

**NP to Colyton Parish Neighbourhood Plan**

**Regulation 14 Consultation - Comments Received by Section and Policy**

<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Substance of Comment:</b>	<b>Interpretation and Reaction:</b>	<b>NPSG Response</b>
	<b>GENERAL</b>		<b>General</b>
1	<p>It is essential that the neighbourhood plan reflects and complies with national planning policy for sport as set out in the NPPF. A neighbourhood planning body should look to see if the relevant local authority has prepared a playing pitch strategy or other indoor/outdoor sports facility strategy.</p> <p>Any new housing developments will generate additional demand for sport. If existing sports facilities do not have the capacity to absorb the additional demand, then planning policies should look to ensure that new sports facilities, or improvements to existing sports facilities, are secured and delivered. Proposed actions to meet the demand should accord with any approved local plan or neighbourhood plan policy for social infrastructure, along with priorities resulting from any assessment of need, or set out in any playing pitch or other indoor and/or outdoor sports facility strategy that the local authority has in place.</p> <p>In line with the Government's NPPF, consideration should also be given to how any new development, especially for new housing, will provide opportunities for people to lead healthy lifestyles and create healthy communities.</p> <p><b>Sport England</b></p>	<p>Offers a range of generic advice to plan-makers.</p> <p>Does not make any specific comment on the current version of the NP.</p>	<p>No change necessary as a result of this comment.</p>
2	<p>We are satisfied that the plan's proposed policies are unlikely to result in development which would adversely affect the SRN and therefore we have no comments to make. However, this does not prejudice any future responses Highways England may make on site specific applications as they come forward through the planning process, and which will be considered by us on their merits under the prevailing policy at the time.</p> <p><b>Highways England</b></p>	<p>Highways England confirms that the NP does not impact negatively on the Strategic Road Network</p>	<p>No change necessary as a result of this comment.</p>
3	<p>We would like to applaud the huge amount of time and effort which the Steering Group has put into this comprehensive Neighbourhood Plan. We very much support the intention to promote sustainable change, whilst protecting our beautiful environment at a time of climate crisis.</p>	<p>Supports the NP</p>	<p>No change necessary as a result of this comment.</p>
4	<p>I would like to thank the Colyton NP Steering Group for their efforts and hard work in compiling this complex document. It has been a difficult task for the Steering Group, and it is now up to the Community to comment. It is much easier to comment on a document produced by other people, but this should be accepted as positive comments to ensure that the final edition of the NP is as correct as is possible. I do realise that this is a long document, but with the intention of making positive comments, (some of which may appear to be negative), to facilitate the Neighbourhood Plan to go forward to the Regulation 16 study.</p>	<p>Welcomes the opportunity to comment</p>	<p>No change necessary as a result of this comment.</p>

5	I am in complete agreement with the whole of the document: Bravo to the team that must have worked hard to produce this.	Supports the NP	No change necessary as a result of this comment.
6	I formally object to this version of the plan going forward to referendum for the following reasons: It is vitally important that we prevent any further coalescence between these three settlements: Seaton, Colyton and Colyford and we should give high priority to help retain the character of the area.	Objects to the NP because it fails to prevent any further coalescence	Take objection into account when reviewing policies relating to Green Wedge
7	Some of the maps contained in the document are of poor quality and definition and hard to decipher, especially for me being unfamiliar with the wider Parish.	Criticises quality of maps	Ensure maps are of appropriate quality
8	I would like to offer my thanks to everyone for the obvious hard work that goes in to producing such a document and hope that my comments are helpful and constructive. Colyton Parish, including Colyford, deserves a strong plan to promote and protect its integrity and allow it to flourish in the future.	Supports the NP	No change necessary as a result of this comment.
9	I would like to thank the steering committee for their hard work in putting this, mostly balanced and well thought out document together.	Supports the NP	No change necessary as a result of this comment.
10	It is my understanding that regarding planning the Parish Council should be acting as a check and balance to EDDC planning processing, passing comment with its unique local knowledge and perspective. I would suggest within Neighbourhood Plan some method be outlined of double check on at least the top 5 ideals requirements be made that the Parish Council members would check upon with accuracy..... I would be interested in a response to including some outlined form essential basic checks within neighbourhood plan and who or what the process is.	Calls for monitoring regime to be put in place to ensure the NP has positive impact	Include more detail of plan monitoring and implementation in Section 12
11	ensure that where personnel are mentioned within it they are accurately described <b>CVRA</b>	Raises question about current position of some members of the SG	Review and up-date SG members list
12	The definition of all these maps should be improved to make them readable. <b>CVRA</b>	Criticises quality of maps	Ensure maps are of appropriate quality
13	I call upon the members and planning officers of the East Devon District Council to ensure that any proposals to change the present Green Wedges between Colyton, Colyford and Seaton within the Neighbourhood Plan cannot be exploited by future developers.	Stresses importance of Green Wedge	Recognise importance of Green Wedge
14	In policy Coly16 one of the adverse impact items is 'flood risk' (including local surface water flooding). This item should be included in the impact list of other policies – Coly4, Coly6, Coly7, Coly 8, Coly9. There are a lot of areas in Colyton/Colyford where the natural drainage of water could be affected by any development, causing local flooding. This may not always be apparent to any developer.	Emphasises the importance of minimising flood risk	Ensure policies address the matter of flood risk appropriately
15	not enough mention of the Green Wedge Area or protect it.	Stresses importance of Green Wedge	Recognise importance of Green Wedge
16	The neighbourhood plan is a very useful piece of work and the members of the team that has prepared it are to be commended.	Calls for monitoring regime to be put in place to ensure the NP has positive impact	Include more detail of plan monitoring and implementation in Section 12 including reference to

	The purpose of the plan is to provide no more than a framework within which the parish can progress. It would be a huge pity if, once completed, it is then left to gather dust. I urge the Parish Council to highlight priorities that now need to be pursued and assign small task groups to achieving the specific ambitions set out in the plan.		relationship between NP LP and NPPF
16	I would like to thank those who prepared the document for their hard work and attention to detail.	Supports the NP	No change necessary as a result of this comment.
18	Thank you for all the hard work that has gone into producing this draft document.	Supports the NP	No change necessary as a result of this comment.
19	I wish to support the Colyton Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2018-2031 and commend the Steering Group for all their hard work in compiling it.	Supports the NP	No change necessary as a result of this comment.
20	I would like to say I think the Plan is very good and I wholeheartedly support it.	Supports the NP	No change necessary as a result of this comment.
21	Thank you to all involved in pulling this together.	Supports the NP	No change necessary as a result of this comment.
22	First off, may we show appreciation and respect for all the work that has been put into preparing the pre-submission version of the plan especially by the members of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group. Overall, we are supportive of the majority of the proposed aims/ objective and associated policies set out in the draft plan.	Supports the NP	No change necessary as a result of this comment.
23	I hope these suggestions are appropriate with the consultation framework and thank you once again for your work to ensure that our Parish continues to be a vibrant and viable community for all age groups, whilst continuing to preserve what makes the Parish "a uniquely characterful and caring place to live and work"	Supports the NP	No change necessary as a result of this comment.
24	Firstly, congratulations to the Parish Council and all involved in the production of your Neighbourhood Plan for reaching the pre-submission consultation stage in the process. The content is a clear reflection of the considerable effort, research and community engagement undertaken, and this is to be commended. We would also like to draw attention to the fact that we are commencing work on the process of producing a new Local Plan. This is likely to take a year to reach draft stage, but depending on how your Neighbourhood Plan progresses, you may be able to consider conformity with both plans (adopted and emerging). Ultimately if there is a conflict between your Neighbourhood Plan and the emerging Local Plan, the more recent policy will take precedence, and we will work with you to consider the relationship and any implications. You will see that whilst there are numerous comments/observations made, there are no fundamental objections or matters of significant concern raised and it would appear that the Plan broadly conform to national and local planning policy. The comments relate mainly to matters of detail and are intended to be constructive and positive to assist the final document to be as useful as possible in application. <b>EDDC</b>	EDDC compliments the SG and PC on its work and stresses the importance of synergy with the NP and	Consider the suggestions made by EDDC and commit to maintaining a dialogue with the local planning authority <b>Refer comment to PC</b> regarding new Local Plan

25	The addition of an index of policies at the start of the document is considered to be essential for helping Development Management planners (and others) to navigate the plan and use is as a practical tool in the determination of planning applications. Ideally these should be clickable links to take the user to the particular policy. <b>EDDC</b>	Suggests adding a policy index	Add policy index with clickable links
26	As in common in Neighbourhood Plans, you could consider including Community Actions to set out how identified issues and opportunities outside the realms of planning policy will be addressed. <b>EDDC</b>	Suggests including Community Actions in NP (this is not common in all NPs)	Continue established practice of referring community suggestions to PC for it to decide what action to take. Publish Community Actions on website Refer to this with weblink in NP document
27	The Plan should be made as compliant as possible with the Government Accessibility requirements. This includes adding descriptive 'alt text' to all images and tables for those using screen readers and ensuing headings are official 'headings' to aid navigation. Assistance can be provided on this if required. <b>EDDC</b>	Suggests improving accessibility of final version of NP	Discuss with EDDC after submission <b>Refer to PC</b>
28	Clarity on the position of the Parish Council regarding Community Land Trust aims and proposals would be useful, including any technical input sought from EDDC (planning or housing teams). <b>EDDC</b>	Suggests NP clarifies role of CLT	Consider whether the NP can include an up-dated reference to the role of the CLT
29	I can confirm that there are no issues associated with the Plan upon which we wish to comment. Our congratulations to your community on its progress to date and our best wishes for the making of your Plan. <b>Historic England Historic Places Adviser SW</b>	Historic England has no issues with the NP	No change necessary as a result of this comment.
30	Thank you so much for the opportunity to read through the Neighbourhood Plan pre submission version. What an excellent plan, diverse and through and clearly representing a massive amount of hard work. Well done to you and your team. I think the phrase 'fair and worthy vision for the future' is a challenging brief.	Supports the NP	No change necessary as a result of this comment.
31	It is well researched, well thought and very well and clearly presented plan. The Parish Council are to be congratulated.	Supports the NP	No change necessary as a result of this comment.
32	I generally support the proposal. I feel it is vital that there is no encroachment of the green wedge.		No change necessary as a result of this comment.
33	The Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group are to be congratulated on their sterling work to bring this plan into being. authoring a document of this complexity is an immensely challenging task. The responsibility of review and amendments has been made much easier by the quality of the work.	Welcomes the opportunity to comment on the NP	No change necessary as a result of this comment.
34	General I am in full support – well done	Supports the NP	No change necessary as a result of this comment.
35	Friends of Colyton Library are in support of this Plan. Well done – thank you. <b>Friends of Colyton Library</b>	Supports the NP	No change necessary as a result of this comment.
36	I feel the Council needs to plan more carefully. I walk and cycle all around this beautiful area and see how neglected things are. Verges, lay-bys,	Points out matters of concern and calls for more action and investment	<b>Refer comment to Parish Council</b>

	roads, drains. To put another road and bus/lorry park would cause more upkeep (money you may not have). The green wedge to be destroyed, it just opens up planning and there will be lots of issues. Schools, doctors, parking and more pollution. Yes, it is a wonderful area to live in, but if more thought is not given, it's the next generation that will inherit a shambles. Could the money be spent on what causes most upset to most residents, our high street? Speed cameras, traffic lights at school times and maybe a crossing.		Include in a list of community suggestions published on the website with a weblink in the NP
37	...hoping that the Parish Council will take note and support ideas given to resolve certain problems all related to land use with the aim of making Colyton and Colyford a better place to live attractive for young families and retired folk.	Supports the NP	No change necessary as a result of this comment.
38	An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Grid's electricity and gas transmission assets which include high voltage electricity assets and high-pressure gas pipelines. National Grid has identified that it has no record of such assets within the Neighbourhood Plan area.	No records of assets in the area. Does not make any specific comment on the current version of the NP.	No change necessary as a result of this comment.
<b>COVER</b>			
39	Title page does the start date of 2018 need to be updated?	Questions use of 2018 as start date	Change start date to 2020
<b>FOREWORD</b>			
40	Note: there are also a few errors in the overall plan which must be corrected for the next version, mainly to do with the historical changes of status of personnel involved with creating the plan, these should be easy to address.	Calls for the position and roles of members of the SG to be reviewed	Review and up-date SG members list
41	Page 3 Caroline Collier is no longer a Parish Councillor	Calls for the position and roles of members of the SG to be reviewed	Review and up-date SG members list
42	...the plan needs to be reviewed to make sure it is up to date and factual and changes made to correct these errors.	Suggests that the NP needs some correcting and up-dating	Ensure the NP document is subject to a thorough review
43	In the acknowledgment Caroline Collier is shown as a parish councillor, this is not correct	Calls for the position and roles of members of the SG to be reviewed	Review and up-date SG members list
44	Page 3 Caroline Collier is no longer a parish councillor	Calls for the position and roles of members of the SG to be reviewed	Review and up-date SG members list
45	Page 3 Caroline Collier is no longer a parish councillor	Calls for the position and roles of members of the SG to be reviewed	Review and up-date SG members list
46	Page 3 – Caroline Collier listed as Parish Councillor – no longer the case	Calls for the position and roles of members of the SG to be reviewed	Review and up-date SG members list
47	A new Foreword will be required for the submission version.	Recognises that the Foreword will require some re-writing	Prepare a Foreword suitable for the submission version of NP including reference to NP status
48	it would be more becoming to acknowledge the contribution of all those who have been members of the Steering group	Suggests that the SG list is incomplete	Review and up-date SG members list to include all those that have been members
<b>SECTION 1</b>			
49	Para 1.1 The map is of very poor definition.	Says Map 1 is unclear	Seek help from EDDC to ensure all maps are of appropriate quality
50	map 1 should read Colyton parish neighbourhood plan	Calls for title of map to be changed	Use the name that EDDC used when it designated the neighbourhood area

51	... change map 1 to Colyton parish neighbourhood area for consistency	Calls for title of map to be changed	Use the name that EDDC used when it designated the neighbourhood area
<b>SECTION 2</b>			
52	Para 2.1 Add after Colyford, “a village”, (population circa 800) etc.	Wants to emphasise that Colyford is a village	Add “a village”
53	Para 2.1 – Colyton is described as a town thus Colyford should be described as a village	Wants Colyford to be described as a village	Add “a village”
54	Para 2.1 States that Colyton is a small town, it should also be made clear in this paragraph that Colyford is a village. <b>CVRA</b>	Wants Colyford to be described as a village	Add “a village”
55	Page 5 Para 2.4 that straddles the main road “the A3052” etc.	Wants to include main road number	Add “A3052”
56	Para 2.4 – The main road should be described as the A3052 for clarity.	Wants to include main road number	Add “A3052”
57	Para 2.4 It should state that Colyford straddles the main road which is the A3052. <b>CVRA</b>	Wants to include main road number	Add “A3052”
58	Maps 2 and four have poor resolution and detail is not easy to see at larger magnification. map 3 is better.	Says some maps are of poor quality	Seek help from EDDC to ensure all maps are of appropriate quality
59	2.4 Colyton Grammar School is now an Academy Trust	Points out the Grammar School is an Academy Trust	Refer to Grammar School as an Academy Trust
60	Section 2 should read Colyton Parish today	Want section title changed	Change title
61	2.2 change to read “ <i>the roads within the parish are otherwise small country roads and lanes</i> ”.	Wants to add “roads and”	Add “roads and”
62	2.2 no mention that the B 3161 has no public footway between Colyford and Colyton a key feature which should be highlighted	Wants to mention lack of footway between Colyton and Colyford	Add reference to lack of footway along B3161
63	2.4 citing the A3052 as a lifeline and then a problem is not agreed. To single this out is not appropriate without also raising the problems of Colyton roads which are arguably more acute.	Wishes to emphasise problems of several roads	The extent and nature of problems with the roads is better detailed when relevant to the NP in the Transport Section 10.
64	2.4 the heritage of Colyford is not being afforded the same weight as that of Colyton. No mention of Magna Carta ancient Boris status the election of a mayor status of residents as burgesses and their collective ownership of land assets. clear need to include these key differences between town and village both as something to be celebrated and preserved.	Want to go into detail about Colyford’s heritage credentials	The degree of historic detail that was necessary and relevant to a land use document was discussed at length during the drafting of an earlier version of the NP. No further change necessary as a result of this comment.
65	Section 2 general suggest this section would be better reordered so that 2.3 2. 4 and 2.5 are presented as a continuum followed by a separate more expensive paragraph on Colyford. This could then be followed by a listing common features such as extensive network of public footpaths Coly River and tramway.	Calls for more descriptive text about Colyford	The degree of detail that was necessary and relevant to a land use document was discussed at length during the drafting of an earlier version of the NP. No further change necessary as a result of this comment.
<b>SECTION 3</b>			
66	Paragraph 3.3 – as the Villages Plan was adopted as part of the East Devon Development Plan in July 2018, so it is no longer accurate to say EDDC has recently completed preparing it. <b>EDDC</b>	Calls for para. to be up-dated	Up-date para 3.3
67	3.8 this is factually incorrect the Parish Council does not have an established planning position.	Questions the accuracy of para 3.8	If the para is approved by the PC – it has confirmed that it has an established position on many of the local planning issues. No further change necessary as a result of this comment.

