Q27	Question 27 Comment
			Tier 1 West End, North of Blackhorse, Pinhoe, Cranbrook
			Tier 2 Seven Large towns and new town(s) outside AONB if required
			Tier 3:- Small towns and 'larger' villages with populations over 1500 (primarily outside the AONB) with basic facilities. Allocations to be no more than 5% of the number of houses in the village or Town. (Broadclyst, Clyst St Mary, Colyton, Feniton, Lymptone, Newton Poppleford, Uplyme, West Hill, Whimple, Woodbury)
			Tier 4:- Villages within the AONB and those outside the AONB with populations under 1500 people. Small scale development (up to 15 houses) on 'exception sites' when a community led housing survey shows a demonstrable need for affordable housing in a village (Strategy 35 in current plan)
			Tier 5 Hamlets/Open Countryside
FS-Case-308046866	Simon Greenslade	option 3	The problem with focussing things around Exeter is that it will provide another reason for people to neglect their own towns and villages because everything they need is in Exeter.
FS-Case-308071816	Gillian Cameron-Webb n/r	option 4	I would've gone for option 1 but I don't think all the villages listed are appropriate for development just because they have some services and facilities. Some of the listed villages have other issues which makes them inappropriate for much development. e.g. Newton Poppleford is entirely within the East Devon AONB so should only have development to deliver a proven local need. Villages like Sidbury have difficult access roads so it's not sensible to expand it much further. Also it depends on what facilities are actually available, e.g. everyone needs a doctors surgery but Newton Poppleford doesn't have one and two thousand residents are forced to go to Ottery despite it taking 1 1/2 hours on the bus.
FS-Case-308072238	Robert Cooper	option 4	Cannot see the need for this hierarchy. The towns and villages are what they are. They do not need you to categorise them
FS-Case-308105398	Jane Ashton Please choose	option 3	Option 3 but only if done with sensitivity to the size and characters of those smaller villages. How unbiased are people's replies to this question likely to be? I wonder how many of us are sufficiently well – informed to answer this question.?
FS-Case-308155966	Vivien Rands	option 3	Development has to be careful and appropriate and maybe more evenly spread rather than heavily weighted in certain places.
FS-Case-308177703	Judith Ferrier	option 4	Historic villages should be kept as such and not ruined by modern development and large scale housing development
FS-Case-308199882	Bernadette Steadman	option 3	Villages to only have small-scale developments though - not to ruin the place.
FS-Case-308210121	Cariad Eccleston	option 4	No opinion.
FS-Case-308231255	Martin Seymour	option 3	The objective should be to build self sustaining communities for a diverse range of people.
FS-Case-308288718	Emily Davis	option 1	For the moment it would be sensible to keep it as is. Ottery has had far more than its share of building work and its infrastructure is under a huge strain.
FS-Case-308326362	Peter Eastwood N/A	option 1	Careful planning.
FS-Case-308433805	Kerry Carr		I thought Cranbrook was developed to take the strain off of constantly developing local Villages & Town's??

Ref No	Respondent	Q27	Question 27 Comment
FS-Case-308527556	Kevin Staddon	option 4	None, we have sufficient
FS-Case-308655667	Jan Gannaway Exmouth Wildlife Group + Active Travel Exmouth	option 1	Broadly Option 1 but there may be room for including more villages if the population of East Devon continues to grow. Small carefully planned additions to villages can sometimes increase sense of community as long as facilities are not overwhelmed.
FS-Case-308690532	Martin Weller	option 4	More detail required.
FS-Case-308816947	Heather Elgar Woodland Trust		With regards to any intensification approach, we support the renewal first of brownfield sites, but it is crucial: a) to review the ecological value of sites first – as brownfield sites can have high ecological value; b) to ensure that all residents have good access to high quality natural green spaces; and c) to ensure that green infrastructure is embedded in all new schemes.
FS-Case-308930499	Lisa Bowman Exmouth Town Council	option 4	Members felt that Exmouth should be considered as a separate entity. Exmouth is much larger and did not fit into a settlement hierarchy with the other towns in terms of shared characteristics of size and population.
FS-Case-308948443	Karin Goodfellow	option 2	Villages in East Devon do not have the infrastructure to support much new development, and if lots of new homes are suddenly built in them it will mean many more car journeys to the main towns before local facilities 'catch up' with the developments. Ottery St Mary has had a lot of new development (from apartments to family homes to retirement homes) over the last 5 years and it was hoped that the influx of people in these properties would regenerate and invigorate the town centre. This doesn't seem to have happened. There are more and more empty shops now (not helped by covid and the endless lockdowns) but it appears that local people are not shopping in the town. Perhaps the problem lies in the mix of shops that did not change quickly enough to suit the needs of the new residents, so people went elsewhere (Exeter, Exmouth) to shop. The local schools however and health centre are now oversubscribed as there was no corresponding expansion to cope with the extra population.
FS-Case-308982711	Amy Roberts Bell Cornwell		Please see attached sheet.
FS-Case-309058862	Suzie Mack	option 3	Small development in all villages would allow more families to have homes in their local area.