68	3.11 second line replace “would” with “could” since it is impossible to prejudge any beneficial merit until such proposals are tabled.	Suggests “could” is a safer position to take	Change “would” to “ <i>could</i> ”
<b>SECTION 4</b>			
69	Page 8 Para 4.3 I do not agree that the Steering Group have “consulted widely”!! In many aspects, such as the younger generation, there has been no consultation at all!!	Questions the extent and efficacy of local consultation	Set out the breadth and depth of consultation undertaken in the required Consultation Statement Include appropriate reference in NP
70	Page 9 Para 4.8 The Steering Group did not “welcome comments and contributions from all quarters”, in actual fact, this was resisted!!	Questions the extent and efficacy of local consultation	Set out the breadth and depth of consultation undertaken in the required Consultation Statement Include appropriate reference in NP
71	Para 4.3 ..... there has been no meaningful consultation with younger people or people with disabilities in the parish at all. There has also been no feedback from the two organised consultation events in Colyton and Colyford about how people who took part commented, until this draft was recently made public. <b>CVRA</b>	Questions the extent and efficacy of local consultation	Set out the breadth and depth of consultation undertaken in the required Consultation Statement Include appropriate reference in NP
72	Page 8 no real consultation as stated. Did not consult widely	Questions the extent and efficacy of local consultation	Set out the breadth and depth of consultation undertaken in the required Consultation Statement Include appropriate reference in NP
73	Para 4.6 I felt that the consultation process was weak and patchy – did not adequately communicate with local residents. Could have done much better.	Questions the extent and efficacy of local consultation	Set out the breadth and depth of consultation undertaken in the required Consultation Statement Include appropriate reference in NP
74	Have the needs of the disabled been addressed? Were disabled residents consulted specifically as to their needs within the Parish when drawing up the plan? Were under18s consulted when drawing up the plan? What would our young people like to see happening in our Parish’s future?	Questions the extent and efficacy of local consultation	Set out the breadth and depth of consultation undertaken in the required Consultation Statement Include appropriate reference in NP
75	Para 4.8 States a desire to welcome comments and foster discussion and debate within the community, however the experience of the community has been the opposite of this, efforts to have meaningful discussions between the Steering Group and the community has been met with resistance, implying that comments from the community were unwelcomed. <b>CVRA</b>	Claims the SG have been resistant to comments and suggestions form the community at large	Set out the breadth and depth of consultation undertaken in the required Consultation Statement Include appropriate reference in NP
76	Very little indication that consultation has taken place with young children who will be the most affected with this plan, such as youth groups, footballers, skate park users etc	Questions the extent and efficacy of local consultation	Set out the breadth and depth of consultation undertaken in the required Consultation Statement Include appropriate reference in NP
77	Page 9 para 4.2 do we need to mention EU obligations post 31/12/20?	Questions reference to EU obligations	A neighbourhood plan must be compatible with EU obligations, as incorporated into UK law, in order to be legally compliant. The wording in para. 4.2 is still one of the basic conditions laid down by statute. Check

			statute and include link before submission
78	Para 4.2 is reference to EU obligations still necessary?	Asks if reference to EU obligations is still necessary	This is still one of the basic conditions laid down by statute No change necessary as a result of this comment.
79	Para 4.7 pages on the website? What pages? Minutes of steering group meetings were often not displayed for many months and some even now are not available.	Criticises efficiency in dissemination information	Seek improvements to website before NP is submitted <b>Refer to PC</b>
80	Timescale/relationship to Local Plan - paragraph 4.4 refers to the Neighbourhood Plan shaping development in the parish over the next 15-20 years but this will be shorter now as the plan period is to end 2031. <b>EDDC</b>	Suggests timescale referred to should be amended	Para 4.4 was trying to imply that the plan was looking beyond the end of the current LP. Reference to the time horizon in para 4.4 should be shortened.
81	Aware that this is 2031 in order to align with the adopted Local Plan and enable reliance on the evidence behind that plan. Suggest at the least a reference is added to the emerging local plan as you may rely on our evidence for it going forward, for example, with regard to communications/broadband infrastructure and electric vehicle charging points, in addition to relying on our existing Local Plan evidence base too. <b>EDDC</b>	Suggests there is a reference to the relevance of the new LP when it begins to emerge	Add suitable reference to EDDC's commitment to produce a new LP and implications for the NP policies
82	4.2 delete 4th bullet as UK no longer a member of the EU	Calls for one of the basic conditions to be deleted	It remains one of the basic conditions laid down by statute. Check statute and include link before submission
83	4.4 title page sets the time frame of the plan as 2018 to 2031. Fifth paragraph talks vaguely of a 15-20 years' time frame which is it? Will it be subject to review? what happens if government policy changes? This section should therefore point the reader to section 12 where these issues are addressed.	Suggests timescale referred to should be amended	Reference to the time horizon in para 4.4 should be shortened and explained.
<b>SECTION 5</b>			
84	Para 5.8 Presumably the "Consultation Statement" will be produced after the Regulation 14 process is completed?	Asks about the Consultation Statement	This document is in production and will accompany the submission version of the NP. Para 5.8 will be revised to include a link to the Consultation Statement.
85	Para 5.8 Mentions a "Consultation Statement". When will this be produced and will it be made publicly available? <b>CVRA</b>	Asks about the Consultation Statement	This document is in production and will accompany the submission version of the NP. Para 5.8 will be revised to include a link to the Consultation Statement.
86	5.6 amend "should be considered" to read "shall be considered" to ensure compliance.	Suggests change of wording	It would be inappropriate to be so dogmatic. No change necessary as a result of this comment.
<b>SECTION 6</b>			
87	Approved Aims and Objectives There is no aim for car electric charging Points. No aim for a Carbon Neutral requirement for the Parish.	Points out that some matters are not covered specifically in the approved aims and objectives	The Aims and Objectives were 'approved' by the PC following consultation.



			Up-date to refer to carbon neutrality and indicate change was made following Reg. 14 consultation
88	Approved aims and objectives – The greatest aim must be for a carbon neutral Parish. A “Green” Parish.	Calls for carbon neutrality to have primacy	Note view and <b>refer comment to PC</b>
89	Approved Aims and Objectives: There is no reference to an aim to make the Parish ‘Carbon Neutral’. This section needs to acknowledge there is a need to stop burning fossil fuels and transfer the housing stock to renewable solutions such as air or ground source heat pumps in conjunction with the introduction of insulation, underfloor heating and solar panels. There is also no reference to the provision of electric vehicle charging points, which after recent government announcements will be needed in the near future. <b>CVRA</b>	Points out this section 6 does not refer to carbon neutrality and practical actions that could be taken to this end	The Aims and Objectives were ‘approved’ by the PC following consultation. Up-date to refer to carbon neutrality and indicate change was made following Reg. 14 consultation The ‘call’ for action should be <b>referred to the PC</b> for its consideration in the context of the ‘climate emergency’ debate.
90	Para 6.4 Also workshop held in 2017 was confined to Steering Committee members and invited members of PC and invited members of the community – your words from minutes. Not open to members of the local community who might like to have participated.	Points out that the Workshop had limited participation	The Workshop was limited because of space and time, but the outcomes were shared with the community as a whole to comment on. No change necessary as a result of this comment.
91	Where the word sustainable is used it is important that it includes carbon reduction targets in addition to policies which mitigate the effects of climate change. The box on page 12 transport and travel might also contain a reference to the promotion of alternative fossil fuels in relation to sustainable targets the following may be helpful.	Points out that some matters are not covered specifically in the approved aims and objectives	Up-date Aims and Objectives to refer to carbon neutrality and indicate change was made following Reg. 14 consultation
92	Page 12 built environment and housing box - why is there no reference to Whitford in relation to green wedge designation?	Points out that some matters are not covered specifically in the approved aims and objectives	The Aims and Objectives were ‘approved’ by the PC following consultation. They should not be changed as a result of this comment.
93	The document identifies a number of serious issues but does not appear to propose any firm actions or proactive measures to deal with these. In my view the problems for Colyton and Colyford that require urgent solutions include: 1 Lack of market housing that is affordable..... 2 Shortage of equity share housing..... 3 A shortage of local tradespeople artisans retained fire crew youth leaders and the like resulting in part from the inability to purchase a house locally. 4 Severe shortage of parking and no safe drop off area for the primary school. 5 Lack of off-street parking in many areas for residents..... 6 There is no safe coach and bus parking for their grammar school resulting in a serious danger to all Rd users of the A3052 two between 15:20 and 15:50 on all school days. 7 Whether or not Colyton is sustainable at the moment is questionable but there is no doubt that it is becoming less so by the day..... one aim of the neighbourhood plan should be to make it so and similarly improve Colyton’s sustainability.	Offers their own thoughts on what local matters require urgent solutions:	Note comments. Most of the ‘issues’ were recognised during previous consultation and plan-making. Many of these matters are addressed in the NP, where a land use policy can make a positive contribute. No specific change is necessary as a result of this comment.

94	Vision statement - may wish to elaborate to illustrate the vision more tangibly. <b>EDDC</b>	Suggest the Vision Statement could be more 'tangible'	The aims and objectives provide a more tangible and physical manifestation of the Vision Statement. Up-date A&O and indicate post Reg.14 changes
95	Table of aims & objectives (page 12) has 2 categories for housing. Suggest the first one could be renamed "Built Environment, Heritage & Design". <b>EDDC</b>	Suggests changing "topic title	Because 'Housing' is a topic in its own right in the 'Aims and Objectives', the suggestion makes sense and helps avoid confusion. Change topic title to " <i>Built Environment, Heritage &amp; Design.</i> "
96	6.2 I recognise and acknowledge the challenges of producing a succinct vision statement that accurately captures the desired end state. However, I feel a uniquely characterful and caring place to live and work could be bettered.	Calls for a better Vision Statement	The SG's debate/discussions on the Vision Statement were lengthy, and only two persons have found problems with it. No change is necessary as a result of this comment.
96A	We support the neighbourhood plan's overarching aims and objectives. In particular, we are supportive of the aim to increase resilience to climate change and the associated objective to support flood prevention schemes. Similarly, we support the objective to protect and enhance ecologically sensitive areas and habitats. Env. Agency	Supports the aims and objectives of the NP	No specific change is necessary as a result of this comment.
<b>SECTION 7</b>			
97	Thank you for inviting the Forestry Commission to respond to the consultation on the Colyton Neighbourhood Plan. Unfortunately, we do not have the resources to respond to individual plans, but we have some key points to make relevant to all neighbourhood plans. Forestry Commission and Neighbourhood Planning Existing trees in your community The Forestry Commission would like to encourage communities to review the trees and woodlands in their neighbourhood and consider whether they are sufficiently diverse in age and species to prove resilient in the face of tree pests and diseases or climate change..... Ancient Woodland If you have ancient woodland within or adjacent to your boundary it is important that it is considered within your plan. Deforestation The overarching policy for the sustainable management of forests, woodland and trees in England is a presumption against deforestation. Woodland Creation The UK is committed in law to net zero emissions by 2050. Tree planting is recognised as contributing to efforts to tackle the biodiversity and climate emergencies we are currently facing. Neighbourhood plans are a useful mechanism for promoting tree planting close to people so that the cultural and health benefits of trees can be enjoyed alongside their broader environmental benefits..... <b>Forestry Commission</b>	Offers a range of generic advice to plan-makers. Does not make any specific comment on the current version of the NP.	No change necessary as a result of this comment.
98	Thank you for consulting the Devon Countryside Access Forum on the Neighbourhood Plan. The	Welcomes the inclusion of the PROW map otherwise offers a	No change necessary as a result of this comment.

	Forum notes the useful maps of public rights of way and Local Green Spaces. In response to this consultation I am attaching the Forum's position statement on Neighbourhood Plans and advises that the Plan is cross-referenced against this. <b>Devon Countryside Access Forum</b>	range of generic advice to plan-makers.	
99	Pages 15,17,18,20 The maps need to be a much better definition.	Criticises quality of maps	Ensure maps are of appropriate quality
100	Para 7.2 – The green wedge. These areas should be absolutely sacred and the notion of any “crack in the door” to support or encourage planning of any kind should be removed.	Stresses importance of designated areas of countryside	No change necessary as a result of this comment.
101	Natural environment – Some wording should be included to ensure the River Coly, water ditches, and the wetlands are controlled of invasive species such as Himalayan Balsam and Japanese Knotweed. A Could “dogs on leads” be permitted into the wetlands – Apologies as I am not sure this is a Parish matter. B The electrical substation near the White Hart Inn is an eyesore. Could the owner be encouraged to plant some trees and hedging to screen this?	Matters raised are cannot be addressed by a land use plan	<b>Refer suggestions to Parish Council</b>
102	Development outside of the built-up area should also be supported where it enables the creation of a new rural business e.g. by new entrant farmers. Support the creation of shorter food supply chains and food resilience within the parish e.g. by the creation of new market gardens.	Expresses support new farm-based enterprises and farm diversification	Covered by Local Plan policy. No change necessary as a result of this comment.
103	Rainfall and water sources – with high hills on the western side of the town any future applications for development on these hills should be treated with extreme caution. Any attempt at suppression or movement of such springs and streams would/could create difficulties in areas previously unaffected.	Expresses concern about development on hills and impact on water courses	Point noted. No change necessary as a result of this comment.
103A	The plan should also acknowledge the water quality of the rivers within the plan area. For example, the Lower Axe and the Coly have a poor ecological status, and the Umborne Brook has a moderate ecological status (according to 2016 WFD status data). Poor agricultural practice and inadequate non-mains foul drainage arrangements can contribute to poor status and so best practices should be encouraged through development and land management. <b>Env. Agency</b>	Suggests reference is made to the poor water quality of local water courses	Include reference to water quality in the introduction to Section 7
<b>POLICY Coly1</b>			
104	Para 7.10 It would be useful and informative if the boundary of the East Devon AONB was shown on Map 2. <b>CVRA</b>	Suggests AONB boundary should be shown on Map 2	Map 2 was prepared by DBRC. Discuss with them whether they can provide better quality map and include AONB boundary.
105	Page 16 map 2 could do with being clearer type/detail	Criticises quality of map 2	Ensure map is of appropriate quality
106	Given the importance of the River Coly to the character of the town and the amenity of residents and appeal visitors that bring commercial income, could we have objective that specifically seeks to "Protect & enhance the	Suggests an additional 'objective' relating to River Coly	The 'Aims and Objectives' were 'approved' by the PC following consultation.

	setting, water quality and bio-diversity of the River Coly"? The background here being that even prior to the slurry incident from Southleigh, the Environment Agency observed that the ecological standard of the Coly was not good. Such an objective could be developed to ensure that considerations such as harmful run off management are considered in planning applications and allow for the inclusion of appropriate measures of ecological health and diversity.		They need not to be changed as a result of this comment <b>Refer comment to PC</b>
107	Consider replacing "respect" with a stronger term which is less open to interpretation. Possible alternative could be "avoid adversely affecting". <b>EDDC</b>	Proposes minor amendment to policy wording	Amend criterion i to read: <i>"avoid adversely affecting local wildlife sites...."</i>
108	For clarity, if this policy relates to the areas shown in Map2, suggest the policy refers to map 2. Map 2 does however need updating as there have been some changes since June 2017 (e.g. according to EDDC records, Holyford Woods was designated as a Local Nature Reserve in 2018). We can assist with mapping. <b>EDDC</b>	Questions whether policy applies to map 2 areas	It does not. Map shows the important and significant areas at a point in time. The policy requires developers to seek information at the time of application. No change necessary as a result of this comment.
109	Strengthen " <i>Where possible seek to deliver a net gain in biodiversity</i> ", to simply " <i>deliver a net gain in biodiversity</i> " (or wherever possible, deliver a net gain") to be more consistent with the wording in the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 170) and the Government's intention to make 10% biodiversity net gain mandatory on all development which is likely to be in place when the Plan reaches adoption. <b>EDDC</b>	In accordance with Suggests deleting " <i>where possible seek</i> " from criterion iv	Delete " <i>where possible seek</i> " from criterion iv
110	There appears to be some contradiction as worded between the final paragraph and points (i) and (iv) of the policy. Suggest amend the final paragraph to reflect that development proposals which would result in the loss of or create harm to these areas, "and which cannot be suitably mitigated", will not be supported. <b>EDDC</b>	Suggests adding " <i>and which cannot be suitably mitigated</i> " to last clause of policy to better sync with criterion i	Amend clause of policy to read: <i>"Development proposals that would result in the loss of, or which would create unacceptable harm to, wildlife sites and other areas of ecological or geological importance, and which cannot be suitably mitigated, will not be supported."</i>
111	A strong comment on the present day anomaly of the exclusion zone of the East Devon AONB drawn in 1963. This boundary needs urgently re drawing in consultation with Seaton and Beer parish councils that Natural England is lobbied and persuaded to change this boundary.	Calls for AONB boundary to be withdrawn	This is not a matter that can be dealt with by the NP. <b>Refer proposal to PC</b>
	In particular we are supportive of policy Coly1 which states that development proposals should protect and, where possible enhance the network of habitats. This policy uses the hierarchical approach to indicate the intended protection of the natural environment (avoid > minimise impact > compensate). You may consider strengthening the policy by identifying that development should avoid any detrimental impact on biodiversity in the first instance, and if impact is unavoidable, a development will only be considered where adequate mitigation and compensation measures are proposed and delivered. <b>Env. Agency</b>	Suggests strengthening the policy with reference to mitigation measures	Include reference to mitigation and compensation measures in the policy

	Policy Coly1 (iv) considers the net gain of biodiversity. Again, this could be strengthened to say that all development must deliver a net gain, in line with the Government's 25 Year Environment Plan. <b>Env. Agency</b>	Suggests that requiring a net biodiversity gain should be an imperative	Strengthen the policy to require a biodiversity gain wherever possible
	We support the statement at the end of Policy Coly1 where it states that proposals resulting in a loss of, or an unacceptable harm to areas of ecological importance would not be supported. <b>Env. Agency</b>	Expresses support for last clause of policy	Note support No change is necessary as a result of this comment.
	<b>POLICY Coly2</b>		
112	Para 7.14 Should include reference to greater use of Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) to protect individual trees within the wider landscape <b>CVRA</b>	Wants the NP to propose greater use of TPOs	TPO policy is a matter for the LPA
113	Suggest splitting the policy into 2 parts, e.g. (a) and (b) and switching the ordering of the 2 parts so that no harm is the preferred position but mitigation /replacement is acceptable if harm has to occur. <b>EDDC</b>	Suggests re-ordering of policy	Re-order the policy and label clause A and B as suggested
114	In terms of allowing replacement, the policy as currently worded appears to allow any trees (apart from those forming part of a natural woodland) to be removed and replaced. Similar to Policy Coly1, suggest reframing this as loss or damage which should be avoided in the first instance, with replacement planting required where the loss or damage is unavoidable to enable an otherwise acceptable development. Also consider include a replacement planting ratio as seen in some other neighbourhood plans	Wants the policy to be more similar to those recently adopted at Farringdon and Clyst St George.	Agree with EDDC's suggestions and revise policy Coly2 to align with recent approved NPs
115	Suggest adding "where deemed necessary by the Local Planning Authority" in respect of requiring a method statement. <b>EDDC</b>	Suggests a method statement should be asked for "where deemed necessary by the Local Planning Authority"	Add " <i>where deemed necessary by the Local Planning Authority</i> "
116	Suggest it would be useful to refer to map 3 within the policy but unclear from paragraph 7.13 if the full extent of these 'areas of natural woodland' covered by the Policy are synonymous with the areas shown on Map 3. If not, the policy could perhaps state, "including, but not limited to, the woodlands shown on map 3". <b>EDDC</b>	Asks whether policy relates directly to areas of woodland shown on the map.	Add " <i>including, but not limited to, the woodlands shown on map 3</i> ".
117	Also suggest making it clear what the definition/status is of the woodland identified on map 3, to clarify the title "Protected Woodland" and the key "Colyton Parish Woodland". <b>EDDC</b>	Queries title of map	Amend title and key of Map to read 'Main Woodland Areas'
118	policy Coly 2 I think this policy is deficient in relation to the need to dramatically increase the numbers of trees in the parish as a contribution to the reduction of carbon dioxide level. <b>EDDC</b>	Points out that the policy does not mention new woodland areas	This can only be done if there is a commitment and area(s) identified Point noted. No change necessary as a result of this comment.
119	Enhance tree Woodlands and hedgerows protect notable hydro trees promote the planting of a linear Woodland giving connectivity. Promote planting on steep land at each end of Holyford Woods.	Calls for the woodlands to be enhanced	Note point <b>Refer call to PC</b>
120	Publicise the two local nature reserves of Holyford Woods and Colyford Common within walking distance of Colyton and Colyford.	Calls for the two local nature reserves to be 'publicised'	This is not directly relevant to the policy. No change necessary as a result of this comment.
	<b>POLICY Coly3</b>		
121	7.17 there is mention of new bridge over the river Coly can we be clear that the main issue is	Asks if a bridge over is proposed by the White Hart	The reference in the NP is to the need for " <i>bridges</i> ". No specific area should be

	crossing by the White Heart Pub in Colyford and this is the proposed bridge site?		mentioned unless it has been approved. No change necessary as a result of this comment.
122	There is no time scale of mention of urgency or prioritizing footpaths and cycle paths especially as they are now used, where passable, more frequently. Your survey in 2008 states the need for safe pathways between settlements is needed ....12 years ago and its only got worse.	Points out that there is no mention of priorities and timescale and criticises lack of action on matters identified in the Parish Plan	These matters can only be included if they have been approved. <b>Refer criticism to PC</b>
123	Map 4 – could do with being clearer type/detail	Criticises quality of map 4	Ensure map is of appropriate quality Seek assistance from EDDC
124	Consider whether it is appropriate to add protection of existing public rights of way to this policy, and to actively encourage development proposals to make links to this network, where appropriate. <b>EDDC</b>	Suggests protection of existing rights of way is added to policy	Add reference to protecting existing PROW to policy
125	Consider referring to ‘as shown on Map 4’ in the policy for clarity. <b>EDDC</b>	Suggests referring to map in policy	Add reference to map 4 in the policy Amend policy to read: <i>“Measures to improve and extend the existing network of public rights of way, shown on Map 4, are.....”</i>
126	Note Map 4 is not easily legible at the current size it is shown in the document – suggest this is given a full page. <b>EDDC</b>	Criticises quality of map 4	Ensure map is of appropriate quality Seek assistance from EDDC
127	Restore closed footpath Whitwell Lane – Holyford Lane with a 22-person lobby to make the path a definitive path. To promote a new walking path between Shells Lane and Courtney Drive To give a linking path between Colyton and Colyford.	Calls for restoration of closed footpath	Not a matter for the NP <b>Refer proposal to PC</b>
<b>POLICY Coly4</b>			
128	I object to this version of the plan going forward to referendum for the following reasons: Preventing coalescence between these three settlements should be a very high priority to retain the character of the area, uncontrolled urban sprawl has ruined the character of many towns and villages around this country and this should not be allowed to take place here. The plan should contain adequate wording to protect from inappropriate developments in the Green Wedges. As it is currently worded it is completely inadequate.	Doubts that the current wording of the policy is fit for the purpose of preventing coalescence	Review the wording of policy Coly4 in the light of the comments received on this policy and the changes proposed to other policies Including reference to “green wedge areas”
129	Para 7.20 I recommend that the last sentence is amended as follows: The Green Wedge areas <i>“detailed on map 5, are an important local planning designation and considered to be the minimum “land mass” required to ensure the separation of local settlements.”</i> REASON To make this paragraph clearer and stronger. Which will make this para to be more specific in describing the Green Wedges.	Suggests an amendment to the policy to include reference to existing Green Wedge being the minimum ‘land mass’ required to ensure separation	Include an initial statement in the policy regarding the significance of the Green Wedge areas to the Parish
130	Preserving the character of our parish is critical to the wellbeing of the residents. Maintaining green spaces between Seaton, Colyford and Colyton is vital. Stronger wording must be included in the Neighbourhood Plan to set out the ‘green wedges’, never to be built upon.	Doubts that the current wording of the policy is fit for the purpose of preventing development in the Green Wedge area	Include an initial statement in the policy regarding the significance of the Green Wedge areas to the Parish

	This may not please some influential landowners but is in the interest of the majority of residents.		
131	The Neighbourhood Plan should contain adequate wording to protect us from inappropriate developments in the Green Wedges. The wording covering this in the current draft proposal is completely inadequate.	Doubts that the current wording of the policy is fit for purpose	Include an initial statement in the policy regarding the significance of the Green Wedge areas to the Parish
132	7.21 We feel uncomfortable with the wording 'need and justification for minor development'. We believe that 'minor development' is not quantified and that this could lead to manipulation in the future. If minor development in the interests of local properties and businesses is allowed, this could easily open the door to substantially larger development, thereby significantly affecting the Green Wedge and other important assets.	Concerned about the policy allowing "minor development" without greater definition	Rewrite 7.21 deleting whilst and ending with "will be resisted" Extend the explanation of what is meant by minor development
133	Para 7.20 The wording in this paragraph needs to be strengthened to make the definition of the Green Wedge clearer and stronger, by changing the last part of Para 7.20 to read: <i>'The green wedge areas are an important local planning designation and are considered to be the minimum local land mass required to ensure the separation of local settlements.'</i> <b>CVRA</b>	Suggests an amendment to the policy to include reference to existing Green Wedge being the minimum 'land mass' required to ensure separation	Amend para. 7.20 to reflect the views expressed
134	Para 7.20 - amend last sentence to read – <i>the green wedge areas on map 5 are an important....</i>	Suggests policy refers directly to map 5	Add reference to map 5 as suggested
135	Para 7.21 Have misgivings about wording here. Please explain exactly what you mean by this para. It seems to leave green wedges in a very vulnerable position.	Concerned about para. 7.21 and how it might be interpreted	Consider implications of wording of para. 7.21 and extend the explanation of what is meant by minor development
136	7.21 I suggest the following is added <i>'and to meet the need for local affordable housing when other alternative sites are not available'</i> .	Suggests adding reference to allow the need for affordable housing development to be met if necessary	Point noted No change needed as a result of this comment
137	The green wedge as drawn is clearly designed to stifle development and I firmly believe it should be removed altogether. There are sufficient local plan policies, the AONB being just one, to give Colyton and Colyford the protection that it needs.	Calls for removal of Green Wedge	Such a proposal would conflict with a strategic policy of the LP, which the NP cannot do. No change necessary as a result of this comment.
138	We, unsurprisingly, welcome the continued support for the Green Wedge designation and protection.	Supports purpose of the policy	No change necessary as a result of this comment.
139	Noted that this Policy is more restrictive than Strategy 8 of the Local Plan as the latter does not refer to any particular types of development as being unacceptable or restrict development to a certain scale or within existing curtilages. However, the Neighbourhood Plan does broadly conform and can go further than Local Plan policy provided local circumstances justify it. We would like to ensure you are aware however that the implications of this would be to prevent development that you may wish to consider for reasons of meeting evidence of need / community benefit / a shortage of suitable alternative sites. Examples could be an exception site to accommodate affordable housing, recreation and community facilities (including a car park/facilities associated with the improved footpath network), holiday accommodation. <b>EDDC</b>	Points out the implications of a policy that is more restrictive than the Local Plan policy	Discuss the implications of policy Coly4 with EDDC in the light of any changes made to the policy

140	In final wording, recommend amending numbering of criteria to improve clarity for the reader of what is essential and what is either/or <b>EDDC</b>	Suggests amending criteria numbers	Review the format of policy Coly4 in the light of changes proposed to other policies
141	7.21 change will be resisted too will not be supported and delete the remainder of that sentence. There should be no explicit variance of position. Properties and businesses within the green wedge will still be afforded the same impartial hearing on specific issues they face as they do currently.	Proposes amendments to para. 7.21	Review wording of supporting text and para. 7.21
142	paragraph 7.20 safeguarding the green wedges is of vital not significant importance to the preservation of the unique characters and heritage of Colyton and Colyford. They define and shape the very essence of what makes this parish unique and are at the heart of what makes this such a wonderful place to live.	Stresses the importance of the Green Wedge areas	Consider how to further stress the importance of the Green Wedge areas to the Parish in 7.20 with reference to the Reg.14 consultation response
143	<p>I notice in the Plan that there are what might be called potentially irreconcilable differences between on the one hand policy Coly8 regarding exception site housing development proposals that is housing development outside the BUAB and the strong presumption in favour of development in national policy guidance under the NPPF.</p> <p>I am concerned about the green wedge between Colyton and Colyford and I am not at all confident that the pressures from developers under the auspices of the NPPF will in crucial cases be able to be resisted by decision makers in Colyton and East Devon. I strongly support policies which resist the encroachment of housing or other forms of development on existing rural areas. After all, Colyford is classed as a rural area not having a specific BUAB as such.</p> <p>The Colyton Plan states under section 7.19 that East Devon Local Plan has designated green wedge areas to prevent creeping development which could lead to the coalescence of adjacent settlements and that it is important to help them retain their separate identities. It states that the land between Colyford and Colyton is one of the key locations for its green wedge policy S8, further stating that within green wedges development will not be permitted if it would add to existing sporadic or isolated development or damage the individual identity of a settlement or could lead to or encourage settlement coalescence. That is clear enough.</p> <p>However, in section 7.21 the plan states whilst isolated new development or incursions into the green wedge will be resisted, we recognise there may be a need and justification for minor development in the interests of ensuring that existing properties and businesses within the green wedge can continue to function properly. Such specious language can give one no confidence that the fine words in support of protecting green spaces, for all the valid reasons given in the plan, would in important cases be honoured. The wording in section 8.18 gives further support for the suspicion that the green wedge will, before too long, play whittled away;</p>	Doubts that the current wording of the policy is fit for the purpose of preventing development in the Green Wedge area	Re-word para. 7.21 and extend the explanation of what is meant by minor development