FS-Case-309293778	Paul Smith	option 3	Lack of sufficiency of Affordability Housing and Social provision dictates that a greater number of existing communities should accommodate development need identified within those communities, including ANOB, with a view to offsetting the ongoing increased urbanisation of the West End and larger towns where the nature of house building provision has very limited impact upon addressing need..
FS-Case-309383731	Val Ranger		Strategy 27 does not work as it does not take into account where existing infrastructure is at capacity (schools, access to medical services) or indeed where some services have diminished eg public transport no longer serves the community well. It does not take into account the increasing traffic on the roads and the unlikelihood that walkers and cyclists will risk their lives using narrow roads with huge amounts of traffic, roads with no pavements or intermittent pavements. Impossible hills for the average cyclist unless they have electric bicycles .
FS-Case-309401093	Philip Jordan	option 3	As I have seas small developments are more acceptable in all aspects.
FS-Case-309414876	Ross Hussey	option 2	I'd favour 1 or 2; the question of whether all 15 villages should be on the list is really a question for the people in those villages. Some have a very limited range of facilities.

Ref No	Respondent	Q27	Question 27 Comment
FS-Case-309425268	Pamela Dean		ALL villages should retain that status.
FS-Case-309456508	Ian Birch	option 4	Not sure that the hierarchy concept brings much to the party!
FS-Case-309465143	Daisy mclauchlan	option 3	Development in East Devon has to be divided between all towns and villages. People of all ages live in all areas and all areas require new homes
FS-Case-309583339	Andy Bourne	option 4	Any development should be appropriate and sympathetic to the area and encompass all of the aspects of the local plan, not destroying existing trees, hedgerows, ponds and meadows; work with nature!
FS-Case-309588076	Carol Jay Transition Exmouth	option 4	All development to the highest environmental net gain standards.
FS-Case-310194190	WAYNE SUMMERS	option 3	local housing for locals NO MORE OPEN MARKET HOUSING in East Devon
FS-Case-310327426	Amy Roberts Bell Cornwell LLP		Please see attached sheet.
FS-Case-310448600	Anne Double	option 1	Great care is being taken to preserve the identity of the villages and beautiful tourism areas, but a working small town like Axminster, which has no seaside or thatched cottages does also have a community identity. Balance must be maintained so as not to overwhelm it by a disproportionate concentration of large new developments eating into green spaces.
FS-Case-310456969	Penny Kurowski	option 2	I am surprised that Otterton and Colaton Raleigh are not included in the 15 villages as they both have a church, shop, pub, village hall and, in Otterton's case, school, bringing them in line with many of the other villages within the 15.
FS-Case-310604804	Sarah Alana Sayers Farringdon Parish Council	option 1	Farringdon Neighbourhood Plan supports option 1
FS-Case-310651264	Derek Wensley East Budleigh with Bicton Parish Council	option 4	East Budleigh with Bicton Parish Council would like to pursue a similar strategy to the existing Neighbourhood Plan. This would require that the current settlement hierarchy in the proposed Local Plan would have to be abandoned so that East Budleigh is no longer designated a growth village. All villages within the AONB would be removed from the hierarchy to protect sensitive environments from the risk of substantial growth and damage to the environment and wildlife. This would be broadly in line with the Government's proposal that all settlements in the AONB would be in protected landscapes deemed inappropriate for large scale development.
FS-Case-311523569	Kevin Clarke	option 3	For villages to be sustainable in the long term they will need new development
FS-Case-311676977	Rosalind Fox	option 2	It is pointless trying to develop a village such as Axminster without the appropriate infrastructure. Without a new bypass and considerable investment in drainage etc more housing would just impose an intolerable strain on the community. Already the centre of what was once a small market town of character has become ruined by heavy traffic disgorging toxic fumes along the high street.
FS-Case-311868155	Martin Dowse	option 4	Turn Cranbrook into a district of Exeter. Allow natural development of towns and villages. Protect ANOB
FS-Case-312087808	Gill Akers	option 1	If every village had 6 new houses, we would have to have sprawling new estates which overwhelm a town.
FS-Case-312235817	Amy Roberts Bell Cornwell		The West End will continue to play an important role at the top of the hierarchy, given its relationship with Exeter and in order to help support the city's future growth requirements. The overall hierarchy does, however, need to be revised so that it allows some

Ref No	Respondent	Q27	Question 27 Comment
			development to be accommodated in a greater number of locations across the district, which will ensure that local needs are met more adequately. We would suggest that there is some potential for growth to take place around the A3052 corridor, a location which is close to Exeter and where there is already a considerable amount of employment, infrastructure and other development.
FS-Case-312251067	Neal Jillings Place Land Ltd	option 3	I have never been able to understand (after 25 years on planning) the big town/sustainable versus the village/unsustainable paradigm that has been all encompassing in planning for most of my time in planning. There is a spectrum of sustainability, one consideration of which is meeting needs where they arise. Development should be accommodated in as many locations as possible where it can be made as a sustainable as possible. This will include most of the larger villages in East Devon, such as Woodbury and Kilmington, for instance. Both have a good level of services and facilities commensurate with their size and relatively good public transport links. In only actively planning for growth in the larger settlements, the Local Plan is missing a potential valuable source of housing that meets the social leg of wider sustainability. Teignbridge has grasped the nettle and included a greater number of larger villages in a revised draft distribution strategy; EDDC should do the same.