	once that process begins, it will change the special nature of the area for ever.		
144	To reinforce the Local Plan policy in protecting the green wedge, see comment on preserving the Sellers Grave skyline green wedge area.	Supports policy	Note point No change necessary as a result of this comment.
145	<p>A developer has already suggested putting in a road from Coly Road, which is at the opposite end of the village from the Grammar School right through the green wedge across several fields to the school - obviously at great expense which would be offset by developing this land for housing. How can that be beneficial to the residents of Colyford? Why is the transport issue a problem of the village and not the responsibility of the school which does not benefit the local community in anyway? How would putting in a road the complete opposite end of the village benefits anyone but the school?</p> <p>The wording of the neighbourhood plan is too ambiguous regarding the protection of the green wedge. The wording should be robust and clear in protecting it from any development without loopholes that could be exploited by developers and landowners who could use the grammar school bus issue as justification to get their access roads and plans approved. The green wedge is an asset to the village, home to rare bats and other wildlife this beautiful area should be protected not exploited.</p>	Concerned that the draft policy will be exploited by developers in conjunction with the Grammar School	Re-word para. 7.21 and extend the explanation of what is meant by minor development
	<b>POLICY Coly5</b>		
146	Para 7.29 The Road Green Play Area is described, but not the overall Roade Green site. Surely this description needs further detail.	Suggests broader and better description of the Road Green open space	Add further description of Roade Green site to ensure the NP recognises the quality of the whole area being designated as LGS
147	Para. 7.32 The Elms Amenity Area Amend the wording to read Community recreation purposes for <i>“the residents of The Elms, who fully own and maintain this area”</i> .	Suggests adding reference to the role of the residents in owning and maintaining the site in question	Add additional words to para. 7.32 to emphasise the role of the residents
148	Pages 23 and 24 The Colyton Map (Page 23) is coloured. The Colyford Map (page 24) is much poorer quality and is only in black and white. Why?	Questions the different format of the two LGS maps	This point has been made to EDDC who provided the maps. Discuss with EDDC and ensure all maps are of good quality and similar format.
149	Para7.32 Local residents of The Elms have been asking for the wording of this section to be changed for over 2 years now.... The wording should read: <i>“Is a long established amenity space for community recreation purposes for the residents of The Elms, who fully own and maintain the area.”</i> <b>CVRA</b>	Suggests adding reference to the role of the residents in owning and maintaining the site in question	Add additional words to para. 7.32 to read “: <i>“Is a long-established amenity space for community recreation purposes for the residents of The Elms, who fully own and maintain the area.”</i>
150	....it is not clear from the document whether these listed ‘Local Green Spaces’ have actually been designated by the District Council or not. Presumably, this will take place prior to the Neighbourhood Plan being submitted.	Asks whether EDDC has designated LGS sites	This is not a matter for EDDC. It is the PC that designates LGS areas. No change necessary as a result of this comment.
151	7.31 St Michael’s Churchyard. We do not support your description of this space as being a ‘quiet open space’ being, as it is, right next to the A3052. Whilst this space is in the centre of the village, is it freely accessible to the public? For	Questions the description and asks about accessibility to a LGS site	Designating a site as LGS does not change its ownership or accessibility. It merely recognises its qualities and value as a green area to the character

	instance, should a family decide to have a picnic on the grass there would this be acceptable?		of the area and the environment generally. No change necessary as a result of this comment.
152	7.32 The Elms Amenity Area. This area appears to be solely for the use of residents of The Elms – therefore it is more likely to be viewed as being private open space.	Questions whether a privately owned green area can be designated as a LGS	It can. No change necessary as a result of this comment.
153	para. 7.29 – include whole of Roade Green – not just the play area	Suggests broader and better description of the Road Green open space	Add further description to ensure the NP recognises the quality of the whole area being designated as LGS
154	Page 23/24 Map of Colyford does not show all the areas	Suggests the LGS maps are not accurate	Discuss with EDDC and ensure all maps are accurate and similarly formatted.
155	para. 7.32 amend the reading to be “ <i>residents of the Elms who have always paid for it to be maintained</i> ”	Suggests adding reference to the role of the residents in owning and maintaining the site in question	Add additional words to para. 7.32 to emphasise the role of the residents
156	Para 7.32 the Elms green space amenity area should change the wording from ‘estate’ to ‘residents of the Elms’ who have always paid for its care and maintenance work done by residents since the 1960’s.	Suggests adding reference to the role of the residents in owning and maintaining the site in question	Add additional words to para. 7.32 to emphasise the role of the residents
157	Note re para 7.32 In your workshop report 2017 it states that residents would be informed – they have not. Have asked 2/3 times at your meeting. You have ignored.	Claims not to have been informed of outcomes from workshop in 2017	The methods used for sharing and disseminating information will be set out in the Consultation Statement <b>Refer suggestion to PC</b>
158	Suggest using usual terminology of “exceptional circumstances” instead of ‘very special’. <b>EDDC</b>	Suggests amended wording to the policy	Change wording of policy Coly5 to read; “.. <i>or exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated.</i> ”
159	Consider giving some clarity to the explanation of special circumstances in paragraph 7.24 regarding ‘other considerations’, for example, being of overriding community or public benefit. <b>EDDC</b>	Suggests providing examples of what may be regarded as exceptional circumstances	Include examples in para. 7.24 with reference to the NPPF
160	Consider making provision for suitable alternative replacement space to be required as part of this policy to compensate for any loss that does occur in exceptional cases. <b>EDDC</b>	Suggests considering making provision for suitable alternative replacement space	Consider making provision for suitable alternative replacement space to be required as part of this policy to compensate for any loss that does occur in exceptional cases.
161	If any of these sites are in private ownership, suggest it might be useful to add ‘or future community use’ to ‘existing recreation or amenity’, otherwise the community are precluded from using it in future as that is not the existing use. <b>EDDC</b>	Suggest the inclusion of a clause referring to possible future community use	The purpose of the policy is to protect the status quo, not to herald change. This clause could cause landowners much concern and objections. No change.
162	Relating to this policy, suggest slight amend to wording at plan paragraph 7.22 2nd sentence for clarity – either insert “green spaces” between “These” and “provide”, or change to “This provides” to flow from the 1st sentence. <b>EDDC</b>	Suggests add “green spaces” to second sentence for clarity	Amend second sentence of para. 7.22 to read: “ <i>These green spaces provide important amenity and...</i> ”
163	Local green space must be preserved.	Supports policy	No change necessary as a result of this comment.
164	Why is Colyford Play Park designated and the largest area of green space Peace Memorial Playing Field omitted?	Asks why Peace Memorial Playing Field is not designated as a LGS	Peace Memorial Playing Field is subject to policy Coly19 which recognises it

			as a key recreation area and protects its use as well as its greenness
165	Amend sub para c to read Colyton Community Woodland and picnic sites	Suggests site title is changed	Amend title of C in policy and text to read Colyton Community Woodland and picnic sites
166	7.30 4 <sup>th</sup> line last word “the” delete	Points out a typo	Amend sentence to read: “Adjacent to the public footpath alongside the Gerrard Arms is a small, secluded garden and rest area that provides a good view of the Church and its churchyard.”
167	Policy 5 – local green spaces – Dolphin St Garden opposite car park missing – well used by visitors/walkers.	Proposes additional LGS	This area has been previously considered and is only proposed now by one person. No change necessary as a result of this comment.
168	Road Green is on the wrong side of the road on the map.	Suggests the LGS maps are not accurate	Discuss with EDDC and ensure all maps are accurate.
169	... promote the local green space of two acres within the developing Ceramtec site to ensure it becomes an outdoor learning area for Colyton Primary School and recreational space for local residents.	Calls for open space on Ceramtec site when developed to be designated as LGS	The policy can only cover existing areas of proven value to the area and community No change necessary as a result of this comment.
<b>SECTION 8</b>			
170	We very much support the work to identify new sites by groups like the Community Land Trust. However, we believe that these sites should be scattered throughout the parish, so that families can be properly integrated into the community, and the environmental impact can be minimised. We would urge the community to resist pressure from Housing Associations and planning consultants to create large estates on green field sites. Although this may be more cost effective for them, the negative consequences for our environment would be permanent.	Calls for new development of affordable and social housing to be provided on small sites rather than large estates	Point noted. No change necessary as a result of this comment.
171	If we are serious about averting climate catastrophe and becoming carbon neutral by 2030, it would be desirable if all new buildings in the parish were carbon-neutral, and built to the highest environmental standards	Calls for all new development to be required to achieve carbon neutrality and the highest environmental standards	Add an additional clause regarding carbon neutrality to policy Coly6 and reference in supporting text
172	Para 8.2 Reword as follows: has a substantial number of listed buildings, 114 are listed by Historic England “of which 21 are in Colyford” etc.	Suggests adding reference to the number of listed buildings in Colyford	Add “of which 21 are in Colyford” to para. 8.2
173	Development outside of the built-up area should also be supported when it is the creation of new self-sufficient homes, similar to the planet development scheme currently operating in Wales.	Calls for new self-sufficient homes to be allowed in the countryside	Such a policy would be contrary to the strategic policies on the LP No change necessary as a result of this comment.
174	I am generally supportive of the document and would like to thank the NP Committee for their efforts. The only glaring omission as far as I am concerned is any detail on the development of the several acres of brownfield land at the Ceramtec site. Whilst the document states that brownfield development would generally be	Calls for a detailed policy regarding the Ceramtec site	This matter has been discussed at length with EDDC. The draft policy reflects an agreed approach. No change necessary as a result of this comment.

	<p>supported, I feel that this site is so large, and its development will have such an impact on the town, that it requires specific discussion.</p> <p>My personal opinion is that the phased development of this multi-acre site would provide all the housing (including affordable homes for local first-time buyers) that it is reasonable to expect Colyton to absorb over the next decades without overwhelming the community, its amenities and services. As such no additional multi house developments should be needed or approved.</p> <p>If the horse has already bolted on this one, and planning permission has already been granted for a large number of houses, then this should be referred to the NP as justification for not approving any additional multi house developments for decades to come.</p>		
175	<p>My first major concern is the reference to climate change and reduction in carbon-based emissions. I think the document should place more emphasis on this topic, particularly bearing in mind the future life span of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>All future construction should be zero based wherever possible and this should not only include construction but also the energy consumed within the building. concrete and brick has a huge carbon footprint in manufacture and it also does not lock significant amounts of carbon into the structure. Off-site fabrication may also give savings in carbon emissions.</p>	Asks for more reference to carbon neutrality	Add an additional clause regarding carbon neutrality to policy Coly6 and reference in supporting text
176	<p>Thank you for your recent consultation on the preparation of your Neighbourhood Plan. The production of your Neighbourhood Plan is an ideal opportunity for you to determine what parts of your Historic Environment are important to the community and how they are best managed.</p> <p>You may also want to compile a Local List of the heritage assets that are of the most importance to you.</p> <p>Some communities are producing local action plans for their historic environment, which can very usefully inform a Plan (see below).</p> <p>The Devon County Historic Environment Record (HER) contains a constantly growing record of known heritage assets and is a great resource that can help you prepare your Plan.</p> <p>The Devon County Historic Environment Record (HER) records that the plan area contains the following:</p> <p>Designated Heritage Assets:  Grade I Listed Buildings: 1  Grade II* Listed Buildings: 1  Grade II Listed Buildings: 114  Conservation Areas: 2  Scheduled Monument 0  Registered Historic Park/Garden 0  Assets on the Heritage@Risk Register 0  Undesignated Heritage Assets: c.515</p> <p>Historic Environment Team General Advice  The historic environment will be a material consideration in deciding many of the planning applications submitted in your area. The National</p>	<p>Devon CC HER provides advice, information and encouragement that would have been most useful during the early phase of NP preparation.</p> <p>No objection is raised about any aspect of the NP.</p>	<p>The NP has been prepared in a way that is consistent with the advice that HER and other such bodies</p> <p>No change necessary as a result of this comment.</p>

	<p>Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, Section 12, 125 Achieving well-designed places), says that Neighbourhood plans can play an important role in identifying the special qualities of each area and explaining how this should be reflected in development.</p> <p><b>Devon CC HER</b></p>		
177	<p>The purpose of this document is to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• outline emerging evidence that integrated nest boxes, commonly known as ‘swift bricks’, are significantly more effective for sparrows than sparrow bricks and terraces, whilst also providing nesting opportunities for swifts and a range of other small birds;</li> <li>• propose that swift bricks are specified as ‘universal’ nesting bricks for small cavity-nesting bird species;</li> <li>• highlight the significant advantages of integrated nesting bricks over external nest boxes;</li> <li>• provide examples of good practice for the level of nest brick provision in new developments.</li> </ul> <p><b>RSPB</b></p>	Advocates inclusion of swift bricks in new development and provides evidence to support proposal	Add clause to policy Coly6 <i>“Opportunities should be encouraged to integrate bee bricks, bat and swift boxes in a suitable position within the development.”</i>
178	<p>Should the Steering Group decide to include possible solutions in the plan I would welcome the opportunity to make constructive proposals. It is clear from the neighbourhood plans produced to date apart from Beer which has made one allocation there has been no serious attempt to provide allocated sites for housing so the villages will not have the housing promised in the original plan and young people are the ones that are suffering and will continue to do so as a result of that.</p> <p>From 1971 to 1994 Colyton benefited from an average of 17 new houses per year as well as a number of industrial units had that not happened then the place would be much less sustainable than it is today with fewer services and there is a good chance that the library and much else would have been lost.</p> <p>Current policies have restricted development and since that time the average has dropped to perhaps two per year and twenty of those were on an exception site on the western skyline. If Colyton is to be sustainable into the future and avoid having development imposed upon it then I would recommend that a fresh look is given to the plan and allocations for parking employment and housing are recommended based upon an objective needs survey.</p> <p>We know already that there is a move to build more affordable housing on an exception site and that means that the plan makers have abdicated their responsibility by ignoring a need that has been established and not proposing an appropriate allocation.</p>	Suggests that the NP should allocate sites for development	This debate took place and SG decided to follow a criteria-based approach No change necessary as a result of this comment.
179	Support for ongoing provision of public conveniences in the town centre of Colyton, preferably modernised and environmentally sustainable.	Wants to protect public conveniences	Not a NP matter <b>Refer proposal to PC</b>
180	We support the focus on Sustainable development and the need to provide our appropriate share of East Devon's new open market and affordable housing. The recent	Wants to ensure development is in character with the area	Such a requirement is already included in policy Coly7.

	development at Seaway Head demonstrates how new housing can be designed in ways that sit well with the character of the area. Similarly, the less recent knapped flint faced houses opposite Fermain House on Dolphin Street. These are in contrast to other developments in visible 'gateway' locations, the design of which is not particularly sympathetic to the character of town and its history. In that context, could we under the Aim of "Safeguarding the Character...." adopt an Objective "to ensure that new developments are designed to complement the existing architectural character of the built-up area."		No change necessary as a result of this comment.
181	Paragraph 8.3, the reference to this plan should also be "in the adopted East Devon Villages Plan (2018)" or equivalent <b>EDDC</b>	Asks that reference to Villages Plan is up-dated.	Amend para. 8.3 to read: " <i>in the adopted East Devon Villages Plan (2018)</i> "
182	8.1 4 <sup>th</sup> line before Colyford insert " <i>in contrast</i> "	Suggests adding " <i>in contrast</i> " to para. 8.1	Amend 8.1 to read: " <i>In contrast Colyford is a linear settlement...</i> "
183	8.4 Is there objective evidence of this growth expectation?	Questions LP housing requirements	Point noted No change necessary as a result of this comment.
184	I believe that there should be a moratorium on future development in and around Colyton until thorough surveys allow for a fuller understanding of how Colyton has become 'a quart squeezed into a pint pot'. With more private vehicles parked in the narrow streets of the town centre there are obviously going to be times when heavy goods vehicles, tradesman's vans (including deliveries) pose serious problems. Suggest that part(s) of developments such as Ceramtec are set aside for extra parking places.	Calls for stop to development because of constraints of road infrastructure	Point noted No change necessary as a result of this comment.
185	As a vision statement to develop the two fields to the West of Gully Shoot and to the South of the Grammar School as a tarmacked walkway along the western boundary for students to access an off-road coach park close to the village West gateway. The Wolf Way to give a safe walking route for students and provide a safe route for students walking to and from Seaton. The two small fields have a mixture of affordable homes and market housing. The top end of the site to be reserved for allotments and a community composting site. In addition, a flood relief scheme to be implemented to prevent flooding at Gully Shoot crossway with a 18 inch storm drain taking stormwater from the CGS campus and intercepting stormwater from Green Lane and Whitwell Lane and taking it down below the walkway to the Stafford Brook. This scheme would demonstrate sustainability and provide safer journeys to and from school. Remove congestion in Elm Farm Lane and take away the need for buses to congregate on the A3052 with all its inherent dangers. The affordable homes could be made available to local people with jobs at the school. Maps provided (see appendix)	Presents thoughts on future development in Colyford (with maps)	Point noted No change necessary as a result of this comment. <b>Refer proposals to PC</b>
186	This representation has been prepared by Savills on behalf Mrs D Rymer, owner of the land at Clarkham Cottages (referred throughout this document as 'the site') in response to the	Presents reasons why land at Clarkham Cottages should be allocated for development in the NP	The NP incorporates a criteria-based approach. Any development proposal should satisfy the criteria of

consultation on the draft Colyton Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan ('the draft NDP').

1.2 Our client owns an area of land known as Clarkham Cottages, located south of Swan Hill Road in the eastern extent of Colyford. The site was historically three dwellings, but now comprises a small number of buildings and structures, most of which are in a state of disrepair.

1.3 We consider that, given the current nature of the site, which detracts from the setting and significance of the Colyford Conservation Area within which it is located, there is an opportunity to enhance the site and its setting within the Conservation Area through a well-designed, small-scale residential development.

1.4 It is clear that the draft NDP sets out a series of draft policies relating to a wide range of topics. However, there are a lack of allocations within the plan to address the local housing need and it is therefore considered that small sites, well related to the existing villages of Colyton and Colyford, should be identified to assist in meeting this need.

Scale of Development

2.1. It is clear that the draft Neighbourhood Plan, whilst outlining policies which relate to housing, does not propose a specific scale of development for the plan period, nor does it propose to allocate land to deliver the housing requirement for the area.

2.2. There are a number of references within the draft NDP to the lack of any need to plan for additional growth and allocate small sites in suitable locations. It is stated at paragraph 8.10 and 8.11 " it has been concluded that further housing development in the Parish should generally be restricted to land within the defined built-up area of Colyton", and "Policy Coly6 acknowledges our support for the Local Plan and NPPF (para. 118), which gives substantial weight to the value of using suitable brownfield land within settlements for homes and other identified needs. It provides support in principle for development within the Colyton built-up area boundary, provided it is appropriate in scale and meets our basic sustainability criteria".

2.3. Whilst we agree with the emphasis behind the support for development within the settlement boundary for Colyton, we consider that the same emphasis should be extended to Colyford where land is available within the village which could contribute to the housing need for the area.

2.4. Above all however, whilst it is acknowledged that the East Devon Local Plan does not explicitly require Colyton or Colyford to accommodate specific growth, Local Plan Strategy 6 and Strategy 27 make reference to the need for development at a local level required to meet local need to be planned for through Neighbourhood Plans. Strategy 6 states that "where a local community prepare a Neighbourhood Plan they may specifically

the NP. This will be a matter for the LPA to assess and the PC to consider when the proposals are put forward. No change necessary as a result of this comment.

	<p>allocate sites and/or include criteria based or other policies for promoting development/land uses beyond the boundary. Such ‘outside of boundaries’ policy provision would supersede relevant constraint considerations set out in ‘Strategy 7 - Development in the Countryside’ and also other relevant constraint policies”.</p> <p>2.5. It is therefore a very good opportunity, in our view, for the Steering Group to assess small sites within both Colyton and Colyford which could be identified for development through the NDP. This will in turn provide additional certainty that local need will be met.</p> <p>2.6. Indeed, the recent housing needs survey from 2017, referred to within the draft NDP, confirms a need within the Parish for “at least 36 affordable homes in the next five years if local young people and others in housing need are to make a future in the Parish”.</p> <p>2.7. Given the housing needs survey is from 2017, the housing need in the Parish is likely to have increased over time so it is clear that there is a significant need for housing within the Parish. In our view, the NDP should be exploring opportunities to identify specific sites to meet this need.</p> <p>2.8. The draft NDP makes reference to the need for a 5-year review. However, given the 2017 housing needs survey, whilst already somewhat outdated, defines a clear local housing need, we recommend that opportunities to explore site allocations are looked at now as part of this NDP, rather than seeking to do this at the 5 year review stage.</p> <p>2.9. Such an approach would be consistent with the provisions of the NPPF and PPG. In establishing the presumption in favour of sustainable development, the NPPF at paragraph 11 sets out that “plans should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area, and be sufficiently flexible to adapt to rapid change”. Similarly, the national PPG encourages the preparation of NDPs which are forward-thinking, stating that “allocating sites and producing housing policies demonstrates that the neighbourhood plan is planning positively for new homes, and provides greater certainty for developers, infrastructure providers and the community. In turn this also contributes to the local authorities’ housing land supply, ensuring that the right homes are delivered in the right places” (paragraph 096, Reference ID 41-096-20190509).</p> <p><b>Savills on behalf of D Rymer owner of land at Clarkham Cottages</b></p>		
187	<p>Clarkham Cottages – The Opportunity The Site Draft Proposals</p> <p>4.17. The key benefits of allocating the site are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is well related to the village</li> <li>• Opportunity to enhance the Conservation Area by redeveloping a derelict site which is currently an eye-sore, whilst also restoring the street scene</li> </ul>	<p>Describes proposals for development of land at Clarkham Cottages with maps and other evidence</p>	<p>The NP incorporates a criteria-based approach. Any development proposal should satisfy the criteria of the NP. This will be a matter for the LPA to assess and the PC to consider when the proposals are put forward. No change necessary as a result of this comment.</p>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Close to local services and facilities, and therefore capable of helping to sustain these key local services.</li> <li>• Capable of accommodating small scale residential development which would be consistent with the emphasis set out in draft policies Coly6 and Coly7, including development which is sustainable, making best use of brownfield land and would be of an ‘infill’ nature.</li> <li>• Would contribute towards meeting the local housing need in the Plan area</li> <li>• The site would assist in providing a balanced approach to housing sites, and ensure the focus isn’t solely on Colyton.</li> <li>• Opportunity to explore the delivery of amenities which may be sought by the local community, for example the land to the rear of the site (edged blue on the Plan at Appendix 3), offers an opportunity to explore the delivery of a community orchard or an area for biodiversity enhancement.</li> <li>• Opportunity to deliver homes with high quality design and materials which respect the local vernacular, including stone and thatch.</li> <li>• 4.18. We therefore consider that the site should be considered for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan in order to increase certainty in the delivery of development within the village envelopes as well as allowing for development at Colyford to enable ‘balanced’ growth within the Plan area.</li> </ul> <p>4.24. Overall, we recommend the Steering Group consider this site for allocation in the NDP. We would be more than happy to discuss any aspect of the site with the Steering Group and assist with any queries. We are keen, on behalf of our client, to engage further with Colyton Parish Council and the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group to discuss the merits of the site in more detail and hope to be in touch in due course.</p> <p><b>Savills on behalf of D Rymer owner of land at Clarkham Cottages</b></p>		
	<b>POLICY Coly6</b>		
188	<p>Natural England is a statutory consultee in neighbourhood planning and must be consulted on draft neighbourhood development plans by the Parish/Town Councils or Neighbourhood Forums where they consider our interests would be affected by the proposals made.</p> <p>The Built Up Area Boundary (BUAB) for Colyton shown in the Neighbourhood Plan is consistent with the BUAB set out in the adopted East Devon Villages Plan. The adopted East Devon Local Plan states (in strategy 6) that development will be permitted within BUABs subject to a number of criteria. On the basis that the BUAB for Colyton has already established through the East Devon Villages Plan we have no comments.</p> <p>We would be happy to comment further should the need arise but if in the meantime you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact us.</p>	<p>Natural England has no issues with the pre-submission version of the NP</p>	<p>NE’s position is noted. It will be asked by EDDC to consider the Submission Version of the NP</p>

	<b>Natural England</b>		
189	8.10 suggest the following might be added <i>'but to meet the need for affordable housing small scale development outside the BUAB may be necessary provided that they receive significant public support'</i> .	Suggests the NP refers to the possibility that affordable housing on a small scale may be allowed outside the BUAB	This is covered by policy Coly8 No change necessary as a result of this comment.
190	8.12 suggest the following addition <i>'or it will provide locally needed and supported affordable housing'</i> .	Suggests the NP refers to the possibility that affordable housing on a small scale in the countryside	Point of view noted No change necessary as a result of this comment.
191	As worded, this may preclude some potentially suitable sites for development e.g. sites with green space to one side and edge of settlement sites. Suggest re-word criteria (iv) to say <i>"predominantly surrounded"</i> or give a definition on infill. <b>EDDC</b>	Suggests slight amendment to criterion iv	Amend iv to read: <i>"is infill and predominantly surrounded by existing development; and"</i>
192	Criteria (ii) – unclear what this means both in terms of sustainability, and also settlement hierarchy, given it relates to development within the Built Up Area Boundary (BUAB). Does it mean that a development must be suitable to be cited in the geography of Colyton, as a 'village with a BUAB, as opposed to a development which would be more suited to one of 7 main towns as identified in the Local Plan settlement hierarchy? Suggest remove this criteria or reword to more clearly specify the requirement/expectation. <b>EDDC</b>	Questions meaning of criterion ii	Delete <i>"having regard to the settlement hierarchy"</i>
193	Criteria (v) - suggest replace 'adverse impact' with 'no harm'. <b>EDDC</b>	Suggests criterion v is reworded	Reword v to read: <i>"there is no harmful impact on the Conservation Area and/or Listed Buildings."</i>
194	Other sites for potential affordable houses are identified to the West of Courtney Drive and to the extension of Cuthouse Meadows and the paddock below the picnic site (exception sites)	Proposes potential development sites	Point noted No change necessary as a result of this comment. <b>Refer proposals to PC</b>
195	... we also consider that Policy Coly6 would benefit from being extended to cover Colyford. It is noted that the draft policy provides support for 'sustainable development' within the built up area boundary, and where such development is appropriate in terms of setting, scale, height, massing and is a suitable infill / brownfield opportunity. Given the local housing need within the Parish, we consider that there would be a number of benefits to extending the general support for development to the village of Colyford. Principally, this would allow small 'infill' sites within and well related to the village of Colyford to accommodate small scale residential development, where they address the other criteria within the draft policy. This would have the dual benefit of both helping to meet housing need specific to Colyford, as well as allowing for a more even 'spread' of housing to be delivered across both Colyford and Colyton, thereby assisting in addressing housing need in both villages. Whilst Colyford does not have a defined settlement boundary within the East Devon Local Plan it does host a range of local services and facilities sufficient to be categorised 'sustainable' to accommodate small scale residential development within the village itself. Any small-scale infill development at Colyford would also	Advocates BUAB for Colyford	This matter has been discussed at length Colyford is regarded as countryside No change necessary as a result of this comment.

	<p>have the benefit of helping to sustain the local services and facilities within Colyford which rely heavily on the custom of local residents. Indeed, the sustainability of Colyford has recently been confirmed by the Inspector for the appeal at Land to the West of Coly Road, Colyford (Ref: APP/U1105/W/19/3233226). As part of this appeal, all parties agreed that the appeal scheme was in accordance with Strategy 35 of the adopted Local Plan. Strategy 35 supports small scale residential schemes where “the village or small town has a population that falls below 3,000 persons, the scheme is well designed using local materials, close to a range of community services and facilities (including four or more of a school, pub, village hall, shop/post office, doctors surgery, place of worship or public transport service) and sympathetic to the character of the settlement and has a satisfactory highway access” (underlining our emphasis). Whilst it is acknowledged that this policy relates to affordable housing exception sites, the conclusion of the Inspector, in agreement with all parties at the appeal, with reference to Strategy 35, demonstrates that Colyford is a sustainable location for small scale residential development.</p> <p><b>Savills on behalf of D Rymer owner of land at Clarkham Cottages</b></p>		
196	<p>I can see no specific reference to designing out crime, disorder or anti-social behaviour which I feel should be included within all such Neighbourhood Plans. Whilst these matters are covered within other national and council policies, I feel it is important that they are also embedded in such a plan. I would therefore suggest that the following statement or similar is included where appropriate, possibly within Draft Policy Coly 7 Housing Development with the Built-up Area Boundary section. “All development proposals should consider the need to design out crime, disorder and anti-social behaviour to ensure ongoing community safety and cohesion” This can apply to all forms of development not just housing. It may also be just as relevant for community facilities, new car parks, footpaths, play areas, commercial development etc. Designing out opportunities for crime and ASB will not only hopefully prevent or reduce such risk, but very importantly also help reduce the fear of crime. Thus, creating a safe and sustainable environment and not undermining the quality of life of community cohesion.</p> <p><b>Devon and Cornwall Police</b></p>	<p>Calls for inclusion of reference to designing out crime, disorder or anti-social behaviour and suggests addition to policy Coly7</p>	<p>Add criterion to policy Coly6 that reads:  <i>“All development proposals should consider the need to design out crime, disorder and anti-social behaviour to ensure ongoing community safety and cohesion”</i></p>
196A	<p>We also generally supportive of policy Coly6 regarding sustainable development. We note that under the section of ‘Built Environment, Heritage and Housing’ paragraph 8.16 mentions that new homes should be designed to address climate change which we support. You may consider including such an approach within an actual policy.</p> <p><b>Env. Agency</b></p>	<p>Suggest reference to including reference to climate change impact in policy</p>	<p>Extend criterion iv to read:  iv. is of sustainable design and construction to minimise the impact of climate change;</p>
	<b>Policy Coly7</b>		
197	<p>...I believe that 8.16 needs to be worded in much stronger terms and suggest as a minimum encouraged is replaced by expected.</p>	<p>Suggests that carbon neutrality message should be stronger</p>	<p>Review wording of 8.16 to reflect changes to policy</p>

			Coly6 regarding carbon neutrality
198	Criteria (i) - suggest this is made more precise by adding 'and existing development around the site' as the town has a range of character types. <b>EDDC</b>	Suggests addition to criterion i	Amend criterion i to read: <i>"design and layout are generally in keeping with the character of the town and existing development around the site"</i>
199	Criteria (iii) - suggest this should be 'pedestrian and cycle links' <b>EDDC</b>	Suggest addition to criterion iii	Amend criterion iii to read: <i>"opportunities to provide safe and secure pedestrian and cycle links throughout"</i>
200	Criteria (iv) – the use of "are considered" makes this criteria hard to require. Suggest replacing with "are utilised wherever practicable". <b>EDDC</b>	Suggests change to criterion iv	Amend criterion iv to read: <i>"opportunities to re-use existing buildings on the site are utilised wherever practicable"</i>
201	paragraph 8.13 – noted that within the policy justification here it is stated that new homes should be designed to address climate change in a meaningful way, and encourages 'passivhaus' and zero carbon construction. However, this is not within the policy wording currently and would need to be so in order to be required <b>EDDC</b>	Makes point about carbon neutrality needing to be part of the policy if it is to be addressed in a meaningful way	Reflect this point in change to policy Coly6 regarding carbon neutrality
202	Ceramtec site - Paragraph 8.6 says that Homes England "recently" acquired Ceramtec – better to say when (month/year) as this document is long term. <b>EDDC</b>	Asks for revised reference to sale of Ceramtec site	Amend para. 8.6 to include month and year of sale
203	paragraph 8.6 currently states, "Ceramtec has potential to fulfil the short to medium term housing need for affordable housing". Suggest this is amended to reflect the fact that need is constantly changing and we do not know when this scheme will come forward. The Housing Needs Survey identified an immediate need of 9, over 1-3 years the need is 16 and up to 5 years a further 13, whilst Ceramtec will provide 14 units. The survey was dated 2017 so we are already 3 years in and need is likely to have increased in this time. By 2022 the needs assessment will be 5 years old and may need to be updated to inform subsequent applications for housing development. By stating this, it would allow the District Council to ask developers to undertake needs assessments if we feel the data is out of date. <b>EDDC</b>	Asks for para. 8.6 to be revised to reflect the ever-changing nature of housing need	Revise wording to para. 8.6
204	paragraph 8.5 – correct the figure to reflect the need was for 36 not 30 affordable homes as stated here. <b>EDDC</b>	Says wrong figure is used in para. 8.5	Check number and change if necessary
205	The plan does not appear to have a map of Colyford built-up boundary. There is a map 8 for Colyton.	Asks where the BUAB map for Colyford is	There is no BUAB proposed for Colyford Ensure this is clear in para. 8.7
206	8.16 excellent policy!	Supports call for carbon neutral housing development	Reflect support in additional criterion regarding carbon neutrality in policy Coly6
207	Development of the Ceramtec site to be in sympathy with the Colyton Conservation Area on which it abuts. The use of local stone to be encouraged.	Calls for development at Ceramtec to reflect local vernacular	This should be covered by policy Coly7 as it will be amended
208	We support the general support shown for development within the settlement boundary, but consider this should be extended to Colyford.	Calls for BUAB for Colyford	This matter has been discussed at length