FS-Case-312255566	Stephen sadler	option 4	Rather than put additional pressure on the towns (Ottery for example was supposed to have 300 new homes built between 2015 and 2031 according to the present LDP but as of 2021 550 new homes have been built or approved to be built. This has put a lot of pressure on the existing community and increased the population more in the last 5 years than in the preceding 110 years. This is unsustainable as the town does NOT have the infrastructure. Many people believed Cranbrook would stop this overdevelopment in the Towns. Therefore maybe be best to reconsider Cranbrook and make that the centre for the majority of the new housing so that the infrastructure can be built along with the houses. As already stated maybe another new town along the M5 between Cullompton and Cranbrook would also be better.
FS-Case-312317917	Steven Walton	option 1	Whichever option uses the least greenfield development
FS-Case-312449388	George Williams Greenslade Taylor Hunt	option 3	Of the available options, number 3 is preferred. This will allow development to be delivered in Cranbrook and towns but also recognises the importance of villages, such as Woodbury, which are of a suitable size to accommodate a commensurate level of growth and sustain existing and new services and amenities. There is a serious risk that by ignoring the benefits of small scale growth for housing affordability will worsen and displace younger generations from their homes. Conversely, taking a more proactive approach to the growth of villages, including development on their peripheries, will allow rural communities to thrive and evolve, whilst also boosting district-wide housing delivery figures.
FS-Case-312482944	Peter Bowler NA	option 2	Only build in villages as need arises. Towns are where new development should take place, that is where the shops and jobs are. Why build affordably homes in villages where two cars are needed and the residents cannot afford them.
FS-Case-312655834	Theresa Sanders	option 3	More villages that have much smaller developments . to provide infrastructure , transport and footpaths to enable integration into smaller local thriving communities.
FS-Case-312726461	Anthony Bevan N/A	option 4	Greater emphasis should be placed on c ordinated development of West End. No large development of villages should be allowed. Sidmouth is constrained by geography and in reality has little room for any development which would not be harmful. No development into the AONB's should be allowed.
FS-Case-312744056	Christina Skinner	option 1	Ensure villages stay villages and dont increase population too much.
FS-Case-312781179	Carine Silver	option 2	Building in villages encourages sprawl which will destroy the character of E Devon and increase car usage.
FS-Case-312793696	Margaret Hall West Hill Parish Council	option 1	We consider it is important to maintain the existing character of East Devon.

Ref No	Respondent	Q27	Question 27 Comment
FS-Case-312834131	Robert Dunn	option 3	Without communities and access to jobs (or the facilities to access those remotely), it is possible the villages lose their younger inhabitants, being replaced by those who can afford the nice houses. By allowing sympathetic development in villages with suitable and affordable housing, it could attract people back to villages and the countryside, so spreading the development around the region.
FS-Case-313070314	Kevin Finch Whimple Parish Council	option 1	There must be no coalescence of settlements an existing Parish Boundaries respected and maintained
FS-Case-313155665	Catherine Dandridge	option 2	Towns being included alongside larger new developments must have their local characteristics & history preserved to ensure Cranbrook doesn't become the master plan for all future building & housing.
FS-Case-313233811	Phil Golder	option 4	Housing development should ideally be restricted to a minimal number of self-build eco-homes, with additional housing needs met through a reduction of empty and second homes. Using the land sparing approach I mentioned in Q21 it would be better to concentrate any additional development that might encroach on nature in the "West end" area. It is already a lengthy process to get from the outskirts of Exmouth to the centre via walking or cycling and I'm sure the same applies to some of the other "7 towns"
FS-Case-313343575	Joanna Burkey	option 4	It makes sense to for most of the development to occur in the towns and Cranbrook as these places already have the required infrastructures. Development in villages should be restricted as a whole because as already mentioned the road infrastructures and facilities are not suitable. However to keep up with demand, development in villages should be limited to small developments (ideally I think this should happen in towns too) carried out by local builders who have an understanding of the local area. Using brown field sites or infilling. I think it is a sin to allow building outside of the village boundaries. The trouble is, like building on protected landscapes, if this is allowed then it makes a mockery of any restrictions previous set up for the protection of environment and they will no longer carry any weight and development will start to take over anywhere, as there will be no respect for the regulations previously set out.
FS-Case-313428092	John Cooper	option 2	The settlement hierarchy does not consider environmental sustainability (sensitivity of the landscape and biodiversity). A better hierarchy would be:- Tier 1 West End, North of Blackhorse, Pinhoe, Cranbrook Tier 2 Seven Large towns and new town(s) outside AONB if required Tier 3:- Small towns and 'larger' villages with populations over 1500 (primarily outside the AONB) with basic facilities. Allocations to be no more than 5% of the number of houses in the village or Town. (Broadclyst, Clyst St Mary, Colyton, Feniton, Lymptstone, Newton Poppleford, Uplyme, West Hill, Whimple, Woodbury) Tier 4:- Villages within the AONB and those outside the AONB with populations under 1500 people. Small scale development (up to 15 houses) on 'exception sites' when a community led housing survey shows a demonstrable need for affordable housing in a village (Strategy 35 in current plan) Tier 5 Hamlets/Open Countryside
FS-Case-313459444	Mike Allen EDDC	option 3	Dunkeswel should be zoned for development
FS-Case-313523282	Gary Barlow	option 4	Why is Exeter getting the majority of the focus. You are making the county a microcosm of the country where London gets out of proportion investment and benefits. STOP IT!