	<p>Whilst Colyford does not have a defined settlement boundary there are nonetheless good, sensible, opportunities to explore small housing development within the village to take advantage of brownfield sites which are available. Such sites would not extend the built 'fabric' of the village into the countryside so would be consistent with the 'thrust' of the draft policy.</p> <p>Such development would help to sustain the local services and facilities within Colyford which rely heavily on the custom of local residents.</p> <p><b>Savills on behalf of D Rymer owner of land at Clarkham Cottages</b></p>		<p>Colyford is regarded as countryside</p> <p>No change necessary as a result of this comment.</p>
	<b>POLICY Coly8</b>		
209	<p>Para 8.17 States that the Parish needs "at least" 36 Affordable Homes. Surely it is much safer to delete the "at least". Therefore, the target of 36 is more achievable, but hopefully the Parish could achieve more than 36 in the longer term.</p>	<p>Suggests "<i>at least</i>" is deleted from para 8.17</p>	<p>Ensure wording of para 8.17 reflects latest situation and agreed position with LPA. Delete "at least" if it is not relevant</p>
210	<p>Para 8.18 This Para states that the National Planning Policy is "very" encouraging etc. It would be a lot safer to delete the word "very", as this encourages developers to go for Exception Sites, as was recently done at the Old Cricket Ground site in the Green Wedge between Colyton and Colyford.</p>	<p>Expresses concern about how the word "very" could be used by developers</p>	<p>Delete "<i>very</i>" in para 8.18</p>
211	<p>Para 8.19 Is it now really necessary to protect development above the 200-foot contour? There are now at least 3 sites developed above this contour already, and it could possibly be an area that could be suitable for some future development.</p>	<p>Questions whether the PC policy is now relevant</p>	<p>Note comment. No change necessary as a result of this comment unless PC position has changed on this matter.</p>
212	<p>Para 8.18 – The word "very" encouraging should be deleted. The document must give no encouragement to speculative developers to go for exception sites, such as the Old Cricket Ground between Colyton and Colyford.</p>	<p>Expresses concern about how the word "very" could be used by developers</p>	<p>Delete "<i>very</i>" in para 8.18</p>
213	<p>Para 8.17 Cites the need for "at least" 36 new affordable homes within the parish, the needs survey showed up to 36 needed, so the "at least" should be removed. <b>CVRA</b></p>	<p>Suggests "<i>at least</i>" is deleted from para 8.17</p>	<p>Review housing needs and wording of para 8.17 to ensure it reflect latest situation and agreed position with LPA</p>
214	<p>Para 8.18 The use of the words "very encouraging" are likely to encourage developers to opt for exception sites, witness the recent attempt to develop the Old Cricket Ground in Colyford. The word "very" should be removed. <b>CVRA</b></p>	<p>Expresses concern about how the word "very" could be used by developers</p>	<p>Delete "<i>very</i>" in para 8.18</p>
215	<p>Page 29 para 8.18 omit 'very'</p>	<p>Expresses concern about how the word "very" could be used by developers</p>	<p>Delete "<i>very</i>" in para 8.18</p>
216	<p>Page 29 para. 8.17 delete "at least" for affordable homes</p>	<p>Suggests "<i>at least</i>" is deleted from para 8.17</p>	<p>Ensure wording of para 8.17 reflects latest situation and agreed position with LPA Delete "at least" if it is not relevant</p>
217	<p>Para 8.17 should delete the words 'at least' affordable homes.</p>	<p>Suggests "<i>at least</i>" is deleted from para 8.17</p>	<p>Ensure wording of para 8.17 reflects latest situation and agreed position with LPA Delete "at least" if it is not relevant</p>
218	<p>Affordable housing – the Parish Council's record on affordable housing is poor. While the issue is</p>	<p>Calls for more support/action by PC regarding affordable housing</p>	<p>Note comment <b>Refer to PC</b></p>

	now being pursued on its behalf by the Colyton and Colyford CLT help is needed from the Parish Council if suitable sites (especially viable brownfield ones) are to be identified.		
219	I would like to see 8.19 worded more objectively. Modern Maps have their contours in metres and at 5 metre intervals on 1:250000 scale 200 feet would be closest to the 60 metre contour And examination of the local Ordnance Survey map shows that this has already been exceeded not only at Seaway Head but also properties in Hillhead and Burnards Field Rd. Whilst I sympathise with the idea of impact on skyline it is not an objective criterion as the skyline of any building will depend upon the relative height of building and observer the direction from which it is viewed and the proximity of the observer, I suggest that as a condition of any construction that it should be subject to a rigorous visual impact assessment and how that building sits with the landscape and full consultation of the local community is engaged wherever possible when citing could be controversial. CPRE provides some useful guidance on rural affordable housing including the use of exception sites.	Questions whether the PC policy is now relevant	Note comment. No change necessary as a result of this comment unless PC position has changed on this matter.
220	8.5 and 8.17 there is a discrepancy in the quoted figures. Also, reference should be made to the fact that the 2017 housing needs survey has an expected life of five years but in the light of the Covid epidemic a new survey before 2022 may be advisable.	Points out discrepancy between housing needs figures quoted in 8.5 and 8.17	Review housing needs and wording of para 8.17 to ensure it reflect latest situation and agreed position with LPA and amend para. 8.5 as necessary
221	Affordable Homes On page 29 paragraph 8.17 (Coly8) it states that the Parish needs 'at least' 36 Affordable Homes. I think it would be preferable to merely state the number '36'.	Suggests "at least" is deleted from para 8.17	Review housing needs and wording of para 8.17 to ensure it reflect latest situation and agreed position with LPA
222	There is a fine line between providing much needed affordable housing and protecting the countryside, but I believe affordable housing is needed.	Wishes to give some priority to the provision of affordable housing	Note comment. No change necessary as a result of this comment unless PC position has changed on this matter.
223	Criteria (i) - suggest the term 'small site' should be qualified as its too subjective – the supporting text has suggested definitional criteria (see paragraph 8.19) so suggest these should be in the policy – this reflects Local Plan policy by saying up to 15. <b>EDDC</b>	Suggest defining "small"	Small is defined in para. 8.19 as 15. Ensure this 'definition' reads as applying to every exception site development. Include reference to size and density.
224	Does the Parish Council have preferred sites in mind, and has consideration been given to allocate any, working with the Community Land Trust (CLT)? Or make a preference to support schemes brought forward by its CLT? <b>EDDC</b>	Asks about likely sites for exception development	<b>Refer question to PC</b> No change necessary as a result of this comment
225	Noted there is no mention in the policy currently to house sizes or tenures. May wish to pick up on this, with reference to the Housing Needs Assessment / other evidence, and with reference to identified issues, including any criteria to facilitate housing being accessible for young people. <b>EDDC</b>	Suggests policy could refer to house sizes and tenures	It would be wrong to prescribe future housing need as it does change and needs to be assessed and justified at the time of application No change necessary as a result of this comment
226	Criteria (iv) re. historic buildings – do the Parish Council have something in mind? If so, suggest	Asks if the PC has any buildings in mind, if not suggests the principle	The criterion only applies to exception site development

	this would be better allowed for through a site-specific policy to allocate, and if not, to promote the principle instead through a separate heritage policy. Also, to be aware that redundant or historic buildings are not typically appropriate for re-use for affordable housing for reasons of viability/cost in terms of development, maintenance and cost of living <b>EDDC</b>	could be promote through a heritage policy	outside the BUAB. Therefore, it is best included in the exception site policy No change necessary as a result of this comment
227	Some of the criteria in Coly7 seems to need to also apply here e.g. pedestrian and cycle links? <b>EDDC</b>	Suggests pedestrian and cycle links criterion is included	This was not included as a policy requirement because of the potential difficulties in ensuring provision on and from a site in the countryside No change necessary as a result of this comment
228	The last paragraph of the policy regarding market homes is open to interpretation and considered overly restrictive. Given the Neighbourhood Plan will rely on the Local Plan/District Council evidence, include our viability assessment, this should align to Strategy 35 of the Local Plan, which allows market housing providing affordable housing is a minimum of 66% of the scheme. <b>EDDC</b>	Suggests cross-referencing policy to LP requirements	Mention the LP requirement in supporting text, thus ensuring the policy emphasise “small” number of market houses and only when “essential”.
229	8.17 The housing survey objectively identified that the affordable housing need was specific to Colyton. delete ‘the parish’ and insert ‘Colyton’.	Suggests that there is no housing needs assessed for Colyford	Ensure para. 8.17 reflects the survey findings Amend to read “Colyton Parish”
230	8.19 To be consistent with BUAB policy 4 <sup>th</sup> line should be amended to read “up to 15 dwellings within the BUAB or adjacent ...”	Suggests that development in BUAB should be limited to 15	The policy criterion applies to exception site development which, by definition, would take place outside the BUAB
<b>POLICY Coly9</b>			
231	Page 30 Surely there must be a priority to provide charging points for electric cars in the areas of Colyton and Colyford to cater for existing homes in the Parish.	Reminds us of the future demand from local residents	Covered by policy Coly17 No change necessary as a result of this comment
232	Para 8.23 As a result of recent new developments in Colyford, on street parking is now prevalent in the village, for example, at the southern end of Fairview Lane, where vehicles (cars and vans) are now being parked in the entrance road to The Elms, thereby making access to The Elms very congested and dangerous.	Makes point that recent development seem to be under-provided with parking space	Include reference to lack of adequate provision in recent developments
233	Para 8.24 This needs to be repeated re “charging plug in”, in other parts of the existing developments in the Parish around Colyton and Colyford e.g.: Colyton Public Car Park, the Reece Strawbridge and Peace Memorial Car Park, and Colyford Memorial Hall Car Park, and possibly at Colyton Grammar School, Colyford.	Advocates charging points/areas at public parking areas	Covered by policy Coly17 No change necessary as a result of this comment
234	Para 8.23 – On street parking is a problem in Colyford as a result of recent new developments.	Makes point that recent development seem to be under-provided with parking space	Include reference to lack of adequate provision in recent developments
235	Para 8.24 – There is an urgent priority to provide charging points for electric vehicles for existing homes in the Parish and additionally for visitors and users of amenities such as the Colyton public car park, Reece Strawbridge and Peace Memorial car park, Colyford Memorial Hall, Colyton Grammar School, Colyton Medical Practice and	Advocates charging points/areas at public parking areas	Covered by policy Coly17 No change necessary as a result of this comment

	encouraging/subsidising business in the Town to install charging points such as the Garden Centre, Colyton Tramway station, etc would be a good policy.		
236	The new and converted housing in Colyford at the Swan Hill Road end of Fairview Road was allowed with space for one car per household. This is patently not sufficient, and the additional vehicles are parked around the vicinity, sometimes on the pavement, into The Elms and Dares Orchard. We therefore endorse the proposal under this policy that any new houses with more than one bedroom should have sufficient space to park two vehicles off the street.	Makes point that recent development seem to be under-provided with parking space	Include reference to lack of adequate provision in recent developments
237	We note that the CPC in Policy No Coly 9 point E. calls for permeable materials to be used for surface parking areas where possible. This good intention is seen in most development plans for new housing these days. The problem comes in later years where householders change or renew their driveways and go to different, possibly not permeable materials, thereby adding to run off.	Expresses concern that householders change or renew their driveways without using permeable materials	Point noted but not a matter that can be addressed in the NP No change necessary as a result of this comment
238	Policy 9C Mentions charging points for new homes, however there is now an urgent need to incorporate in this policy the need to provide charging points for existing homes as well.	Advocates charging points for existing homes	Point noted but not a matter that can be addressed in the NP No change necessary as a result of this comment
239	Para 8.23 Provision of additional temporary parking facilities for vehicles need to be considered in hot-spots all around the parish where currently parking on-road causes danger and congestion. Examples of this are The Square in Colyton and the lower end of Fairview Lane in Colyford. <b>CVRA</b>	Calls for additional temporary parking facilities in key locations	This is not something that can be required of developers of new housing unless the required number of spaces cannot be met on-site. No change necessary as a result of this comment
240	Para 8.24 should mention the need for electric vehicle charging points in all public car parks around the parish. <b>CVRA</b>	Advocates charging points/areas at public parking areas	Covered by policy Coly17 No change necessary as a result of this comment
241	... the wording of 8.24 should be examined to imply that it must be a priority not an add on.	Says electric vehicle charging points should be a priority	Criterion C says charging points for electric cars should be included No change necessary as a result of this comment
242	Suggest remove 'seek to' as this weakens the policy. <b>EDDC</b>	Suggests deleting "seek to"	Delete "seek to" as part of re-wording of the policy
243	Criteria B - Noted this partly repeats Criteria A. Could reduce wording by stating the parking criteria once in terms of all new housing development and then making B cover the additional criterion for major housing development (10 dwellings or more). <b>EDDC</b>	Suggests a rewording of policy to avoid repetition and for clarity	Re-word policy to simplify it in line with the suggestion whilst acknowledging that with single dwelling development it may not always be possible to provide on-site, off-road parking
244	Noted B this goes further than Local Plan policy (TC9) by requiring visitor parking and cannot therefore rely of Local Plan evidence. It would be helpful to specify how many visitor parking spaces are required on major sites, but this would need to be justified. <b>EDDC</b>	Suggests ratio of visitor parking should be included in supporting text	Include reference to numbers of visitor parking by reference to relevant national guidance
245	Criteria C – re. Electric charge points - it would be specify that each new home should have an EV charge point. Further consideration may be needed as to the specification to ensure that	Points out that criterion regarding charging points may change in new LP	Criterion C is consistent with the adopted LP No change necessary as a result of this comment



	<p>what is provided is fit for purpose. We would question that this only applies to major development. The adopted Local Plan (para 16.49) states that “Charging points for electric vehicles should be made available in new developments throughout the District”, and Local Plan policy TC9 specifies “All small scale and large scale major developments should include charging points for electric cars. The emerging Local Plan is highly likely to require charging points (or as a minimum that cables are installed ready for connection), for every new house.</p> <p><b>EDDC</b></p>		
246	<p>Consider including provision for drop off for delivery vehicles and ensuring free flow of traffic for emergency vehicles as noted both are referenced in supporting text (paragraph 8.22) but not translated into policy as requirements.</p> <p><b>EDDC</b></p>	<p>Suggests including a criterion regarding delivery vehicles and ensuring free flow of traffic for emergency vehicles</p>	<p>Add criterion for major development as follows:  <i>“The layout of all major developments should incorporate additional off-street visitor car and cycle parking spaces, and accommodate delivery vehicles, or other forms of logistical support without, adversely impacting upon traffic circulation or road safety.”</i></p>
247	<p>Criteria D – From experience, we suggest only one bike space per dwelling will be proposed by developers, even for family dwellings, if it is specified as the minimum. To overcome this, consider specifying the number relative to house sizes as done with car spaces. Consider also requiring bike storage. <b>EDDC</b></p>	<p>Suggest you consider increasing the bike parking requirements for larger dwellings</p>	<p>Revise criterion for cycle parking spaces</p>
248	<p>Paragraph 8.25 refers to a ministerial statement from 2015 as recent – this could be paraphrased as although not recent it is still reflective of the national position. <b>EDDC</b></p>	<p>Suggests par-phrasing ministerial quote</p>	<p>Delete recent from 8.25</p>
249	<p>8.25 5<sup>th</sup> line, add “Parish” after Colyton.</p>	<p>Suggest the word “Parish” is added to ensure it is recognised that this is the PC’s policy position</p>	<p>Add “Parish” to para. 8.25</p>
250	<p>Parking provision at new housing development to be supported to reduce on street parking. An out of town parking area has been identified near the cemetery and within 8 minutes walking of the school and town centre.</p>	<p>Supports policy Coly9</p>	<p>No change necessary as a result of this comment</p>
<b>SECTION 9</b>			
251	<p>Para 9.6 However, parking for visitors to Colyton to shop in the Market Place and close by is very difficult and the small Public Car Park is often full.</p>	<p>Makes point about parking difficulties in the centre of Colyton</p>	<p>Note point  No change necessary as a result of this comment</p>
252	<p>should Para 9.6 also mention the new light Industrial Development in Rosemary Lane, Colyton?</p>	<p>Suggests mention of Rosemary Lane development</p>	<p>Add reference to Rosemary Lane development in para. 9.6</p>
253	<p>Para 9.6 – Parking in and around Market Place is very dangerous, especially for unfamiliar visitors. The car park is often full. I’m sure parking could be improved in this area and it is essential if you want to promote the shops. If it’s difficult or dangerous to park, people will opt for the convenience of Tesco’s and then the small shops, post office and pharmacy, which are the heart and soul of the Town will be lost forever.</p>	<p>Makes point about parking difficulties in the centre of Colyton</p>	<p>Note point  No change necessary as a result of this comment</p>
254	<p>9.7 We find the wording of this paragraph unwieldy. Could we suggest:</p>	<p>Suggest minor re-wording of para. 9.7</p>	<p>Amend para as suggested</p>