FS-Case-313523797	Heather Broadbent	option 2	I think Ottery St Mary has too much development for the local infra structure. Especially Schools and Medical Services.

Ref No	Respondent	Q27	Question 27 Comment
FS-Case-313533757	Patrick Sinnott	option 2	Several of the 15 designated villages are "quaint" and probably should be allowed to remain as they are (eg Sidbury, Musbury, Beer, East Budleigh).
FS-Case-313542858	Judith Heathcock	option 4	DO NOT use villages and rural areas for development. The graph is frightening which shows the imbalance of land use.
FS-Case-313584761	Richard Norman Musbury Barn	option 4	It is not essential that such an overarching policy exists. An open planning strategy rather than even option 3
FS-Case-313618009	Elizabeth Twining	option 3	Development in additional villages may be supported by local people.
FS-Case-313629840	Cathy Gardner	option 3	don't push all development onto a small number of places, spread it out a bit more.
FS-Case-313643991	Douglas Smith	option 2	Mass building without 360 degree planning is thoughtless ... classic case Ottery st Mary ...
FS-Case-313653593	ALISON MCLAREN	option 4	Focus on Exeter and nearby but not in towns.
FS-Case-313678330	june glennie	option 1	dont change the villages
FS-Case-313698487	Craig Daley	option 4	The houses being built in the area are of a useless design they no one in their right mind would want to buy. They are too small and too expensive. Bring back council built affordable housing
FS-Case-313710620	Jacqueline Cox	option 3	small development in villages may enable families to remain in the area and provide work for local builders/gardeners/childcare providers ect and will increase the poulation who may use the local shope ect
FS-Case-313718525	Robert Maynard	option 1	Option 1 - Subject to ensuring that the range of facilities are relevant to the settlement hierarchy.
FS-Case-313771026	John Connolly	option 4	Add another major "Cranbrook Style" development to the Option 1 hierarchy.
FS-Case-313780058	Megan Lowe	option 3	Surely it depends on local need and facilities available? Some villages need investment put in to facilities before they can support more houses/people.
FS-Case-313846023	Paul Garnham	option 2	Villages should be left alone apart from very localised and small scale development (as per local need).
FS-Case-313857211	Linda Johnson	option 3	The balance needs to be redressed. So much development has taken place in the West End of the region. Village and rural communities offer a very good quality of life. There are many villages with a primary school and village hall. These should be supported with reasonable, proportionate development.
FS-Case-313893034	Steven Hepplestone	option 4	Towns currently have facilities closing. It would make more sense to expand the west area close to Exeter, rather than expand towns which have a lack of facilities.
FS-Case-313997024	Richard Holman	option 4	Hierarchy is not suitable for EDDC area. Each area and development needs to be viewed separately and fairly when it is brought forward. Developments should not be treated detrimentally because of these policies.
FS-Case-313999789	Jayne Blackmore	option 4	This needs to be a more detailed review. One village may be suitable for larger development, others may not. A full housing and sustainability assessment review is needed to get a more detailed picture of where new development should go.
FS-Case-314090147	Rob Longhurst	option 1	It is not broken so do not try to rix it. Use success - extend Cranbrook.

Ref No	Respondent	Q27	Question 27 Comment
FS-Case-314217529	Don Mildenhall	option 1	Particular issues to avoid coalescence in A376 corridor
FS-Case-314278250	Keith Bungay	option 3	Further consideration perhaps be given to the need for another "New Town". Have to question the reference to Exmouth, in para.13.6, above inferring significant housing growth projected for the future, Current housing land allocations within the Built-up Area in both Local/Neighbourhood plans have now been either developed or approved for development. It is difficult to see, given the strong environmental constraints surrounding the town, how "further significant housing growth" can be accommodated. This is not a "Nimby" comment, more a question of how is it that such a statement can be substantiated at this stage in the planning process!!!!
FS-Case-314345492	Martyn Smith Feniton Parish Council	option 4	The settlement hierarchy needs to be based on an a more detailed review of each settlement. Where one village may be suitable for larger development, others may not. A full sustainability assessment and housing needs review should take place, to give a better, more detailed picture of where new development should go, without impacting adversely on the sustainability of a particular location.
FS-Case-314526176	Terry Sneller Dorset Council		Meeting the development needs of the area at smaller settlements that are well connected to larger service centres can help to deliver sustainable development. The inclusion of Uplyme within the settlement hierarchy is therefore supported.
FS-Case-314606312	RICHARD GETLIFFE	option 2	without knowledge of where spare or available land my be available for development it is hard to comment. maybe a development land office needs to be defined where active site availability is the focus. Maybe exists already?