	<i>Colyford is less well served with retail and service outlets. It has a general store and post office, a butcher, two pubs, one hotel restaurant, a cafe, a cycle repair shop and, away from the centre of the village, a wholesale patisserie.</i>		
255	Suggest at first mention of The Patisserie (paragraph 9.1) this states briefly in brackets what this employer is (wholesale patisserie?) <b>EDDC</b>	Suggests add more details of the patisserie	Add a little more detail of Vaniers in para 9.1
256	would also be useful to state briefly at first mention and at 9.3 what Ceramtec was, when it closed. <b>EDDC</b>	Suggests mention of what Ceramtec produced	Add reference to what Ceramtec produced in para. 9.3
257	Suggest paragraph 9.5 would flow better relocated to after paragraph 9.8. <b>EDDC</b>	Suggests para. 9.5 goes to end of Introductory section	Relocate para. 9.5 to end of Introduction
258	9.1 Is the Leisure Centre (first mention of this significant Parish amenity asset, by the way) really a significant employer?	Questions if Leisure Centre is a significant employer	Nobody else has questioned this. No change necessary as a result of this comment
259	9.8 Amend to read <i>“there is very limited public transport to serve the commuting need and access to principle healthcare provision in Exeter”</i> .	Asks for reference to problems of travelling to healthcare by public transport	The subject of para 9.8 is commuting. Travel by public transport to community facilities is addressed elsewhere in the NP. No change necessary as a result of this comment
<b>POLICY Coly10</b>			
260	Since the Neighbourhood Plan was drafted, Covid-19 has brought many fundamental changes to the way in which we live, work and travel. Although the pandemic has devastated lives, we believe there could be opportunities for positive benefits to our community. To give one example – we are already witnessing a huge exodus from cities to rural areas like ours, and this trend is likely to increase in future years. On one hand this may drive up property prices, increase the need for new housing, and bring more traffic to minor roads. But it could also create a rare opportunity to stimulate and regenerate our parish. Many of us have older children or grandchildren who were educated at local schools, but were driven away by a lack of housing and employment. It is possible that there may be a reversal of this trend, and if we are prepared, this could bring a much needed boost to the local economy and a trend towards a younger - and dare we say it, more ethnically diverse demographic! We see this as a healthy thing for the community, and there is nowhere better for children to grow up than this amazing part of Devon. By welcoming young families to the area and allowing them to establish small ‘virtual’ business, we have the opportunity to build a flourishing community for the future. With this in mind, we support the aims set out in Clauses 9.9. 9.10 and 9.11, especially in relation to ‘encouraging small enterprise and facilitating more homeworking.’ We predict an increase in applications to create homes, small offices and workshops, and we believe that the community should look positively at these applications, so long as they are constructed to the highest possible sustainable standards, with the	Supports policy Coly10	Note support No change necessary as a result of this comment

	minimum impact on our fragile environment and wildlife.		
261	Para 9.9 Lacks any ambition to create a 21st century diverse local economy which encourages rural skills-based enterprises, home working, creative and internet tech enterprises, facilitating collaborative tech hubs for young entrepreneurs who can stimulate economic growth and higher paid employment to begin to address the chronic housing affordability issues. The provision of affordable and social housing is only one part of the creation of a self-sufficient vibrant local economy which is not so highly reliant on social housing and welfare benefits. <b>CVRA</b>	Criticises the lack of ambition and a local economic strategy	Developing a strategy for economic wellbeing is outside the scope of the NP. No change necessary as a result of this comment <b>Refer comment to PC</b>
262	Unclear why this policy only applies in residential areas? Perhaps residential area was intended to mean within the Built Up Area Boundary, in which case it should use that term, or if it is wider than this, clarify the area that policy is intended to relate to. <b>EDDC</b>	Questions why the policy applies only to residential areas	The policy is intended to build on the LP policy and support suitable economic development in non-business zones, specifically within residential areas subject to strict criteria. No change necessary as a result of this comment
263	Similarly, without clarification, to note that by implication Local Plan policy S7 Development in the Countryside would most likely be relied upon in considering proposals for employment use across the remainder of the neighbourhood plan area. <b>EDDC</b>	Points out that outside residential areas other development plan policies apply	Point noted No change necessary as a result of this comment
264	Could also consider protecting existing employment uses/sites through policy, as well as enabling new. To be aware that without safeguarding or allocating of sites for employment within the BUAB, reliance on the Local Plan would usually allow housing otherwise. <b>EDDC</b>	Suggests policy could be included to protect existing employment sites	The LP Strategy 32 protects current or allocated employment land but, because of EDDCs warning, add clause to policy Coly9 protecting existing employment uses/sites
265	Perhaps live-work unit provision could be an opportunity for delivery by the CLT. <b>EDDC</b>	Speculates that CLT could deliver live-work units	<b>Refer comment to CLT and PC</b>
266	Overall, consider this Policy/the plan could more proactively support / promote employment uses, particularly workshops, in line with the findings of surveys of workspace needs conducted in the area following the loss of jobs associated with the close of Ceramtec. Suggest the plan text refers to the redevelopment of Colyton Old Town Mill for business use, if this is proceeding. <b>EDDC</b>	Calls for reference in supporting text to the redevelopment of Colyton Old Town Mill for business use	Add reference in supporting text to the redevelopment of Colyton Old Town Mill for business use
267	Paragraph 9.10 – document in footnotes 27 and 28 is a pre-adoption version of the Villages Plan – this should now refer to the adopted document. <b>EDDC</b>	Points out the footnote needs to be up-dated	Up-date footnote
268	To promote more working from home and to encourage the use of redundant farm buildings for fledgling businesses with low rents. To encourage the take up of workshops at the town mills.	Supports home-working, farm diversification and re-use of town mills	Point noted No change necessary as a result of this comment
	<b>POLICY Coly11</b>		
269	Para 9.13 There is no mention here or anywhere else, of the Colyton Carnival Week, or the Colyford Goose Fayre, and Beating of the Bounds.	Suggests various local events are listed	Extend Para 9.15 to mention specific tourist attracting events that celebrate the area's history, heritage and character
270	Para 9.13 There is no mention of two large and popular events in the parish, namely the Colyton Carnival Week and the Colyford Goose Fair, both	Suggests various local events are listed	Extend Para 9.15 to mention specific tourist attracting events that celebrate the

	of which bring large numbers of people from the surrounding area and afar into the parish. Colyford also organises a Beating of the Bounds event every year which is very well supported by local people. <b>CVRA</b>		area's history, heritage and character
271	para. 9.13 mention the goose Fayre and Magna carta in Colyford	Suggests various local events are listed	Extend Para 9.15 to mention specific tourist attracting events that celebrate the area's history, heritage and character
272	Suggest this policy could be clearer what it is and isn't intended to permit. Consideration to be given to defining "tourism-related" business as this could arguably cover a very wide range of business uses that both directly and indirect support tourism, although it is acknowledged that the criteria are helpful in controlling adverse impact.	Suggests that "tourism-related" is defined	The following definition could be included in the Glossary and cross-reference in the policy: <i>"Tourism Related Business – a business that offers sustainable accommodation or recreation space to visitors to the area, for example those who wish to enjoy the countryside, heritage and natural and built environment of the locality."</i>
273	Criteria (i), however, re. scale is considered difficult to apply if there is no existing activity.	Suggests that criteria i should be re-worded	Re-word criteria i: <i>"the scale of development is proportionate to existing activity in the parish and the immediate locality"</i> and explained in the supporting text
274	Reasons behind the policy set out in paragraph 9.15 could be brought into criteria – e.g. particularly support those that are related to the enjoyment and appreciation of the area's history, heritage and character. <b>EDDC</b>	Suggests policy could refer to the area's unique history and character, which is reflected in its buildings, infrastructure, and several annual events.	Add reference in the supporting text to particularly support those that are related to the enjoyment and appreciation of the area's history, heritage and character
275	Criteria (iii) suggest replace "mitigated by extensive landscaping" with "mitigated as appropriate by landscaping". <b>EDDC</b>	Suggests re-wording of criterion iii	Re-word iii to read <i>"mitigated as appropriate by landscaping"</i> .
276	Criteria (iv) suggest replacing 'issues' with 'matters'. <b>EDDC</b>	Suggests re-wording of criterion iv so all traffic matters are addressed not just 'issues'	Re-word iv to read: <i>"traffic, access and highway matters are satisfactorily addressed."</i>
277	Consider adding a criteria to say are supported provided that they respects the heritage and local character, on the basis only landscape character referred to as written. <b>EDDC</b>	Suggests additional criterion is added	Add the following criterion to the policy: <i>"They respect the area's heritage and historic character"</i>
278	.. encourage self-catering and glamping farm visits on farms in the parish	Encourages farm-based tourism development	Add reference to countryside tourism in para, 9.15
<b>POLICY Coly12</b>			
279	Para 9.16 Line 3 add: stopping at "the Tramway Station" by the White Hart Inn etc.	Suggests adding: <i>".... the Tramway Station by the"</i>	Add <i>".... the Tramway Station by the"</i> to 9.16
280	Para 9.16 Line 5 amend to: Work is now in place to provide an additional "Halt" to serve etc.	Suggests up-dating reference to Wetlands	Para 9.16 up-date reference to Wetlands halt as appropriate
281	Para 9.17 Amend last line to read: At Colyford too, the Tram Station is on the edge of the "village", also with inadequate or lack of footpaths alongside the A3052.	Suggests addition to end of para. 9.17	Add <i>"village, which also has inadequate safe footpath links alongside the A3052."</i>

282	Para 9.18 The last sentence must be deleted completely. The Tramway is too expensive to be used to commute between Colyford, Colyton and Seaton.	Calls for last sentence of 9.18 to be deleted	Review para. 9.18 in the light of several comments
283	Transport & Travel – Use of Tram - Business & Jobs/Para 9.17 – Not only is there a need to improve the pedestrian route from the Tramway to the town, but it also needs to be improved to the village. Pedestrian routes are mentioned throughout the document and are a real problem. The lack of pavement across the River Coly adjacent to the White Hart Inn is very dangerous.	Emphasises the need to improve pedestrian routes throughout the pariah	<b>Refer comment to PC</b> No change necessary as a result of this comment
284	Could the Parish reach agreement with South West Water to build a footbridge adjacent to the road bridge with a right of way across the small patch of land adjacent to their pumping station? If this wasn't possible a footpath could be created if a chicane was installed over the bridge, (similar to the one leading to the Town) this would also serve as a traffic calming measure. A pedestrian crossing to the tramway stop at Colyford could run adjacent to the actual tramway crossing, thus not littering the highway with signs and crossings.	Makes suggestions for improved pedestrian facilities	<b>Refer comment to PC</b> No change necessary as a result of this comment
285	Para 9.18 – This paragraph should be reflective that the tramway is in fact too expensive to be used for a commute. This is a real shame as it would be an excellent way to bring trade to Colyton without bringing the problem of cars and parking. It is also an environmentally friendly way to move between Colyton, Colyford and Seaton. If pavements were improved and some sort of subsidy for local residents to use the tram was agreed, I am certain it would be popular. Even if there a special timetable for a “commuter tram”.	Questions whether the tramway could ever be a regular mode of transport for local people	Review para. 9.18 in the light of several comments
286	9.16 Whilst this states that the Tramway offers residents an alternative way to approach Seaton, we do not believe this to be a practical suggestion. For sure, residents could use the Tramway but in reality, how many do, apart from with their own visitors? Surely it is too expensive to use on a regular basis and both stations are some way from the centre of the villages, even with the Loyalty Card the Tramway offers.	Questions whether the tramway could ever be a regular mode of transport for local people	Review para. 9.18 in the light of several comments
287	Para 9.16 Planning permission for the additional “Halt” for the Wetlands has been approved, so this paragraph should reflect that by updating the wording. This paragraph needs to include making pedestrian access to Colyford from the Wetlands Halt and the White Hart Halt safe, as the new halt will increase footfall to the village from both. <b>CVRA</b>	Suggests up-dating reference to Wetlands	Para 9.16 up-date reference to Wetlands halt as appropriate
288	Also, the reference to the tramway “ <i>providing an alternative way for parishioners to approach Seaton</i> ” is misleading, the service only runs for part of the year and using it regularly would be prohibitively costly, this sentence should be removed. <b>CVRA</b>	Questions whether the tramway could ever be a regular mode of transport for local people	Review para. 9.18 in the light of several comments
289	Para 9.18 There is minimal signage to Colyford village from the White Hart tram stop, also the route involves crossing the narrow bridge along the A3052 over the River Coly which is very dangerous for pedestrians, improving the safety	Points out that pedestrian routes and signage are inadequate	Point noted <b>Refer to PC</b> Address pedestrian issues at Colyford with addition to para. 9.17

	of this bridge should be explicitly mentioned. <b>CVRA</b>		Add " <i>village, which also has inadequate safe footpath links alongside the A3052.</i> "
290	Para 9.16 add ' <i>beautiful countryside, passing through Seaton Wetlands, stopping at</i> '	Suggest adding " <i>passing through Seaton Wetlands</i> "	Amend 2 <sup>nd</sup> sentence to read; <i>"After leaving Seaton it traverses beautiful countryside passing through Wetlands, stopping at the White Hart...."</i>
291	Para. 9.18 the tramway is too expensive and not adequate for community use	Questions whether the tramway could ever be a regular mode of transport for local people	Review para. 9.18 in the light of several comments
292	Para 9.16 the tramway does not really offer an alternative way to travel to Seaton or Colyton. It is expensive and the timetable does not lend itself to regular local use. It is a wonderful tourist attraction for our area.	Questions whether the tramway could ever be a regular mode of transport for local people	Review para. 9.18 in the light of several comments
293	Tramway links – the tramway is very important to the local economy. The pedestrian link to the town centre needs action.	Supports policy	No change necessary as a result of this comment
294	para. 9.18 states " <i>we should pursue opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport</i> ". New Government investment for improving and developing cycle lanes, tracks etc was announced by the Transport Minister Grant Shapps back in July this year.	Points out that the Government is supportive of new initiatives	<b>Refer to PC</b> No change necessary as a result of this comment
295	Query whether these improvements would fall outside development that is permitted by the green wedge policy as currently written. <b>EDDC</b>	Questions whether tramway links would be prevented by policy Coly4	Review implications of final version of Green Wedge policy Coly4 on policy Coly12
296	9.16 It is disingenuous to tout the tramway as a viable form of public transport. No resident discounts are available, and fares priced at premium levels commensurate with its primary function as a tourist attraction.	Questions whether the tramway could ever be a regular mode of transport for local people	Review para. 9.18 in the light of several comments
297	9.17 last line after settlement add "with no continuous footway access to village amenities"	Proposes addition to para. 9.17	Add to para. 9.17: <i>"village, which also has inadequate safe footpath links alongside the A3052."</i>
298	Better signage and road markings to improve tramway to town links	Calls for better signage and road markings to help pedestrian links	Pedestrian management is not a matter for the NP <b>Refer to PC</b>
<b>POLICY Coly13</b>			
299	Para 9.20 Delete "We want" and replace with "We demand".	Wants NP to be more demanding	The NP should not be used as a 'manifesto'. No change necessary as a result of this comment
300	I suggest the PC act on policy Coly13 urgently once the plan is agreed.	Supports policy Coly13 and calls for the PC to be pro-active	<b>Refer comment to PC</b>
301	Connectivity – super-fast communication infrastructure is badly needed and will be most effectively achieved across the parish if driven by the council.	Calls for the PC to be pro-active	<b>Refer comment to PC</b>
302	Suggest this is strengthened to make it a requirement of new development, by deleting the words "seek to" from the second part. This policy wording from the Newton Poppleford & Harford Neighbourhood Plan which has recently been examined goes slightly further, and may be a useful example to consider: <i>"Future improvements to mobile phone reception and superfast broadband infrastructure serving the Parish will be supported where it is sensitively</i>	Suggests the SG consider the wording of the Newton Poppleford & Harford Neighbourhood Plan which has recently been examined and takes a firmer position.	Revise wording of policy Coly13 in line with the NP&H NP