FS-Case-314646596	Alex Pryor	option 2	Some of the villages (e.g. Beer and Colyton) are substantially larger than many of the others. These can plausibly support more houses AND more job creation, whereas the smaller villages will never provide a source of employment.
FS-Case-314760502	christopher Heal Private	option 3	We have a large number of business parks within walking distance of Ebford/CSG but no housing to accommodate the workforce
FS-Case-314762361	ZOE H BETTERTON Cornerstone Design and Build	option 4	You can not promote sustainable transport (chapter 11) to encourage walking and cycling and at the same time allow for developments in villages without convenient transport links. People will always used their cars to access vital services and work. It would therefore be better to lower the level of development like option 2 but future developments should be shared more evenly between towns and Cranbrook. So more developments are centered in areas with good transport links and services. This will promote walking and cycling as long as it comes with better safer cycle routes.
FS-Case-314771914	Ian Cherry	option 2	Small villages have a tendancy to creep towards other small villages or nearby towns and eventually become part of an urban sprawl. This evolvment then outgrows the capabilty of the supporting infrastructure.
FS-Case-314782794	Nicola Daniel	option 4	1 Budleigh Salterton town sits in the East Devon AONB and is therefore not available for development. The present local plan emphasises that BS housing development should be restricted to affordable homes. Sidmouth is surrounded by the AONB. This restricts the towns available for development to 5. 2 Neighbourhood Plans should be the democratic key to viewing local housing development.
FS-Case-314877392	Susan Mills	option 4	Let small development in our villages to sustain them and the local facilities. More people would prefer to live in a village than a warren of houses on a development.
FS-Case-314894688	John Colby	option 3	Concentrate major development in West End/Cranbrook
FS-Case-314910549	James Barnes-Phillips	option 3	One Cranbrook is enough
FS-Case-314926201	Richard Crabtree	option 2	Sidmouth and Sidford seems to have had a significant amount of development too!
FS-Case-314937410	Eleonore Pang	option 1	Option 1 and possibly Option 2 or even 3. However, Ottery St Mary has already been burdened with far too many developments!

Ref No	Respondent	Q27	Question 27 Comment
FS-Case-314943918	Des Senior	option 2	Development in the villages would be counterproductive to the objective of reducing distances travelled, carbon emissions etc.
FS-Case-315126013	George Williams Greenslade Taylor Hunt	option 3	Of the available options, number 3 is preferred. This will allow development to be delivered in Cranbrook and towns but also recognises the importance of villages, such as West Hill , which are of a suitable size to accommodate a commensurate level of growth and sustain existing and new services and amenities. There is a serious risk that by ignoring the benefits of small scale growth for housing affordability will worsen and displace younger generations from their homes. Conversely, taking a more proactive approach to the growth of villages, including development on their peripheries, will allow rural communities to thrive and evolve, whilst also boosting district-wide housing delivery figures.
FS-Case-315136864	Jill Butler	option 4	Shouldn't there be a more bespoke way of assessing the capacity for new development, eg that takes into account existing facilities and services and minimises the need to travel?
FS-Case-315168747	Liz Shortland	option 3	Ottery St Mary has already had higher levels of development than was in our neighbourhood plan. Maybe the potential settlement hierarchy should have an Option 5 where those towns that have born the brunt of recent development become exempt.
FS-Case-315184341	Richard Pratt	option 2	Some of the villages listed already seem to be pushing against their BUABs, with very limited facilities. To develop these further would risk the feeling that they are being crammed and would be imposing on the surrounding countryside.
FS-Case-315216760	Elizabeth Campbell	option 4	In considering the settlement hierarchy, the need to locate so much housing close to major hubs may significantly change if the increase in home working continues as we move out of lockdown. These 'hubs' can turn into urban sprawls taking over small discreet settlements as their expansion progresses - where is a line drawn to prevent this happening?
FS-Case-315275424	Rob Phillips Broadhembury Neighbourhood Community Land Trust (BNCLT)	option 2	The existing draft of the East Devon Local Plan appears to be silent on the roles played by towns, larger villages, and other facilities 'just over the border' in Mid-Devon, Somerset, and Dorset. Are these accounted for?
FS-Case-315287680	Jennifer Hiley-Payne N/A	option 2	Transport from new developments needs to be a concern, particularly bus and rail links. Country villages need to retain traditional charm but could increase bus usage, possibly on a minor scale. Towns and Cranbrook perhaps more practical.
FS-Case-315328621	Chris Burhop	option 2	Maintain BUAB within AONB
FS-Case-315449037	Darren Roberts East Devon District Council, Central Planning	option 3	Even with built up area boundaries, there has been very little growth in a number of villages. The boundaries are tightly constrained and do not allow for expansion of the villages which would maintain existing services
FS-Case-315476876	Graham Long Upottery Parish Council	option 4	The 7 towns, Cranbrook/West End and 15 large villages must be allowed to grow and as they already have large populations they will need more homes than smaller villages/hamlets but that must not be at the expense of no growth being permitted in all other villages (as is the case with the current local plan). Those creating the new local plan must consult with ALL communities and the new plan must support the level of growth that each community/parish/village wants or is comfortable with. Rather than a "settlement hierarchy", which implies that big settlements are better than small ones, the term used should simply be "settlement scale"
FS-Case-315516791	Mary Truell None	option 4	See throughout for my responses to a new local plan.

Ref No	Respondent	Q27	Question 27 Comment
FS-Case-315539551	Gary Parsons Sport England		no comment
FS-Case-315591470	Brian Carpenter	option 2	I think the list of 15 villages needs reconsidering as there are quite pronounced variations in the villages' populations, facilities and locations.
FS-Case-315622017	Robert Martin Clyst Honiton Parish Council	option 2	Villages generally want this to strengthen their position and secure a good future. Market housing with a good supply of truly affordable properties for villages is the best plan.
FS-Case-315672889	James Dorey Plainview Planning	option 4	<p>The settlement hierarchy should be based on existing built form rather than settlement boundaries. Proportionate amounts of development should be directed to existing built areas. This will range from large additions to existing towns to a handful of dwellings to an existing cluster. This would work similar to a traditional settlement boundary hierarchy, but would provide the local plan with flexibility over time. Settlement boundaries are 'blunt instruments' which quickly become out of date, and if possible, should be avoided.</p> <p>To prevent compounding expansion, percentage caps could be applied within the policy to ensure that small settlements grow proportionally rather than exponentially.</p>
FS-Case-315678300	George Williams Greenslade Taylor Hunt		Of the available options, our client prefers number 4. This is because there again is no relationship considered between the placement of new employment and housing development. In addition, there are a number of sustainable locations that may presently fall outside the development area of a major settlement, but that could be an extension to that settlement, such as the site at Sowton forming a functional extension to Exeter. As such, though it is considered that villages have a lot of merit in delivering residential schemes, there is great merit in delivering strategic employment and housing development at Sowton, which does not appear to fall conveniently in any of the above options.
FS-Case-315678845	Paul Hayward Newton Popleford and Harpford Parish Council	option 1	Council errs towards Option ONE as no consequences or possible implications of the other options was provided.
FS-Case-315681467	Jacqui Best	option 3	Some villages, although small, have good access to nearby facilities (for example Talaton) and could accommodate limited development.
FS-Case-315685113	Lauren James MMO	option 2	It is hard for me to comment as my remit is not specific to this area.
FS-Case-315690761	Naome Glanville	option 4	<p>These options presuppose an agreement to high levels of development in East Devon. We should try to limit building to what is actually needed, wherever it is.</p> <p>Also, based on previous experience where so-called consultations have taken place asking whether we would prefer new town(s) or development on the edge of existing towns and villages, in the end, both have happened. So I prefer not to enter into choices 1 - 3.</p>
FS-Case-315804855	Sophie Minter	option 2	There are so many extant locations for better use/ change of use / refurbishment already within the built environment of East Devon that have potential for good residential provision so further house building is just not needed.
FS-Case-315873808	Stephen Harris Emery Planning	option 2	Our concerns with Policy 27 of the Local Plan was that it grouped less sustainable villages with more sustainable villages. For example Feniton is more sustainable than vast majority of the other settlements in Strategy 27 as it is located on the rail line into Exeter and a good range of services and facilities. Services run throughout the day and is an attractive option for people living in the village but working in Exeter. The village also has a primary school, a post office, a public house, a general store and other services and facilities. Therefore the emerging plan should recognise these higher order settlements.

Ref No	Respondent	Q27	Question 27 Comment
FS-Case-315939416	linda aucott	option 3	The possibility of development should apply to ALL existing communities. Development however in smaller communities should be proportionate to their size, be primarily to meet local housing needs and not destroy the character or scale of the existing community. This would be a long term, sustainable policy.
FS-Case-315961800	David & Mrs Wendy Lewis	option 3	It makes sense to spread some of the developments more thinly across the whole area. Some other villages might find a small development enriching for their community.
FS-Case-315967632	David Daniel	option 4	It is often forgotten, because it is an inconvenient fact, that Budleigh Salterton sits inside the AONB and has to be considered differently and Sidmouth is closely surrounded by AONB
FS-Case-315984133	Daphne CURRIER	option 4	Very tricky because what is not being said is this- there is a demand to shoehorn an unwanted number of houses into a small area , a lot of which is designated as an area of outstanding natural beauty. There are no easy answers but flexibility linked to pragmatism is the way forward. Some but not all of the existing towns can be enlarged. Some but not all of the villages ditto. Exmouth was the quickest growing town in Britain after the 1980's and has already doubled in size. Other towns may well lose their uniqueness- Topsham has now been stuck onto Exeter very firmly. It might actually be good to get Cranbrook going and make that the growth area. Perhaps a general survey without a hierarchy to pick out the best places is the best way forward.
FS-Case-316012231	Terry Sweeney	option 2	I would wish to see the West End proportion of development raised to 70% or so, and the remainder distributed to the 3 main towns, with minor development targets for the smaller towns and villages.
FS-Case-316019373	Anthony Green	option 4	Extent of new development needs to be reassessed
FS-Case-316019433	Jennifer Morgan	option 4	Villages should not be part of a hierarchy with large towns which generally have more scope for brownfield development. This is a tourist region and places should be developed very carefully in order to retain their individual character.
FS-Case-316023654	lauren allan	option 1	As said before, the actual need for housing should be evidenced locally and not driven by Government.
FS-Case-316035390	Daniel Lazar Membury Parish Council	option 1	Som development should be encouraged in smaller settlements to ensure they remain viable.
FS-Case-316047097	Richard Pryor	option 2	The access roads to small villages are not wide enough to have a servicable bus timetable
FS-Case-316053199	Ben Evans	option 4	By having this hierarchy you appear to have destroyed the wildlife and communities in the West End whilst those in the East End sit comfortably in their holiday homes. I would prefer no Ends and settlements to be characterised by their own unique characteristics or by Parishes rather than by location. For example Broadclyst is listed as a village but Broadclyst Parish includes settlements within the West End e.g Westclyst and Tythebarn. The characteristics of Broadclyst Parish should have been considered during the developments of Westclyst and Tythebarn rather than the West End!?
FS-Case-316056741	Helene Jessop RSPB		Regardless of the hierarchy chosen, the RSPB recommends that it ensures statutorily designated sites are protected from adverse impacts and that an appropriate level of ecological assessment is given to all developments so that mitigation and/or compensation measures are required where harm cannot be avoided and that all developments provide biodiversity net gain commensurate with their scale.
FS-Case-316057937	irene Wyndham	option 2	Cranbrook is a planning distaster. It does not enhance the environment in any way. It contains cheap mass housing with no imagination of design. We do NOT want any further development of this nature. On the contrary, East Devon is privileged at being one of the UK's most beautiful areas. We should have fine high quality design with ecological excellence, we should be aspiring upwards.
FS-Case-316127687	Lisa Turner Blackdown Hills AONB Partnership	option 3	Support having a hierarchy, but think the 'villages' tier needs more consideration. As seen in other areas, it may be possible to have a hierarchy within this tier, e.g. larger ones/ones with reasonable facilities and services that may be appropriate for some allocations, then some smaller ones where small redevelopment/infill opportunities may exist within the settlement boundary.

Ref No	Respondent	Q27	Question 27 Comment
			The hierarchy may be informed by looking at what you want to achieve in terms of other objectives and how the approaches perform in that regard, e.g. net-zero, self-contained/self-sustaining settlements, economic regeneration.
FS-Case-316135438	George Williams Greenslade Taylor Hunt	option 3	Of the available options, number 3 is preferred. This will allow development to be delivered in Cranbrook and towns but also recognises the importance of villages, such as Newton Poppleford, which are of a suitable size to accommodate a commensurate level of growth and sustain existing and new services and amenities. There is a serious risk that by ignoring the benefits of small scale growth for housing affordability will worsen and displace younger generations from their homes. Conversely, taking a more proactive approach to the growth of villages, including development on their peripheries, will allow rural communities to thrive and evolve, whilst also boosting district-wide housing delivery figures.
FS-Case-316136353	Bill Horner Historic Environment Team, Devon County Council		No comments
FS-Case-316158325	Paul Hayward Personal View only	option 1	This is a model that works well. Perhaps a review of the villages concerned based on their NP submissions (if done)
FS-Case-316159794	George Williams Greenslade Taylor Hunt	option 3	Of the available options, number 3 is preferred. This will allow development to be delivered in Cranbrook and towns but also recognises the importance of villages, such as Whimple, which are of a suitable size to accommodate a commensurate level of growth and sustain existing and new services and amenities. There is a serious risk that by ignoring the benefits of small scale growth for housing affordability will worsen and displace younger generations from their homes. Conversely, taking a more proactive approach to the growth of villages, including development on their peripheries, will allow rural communities to thrive and evolve, whilst also boosting district-wide housing delivery figures.
FS-Case-316166919	Sheila Dorsett	option 3	No good building homes without all the required facilities esp for the young
FS-Case-316188495	George Williams Greenslade Taylor Hunt	option 3	Of the available options, our clients prefer option 3. This will allow development to be delivered in Cranbrook and towns but also recognises the importance of villages, such as Offwell, which are of a suitable size to accommodate a commensurate level of growth and sustain existing and new services and amenities. There is a serious risk that by ignoring the benefits of villages in accommodating housing growth, affordability will worsen and displace younger generations from their homes. Conversely, taking a more proactive approach to the growth of villages, including development on their peripheries, will allow rural communities to thrive and evolve, whilst also boosting district-wide housing delivery figures.
FS-Case-316240170	George Williams Greenslade Taylor Hunt		Of the available options, our clients prefer option 3. This will allow development to be delivered in Cranbrook and towns but also recognises the importance of villages, such as Chardstock, which are of a suitable size to accommodate a commensurate level of growth and sustain existing and new services and amenities. There is a serious risk that by ignoring the benefits of villages in accommodating housing growth, affordability will worsen and displace younger generations from their homes. Conversely, taking a more proactive approach to the growth of villages, including development on their peripheries, will allow rural communities to thrive and evolve, whilst also boosting district-wide housing delivery figures.
FS-Case-316255332	Matthew Sherwood	option 4	The settlement hierarchy needs to be based on an a more detailed review of each settlement. Where one village may be suitable for larger development, others may not. A full sustainability assessment and housing needs review should take place, to give a better, more detailed picture of where new development should go, without impacting adversely on the sustainability of a particular location.
FS-Case-316333576	Rosalind Leveridge	option 1	This hierarchy takes best account of existng facilities and infrastructure.

Ref No	Respondent	Q27	Question 27 Comment
FS-Case-316334732	K A Pearcey	option 3	Be able to react to future change rather than be tied into too specific outline
FS-Case-316371196	Josie Denning	option 4	The settlement hierarchy needs to be based on an a more detailed review of each settlement. Where one village may be suitable for larger development, others may not. A full sustainability assessment and housing needs review should take place, to give a better, more detailed picture of where new development should go, without impacting adversely on the sustainability of a particular location.
FS-Case-316377163	John Sherwood	option 3	Smaller villages should be considered for expansion to sustain local serves and help reduce pressures elsewhere
FS-Case-316444654	Eva Ingleson	option 4	consideration also needs to be given to second home ownership, as this is pushing up the need for additional houses but adding very little to communities. As are empty properties. Lets make better use of exisiting housing before building more.
FS-Case-323661989	Michael Gooch Boyer	option 1	It is considered that maintaining the existing hierarchy and spatial strategy would ensure that development is focused at the most sustainable locations, including the edge of Exeter and other settlements within the West End.
FS-Case-324952647	Lawrence Turner Boyer Planning	option 1	Please refer to submitted representations.
FS-Case-324964822	Sarah Jackson	option 4	Unfortunately, I can't support any of the proposed options as they are simply too ambiguous. They don't consider issues such as local need, impact on the areas character, impact on infrastructure, and resources, sustainability, impact on the natural environment.
FS-Case-324977684	Simon Collier Collier Planning	option 3	Please refer to submitted representations.
FS-Case-324988465	Simon Collier Collier Planning	option 3	Please refer to submitted representations.
FS-Case-324999075	David Morgan Not Applicable	option 4	Please refer to submitted representations.
FS-Case-325010263	Nick Freer David Lock Associates		Please refer to submitted representations.
FS-Case-325030287	John Withrington N/A	option 4	The hierarchy needs to be more sophisticated than this, rather than a blanket percentage increase on villages which is what happened previously. While an initial list could be compiled, the LP should then devote time to a more subtle analysis, taking into account whether a community truly is 'sustainable' (see above), what the local housing needs are (as informed by NPs and housing needs assessments), the extent to which health and environmental concerns may be impacted.
FS-Case-325037488	Ed Salter LDA Design	option 1	Please see attached letter
FS-Case-325053097	Ed Persse EJF Planning Ltd	option 3	The current hierarchy discounts villages such Awliscombe where there is a desire for sustainable growth and facilities that would support the village. The existing policies and strategies do not allow communities to effectively grow as they wish.
FS-Case-325070883	Emma Russell	option 3	Villages without facilities should come into scope, such as Exton and the provision of facilities in such villages should be advanced. Let's not dump all the growth on towns such that they lose their identity. Wealthy areas with high average property values should not be treated as gated communities by the rich for the rich. Social cohesion comes from mixing people up from different wealth brackets.
FS-Case-325077531	I.G. Cann Exmouth Civic Society	option 3	Please see attached submission.
FS-Case-325085151	Matthew Kendrick		See Separate Representations Document - need a blend of options

Ref No	Respondent	Q27	Question 27 Comment
	Grass Roots Planning		
FS-Case-325107229	George Williams Greenslade Taylor Hunt	option 3	Please refer to submitted representations.
FS-Case-325124589	Glynnis Poole LiveWest	option 3	Please refer to submitted representations.
FS-Case-325131855	Michelle Dobrota-Gibbs N/A		Please refer to submitted representations.
FS-Case-325726521	Simon Coles Tetra Tech Planning	option 4	The West End and Cranbrook should fulfill the strategic aspirations established in the adopted Local Plan, despite the ongoing viability challenges at Cranbrook. However, the efficacy of continuing to direct most development to one end of the District is highly questionable. It is now time to consider a much more prominent role for the main towns in the settlement hierarchy, especially those with limited environmental constraints but which have strong transport connections such as Axminster, in meeting housing and other needs where they arise. This will support the self-containment of these towns and potentially reduce the need to travel to Exeter. It also allows for a "restart" in terms of good design and place-making on sites that can draw on local cues in the principal market towns for inspiration rather than simply accepting a more homogenous approach. This "raising of the bar" is consistent with the draft amendments to the NPPF relating to beautiful housing development.
FS-Case-325731054	Andrew Ardley South Western Railway	option 2	Need to focus development along a sustainable corridor such as the railway line.
FS-Case-325829612	Dan Yeates Savilles	option 1	Please refer to submitted representations.
FS-Case-325831870	Cem Kosaner Lichfields	option 4	Please see attached comments.
FS-Case-325838141	Dan Yeates Savills	option 1	Please refer to submitted representations.