	<i>sited and sympathetically designed. Suitable ducting to accommodate FTTP broadband should be provided in all new development. Where practical, all new residential, educational and business premises will be required to make provision for the latest highspeed broadband and other communication networks.” EDDC</i>		
	<b>SECTION 10</b>		
303	Limit expansion of Colyton Grammar School as it has outgrown the site and transportation of pupils is dangerous.	Wishes to limit further development of CGS	Note point No change necessary as a result of this comment
304	Para 10.1 It ranges from “very busy” to “extremely busy”.	Suggests re-wording of para. 10.1	Note point No change necessary as a result of this comment
305	Para 10.2 Despite a town centre car park, “which is often full”, there is a regular problem.	Proposes the addition of “ <i>which is often full</i> ”	This assertion has been challenged previously. No change necessary as a result of this comment
306	Para 10.3 Add at the end: “in Colyford, the traffic issue relates to the periods at the beginning and end of the Grammar School day during Term time.	Suggests an addition to the para. 10.3 to provide context to the Colyford problem with the CGS	Add at the end of para. 10.3: “ <i>in Colyford, the traffic issue relates to the periods at the beginning and end of the Grammar School day during Term time.</i> ”
307	Para 10.4 Line 3 Amend to: There are “no” direct links to Sidmouth, Exeter, “or Lyme Regis”	Says there are no direct links via public transport	Para 10.4 Amend to: There are “no” direct links to Sidmouth, Exeter, “or Lyme Regis”
308	Para 10.5 This para needs beefing up. I suggest that the following is added: “It is essential that the gap in the route between Seaton and Colyford is completed without any further delay. In addition, it is essential that the Stop Line Way Multi-User Path between Colyford and Axminster is commissioned without any further delay. This would then allow cyclists from Seaton, Colyford, Colyton, Whitford, and Musbury to commute by cycle to Axminster Railway Station, and then on towards Exeter or Dorchester and Southampton to work, rather than use a car. This would be a great asset to the area regarding commuting, and a significant contribution towards reducing the Carbon Footprint in these areas of East Devon and is in accordance with Section 9 of the NPPF.	Wishes to advance the cause of the Stop Line	Include reference to strength of feeling about the Stop Line amongst the community
309	Para 10.3 – The traffic issues in Colyford at the beginning and the end of the school day during term time.	Suggests an addition to the para. 10.3 to provide context to the Colyford problem with the CGS	Add at the end of para. 10.3: “ <i>in Colyford, the traffic issue relates to the periods at the beginning and end of the Grammar School day during Term time.</i> ”
310	Para 10.4 – There are no direct links to Sidmouth, Exeter or Lyme Regis.	Says there are no direct links via public transport	Amend sentence to reflect current situation
311	Para 10.5 – It is high priority that the route between Seaton and Colyford is completed and the stop line way multi-user path between Colyford and Administer be commissioned asap to allow cyclists to commute safely by cycle to Axminster railway station and onwards by train, as opposed to car use. This would again help reduce the carbon footprint and have a massive health benefit to boot.	Suggests an addition to the para. 10.3 to provide context to the Colyford problem with the CGS	Include reference to strength of feeling about the Stop Line amongst the community
312	10.1 We are grateful for the introduction of the Speedwatch team in Colyford and the VAS but we are surprised that there is no mention of	Expresses concerns about traffic speed in Colyford	Traffic management is outside the scope of a land use plan

	actual speed of the traffic through the village. In the past few months, we have observed many vehicles travelling in excess of 50mph and some over 60mph. There is no pedestrian crossing apart from island just below the junction with Seaton Road. In the Parish Plan of 2008, it was noted that there was too much traffic travelling too fast – plus ça change!		No change necessary as a result of this comment
313	10.4 .... we do not believe that the Tramway can be listed as an alternative mode of transport for residents.	Questions whether the tramway could ever be a regular mode of transport for local people	Address this comment with revisions to para. 9.18
314	Para 10.3 It should be noted here that the traffic problems associated with the Grammar School in Colyford only occur for a short window of time in the morning and afternoon during the set down and pick up of pupils during term time. <b>CVRA</b>	Suggests an addition to the para. 10.3 to provide context to the Colyford problem with the CGS	Add at the end of para. 10.3: <i>“in Colyford, the traffic issue relates to the periods at the beginning and end of the Grammar School day during Term time.”</i>
315	Para 10.4 Is inaccurate, there are no direct public transport services to Sidmouth, Lyme Regis or Exeter. <b>CVRA</b>	Says there are no direct links via public transport	Amend sentence to reflect current situation
316	Paras 10.5 and 10.10 Should recognise that there is an urgent need for completion of the ‘Stop Line Way’ between Seaton and Axminster to promote tourism and provide a safe and healthy route for cyclists to Axminster Station for onward travel to Exeter, Dorchester and other major conurbations for work and leisure. <b>CVRA</b>	Wishes to advance the cause of the Stop Line	Include reference to strength of feeling about the Stop Line amongst the community
317	There is no clear plan for the residents of Colyford to safely walk through the village on the very narrow or non-existing footpath. Neither is there any mention of slowing the fast-moving traffic despite it being a 30mph zone. The flashing signs at either end have very little effect – surely something should be put in place.	Calls for a walking plan and traffic management measures	These matters are outside the scope of the NP <b>Refer to PC</b>
318	Para 10.4 omit ‘there are few...to Sidmouth or Exeter’ add.... ‘Whilst there are a few services to Sidmouth or Exeter, services do exist from Seaton via Harepath road. This stop is a reasonable walk from Colyford.	Says there are no direct links via public transport	Amend sentence to reflect current situation
319	para 10.3 add .. <i>in Colyford the traffic issues relate to periods at the start and end of the grammar School day during term times.</i>	Makes point that ‘issue’ is only at certain times	Add at the end of para. 10.3: <i>“in Colyford, the traffic issue relates to the periods at the beginning and end of the Grammar School day during Term time.”</i>
320	Para. 10.4 no direct links to Sidmouth/Exeter (hospital) or Lyme Regis	Says there are no direct links via public transport	Amend sentence to reflect current situation
321	para.10.5 it states that completion of the Stopleveline Way cycle route is a "community priority". This is a farce, as the development of the Stopleveline Way over the last five years has been little short of pathetic. There is no signage whatsoever of the Stopleveline Way on the entrance to the Seaton Wetlands track, just one very small notice of it being for joint use of cyclists and walkers at the Colyford end, nothing at all at the cemetery end which is the most used access point, and no further development to date from Seaton Underflete.	Complains about lack of progress with Stop Line	<b>Refer comment to PC</b> No change necessary as a result of this comment
322	it would be an excellent idea to incorporate the need for a pedestrian crossing in Colyford, and a strong intention to introduce a speed limit of 20mph on the A3052 through the village - given	Advocate road safety measures in Colyford	These matters are outside the scope of the NP No change necessary as a result of this comment



	the close proximity to a large school and school children crossing a busy road.		<b>Refer comment to PC</b>
323	Transport and parking could be improved but I believe is outside the scope of the NP Safer routes/pavements to school would be ideal but again I believe this is outside of the scope of the NP, as is the buses problem at Colyford.	Advocate improvements to public transport and road safety measures but recognises that these matters are outside the scope of the NP	No change necessary as a result of this comment
324	Community survey from 2008 - quoted in paragraph 10.6 is a bit old – it says the “community priorities have not changed” – can this statement be evidenced? <b>EDDC</b>	Questions whether there is evidence that the community’s priorities have not changed	Add a reference to the comments received during this consultation and at previous consultations
325	Suggest including statement at end of 10.4 that the tramway is a major Devon tourist attraction with x no. visitors per annum in the tourism section instead of the Transport & Travel. <b>EDDC</b>	Suggests adding reference to Tramway’s tourism impact in Section 9	Add reference to Tramway’s tourism impact in Section 9
326	Colyton is a great place to live and people are helpful and friendly. We feel lucky to live here. Your plan is thoughtful, and you seem aware that traffic and parking are real issues for us all. It would be so good if a few simple measures could improve the roads for us all.	Supports NP	No change necessary as a result of this comment.
327	I have read your plan for Colyton and would like to comment on one issue that affects the road where Queen Street meets King Street. I live in Old Court House with my husband. The house is one of five cottages that are seriously old and therefore vulnerable. Ours is timber-framed. Almost daily lorries that are too large come down Queen Street to then enter King Street. The corner by the Methodist Church is tight and narrow. The drivers are unaware of what they are going to find and try the corner. Would it be possible to put up signage to indicate the narrow corner with size restriction? Other roads in Colyton have this problem and I have seen holes in the walls where lorries have misjudged the space. Could Colyton restrict the very large lorries in the smaller streets? Traffic calming could also be considered in the narrow part of Dolphin Street as it is quite dangerous to walk there at certain busy times of day.	Traffic management measures are outside the scope of the NP	<b>Refer suggestion to PC</b>
328	Para 10.3 asserts ‘Residents are quite used to sharing the road with motor and other vehicles. This is not such a problem, as long as those in charge of the vehicles recognise and respect this.’ I would argue that for the main road between Colyton and Colyford this is a problem. The connecting roads between the two are not safe, and subsequently are not used by a considerable number of cyclists and pedestrians. To assume that motorists recognise the dangers to other users on this key road downplays the impact the lack of safe access has on community connectivity. If we are to limit traffic and increase sustainable travel between Colyton, Colyford and Seaton then the introduction of safe walking and cycling is needed. There seems little space or capacity to introduce new routes yet the first period of lockdown in 2020 highlighted just how many residents make use of the connected routes on foot or bike when the volume of vehicles is reduced.	Traffic management measures are outside the scope of the NP	<b>Refer suggestion to PC</b>

	I propose that as well as statements of intent and strategy relating to connectivity and the environment, we invite potential schemes for achieving improvements now.		
329	10.1 3 <sup>rd</sup> line after "delivery vehicles" add "farm machinery"	Wants to point out that farming vehicles have to use roads as well	Add " <i>and farm vehicles</i> "
330	10.1 last line after VAS add "to promote compliance with 30 mph speed limit"	Seeks addition to para. 10.1	Add " <i>to promote compliance with the speed limit</i> "
331	10.4 The tramway does not serve the Parish in this way.	Questions value of Tramway to Parish	Point noted No change necessary as a result of this comment.
332	The increase in traffic movements is already having detrimental effects on Colyton's streets. With road surfaces being broken up there is no doubt that the services running beneath will become closer to disruption or collapse (as has occurred in Dolphin Street alongside the Colcombe Castle).	Points out that the heavy traffic is damaging road surfaces	This matter is outside the scope of the NP No change necessary as a result of this comment
333	The three main(?) roads into the town all have problems. There should be an integrated study of all the problems in an attempt to avoid the sort of piecemeal approach which leads to streets being dug up twice within 12 months.	Calls for an integrated transport study	Such a study is outside the scope of the NP <b>Refer to PC</b>
334	Seaton Rd, Colyford urgent need for road signage to warn motorists of pedestrians and cyclists and vice versa. Footway urgently needed between Popes Lane and Stafford Barton on the A3052. The cycle way through Colyford needs more signage.	Calls for more signage	This matter is outside the scope of the NP No change necessary as a result of this comment
335	Far more beneficial to the residents of Colyford would be a pedestrian crossing across the busy A3052 and traffic calming measures of some form - a village gateway as they have in Axmouth or traffic lights as they have in Sidford and a pavement from the White Hart and also from Elm Farm Lane to Gully Shute. The traffic speeds through the village with the majority of motorists paying little attention to the 30mph speed restriction. Speed cameras would be a deterrent and with the increase in pedestrians and cyclists on the road this should be given priority but the plans barely give it a mention. Surely these sorts of issues are some of the things the parish plan should be highlighting - things that will benefit the residents of the village.	Traffic management and control measures are outside the scope of the NP	<b>Refer suggestion to PC</b>
<b>POLICY Coly14</b>			
336	Para 10.8 There are only 2 bus services in the Parish. The 885 from Seaton to Axminster (daytime only), and the 20 from Seaton to Taunton on a long and meandering route taking some one and a half hours in each direction, and with only 3 buses per day, each way. Urgent bus routes to Sidmouth and Exeter (especially to Hospitals), are required without any further delay. This would also greatly reduce car movements in the area.	Points out the inadequacy of the current level of provision and calls for more bus routes	Ensure para. 10.4 adequately describes the current level of service and the frustrations expressed by the community
337	Para 10.8 – I have noticed that many of the buses going up and down Coly Road are empty (albeit Covid is probably distorting the usage), however a rethink of the bus sizes (downsize) and frequency (increase) should be looked at. Urgent bus routes to Sidmouth and Exeter are needed	Calls for smaller buses to be used	This matter is outside the scope of the NP No change necessary as a result of this comment

	and again this would greatly reduce car movements, thus reducing the carbon footprint in the area.		
338	10.8 we do not believe that the Tramway offers an alternative mode of transport to residents based on its current fares and timetables.	Questions value of Tramway to Parish	Replace the first two sentences of para. 10.8 with: <i>"We support the more general use of alternative transport modes to the private motor car."</i>
339	Para 10.8 more importance should be placed on a good regular (perhaps shuttle buses for local use) for reasons of environment/pollution.	Advocates a regular shuttle bus	No change necessary as a result of this comment
340	This policy may be more appropriate as a community action with locations for new bus stops etc. identified as it is unclear what development, if any, requiring planning permission would be subject to this policy. And/or the policy could be reframed to reflect that ensuring access to public transport and making appropriate links to it are incorporated in new development proposals as a criteria against which development proposals would be judged. <b>EDDC</b>	Questions whether the policy is needed	This policy helps make a statement in support of public transport No change necessary as a result of this comment
341	10.8 last line amend to read ".. residents want and need to visit"	Suggests an addition to para.	Amend end of para. 10.8 to read: <i>".. residents want to go and need to visit"</i>
342	The scandal of the closure of bed spaces in our local Seaton Hospital needs addressing to relieve pressure on the Exeter hospital	Makes point about closure of Seaton Hospital	This matter is outside the scope of the NP No change necessary as a result of this comment
<b>Policy Coly15</b>			
343	Para 10.10 Add to the end of this para: "and would encourage off road cycle routes, especially to Axminster and Seaton".	Suggests an addition to para.	Add to end of para. 10.10: <i>"and would encourage off road cycle routes, especially to Axminster and Seaton"</i> .
344	Para 10.13 A pedestrian controlled crossing across the A 3052 in Colyford near to the Memorial Hall/ Post Office is essential. It has been promised for years, but nothing has happened to date.	Calls for pedestrian crossing	This matter is outside the scope of the NP No change necessary as a result of this comment <b>Refer to PC</b>
345	Para 10.10 – add some wording to the end of this para ... <i>"and would encourage off road cycle routes, especially to Axminster and Seaton."</i>	Suggests an addition to para.	Add to end of para. 10.10: <i>"and would encourage off road cycle routes, especially to Axminster and Seaton"</i> .
346	Para 10.11 – There is a footpath from Coly Road to the first cottage (Pear Tree Cottage) and then pedestrians have to walk on the road, often with their back to the oncoming traffic, due to the dangerous nature of crossing the road and then having to cross again to access the field or rejoin the footpath.	Points out the inadequacies of the footpath system in Colyford	Point noted. No change necessary as a result of this comment
347	10.11 We would ask you to include the lack of footways along the Seaton Road from the junction with the A3052 to the entrance to the Wetlands. Many locals and visitors walk up and down this road and the lack of pavements makes it a less than pleasant experience. In fact, it is not just the lack of pavements which makes this a dangerous walk but also the speed of many of the vehicles travelling this stretch of road.	Asks for reference to the lack of footways along the Seaton Road for visitors to the Wetlands	Add reference to the lack of footway access for visitors to the Wetlands
348	Para 10.13 There was funding agreed for a controlled crossing to be installed in Colyford to	Complains about lack of action on pedestrian crossing	This matter is outside the scope of the NP

	make crossing the A3052 safer, as this still hasn't been installed this needs to be included explicitly as a requirement within this paragraph. <b>CVRA</b>		No change necessary as a result of this comment <b>Refer comment to PC</b>
349	Creation of more traffic-free cycling routes would be very welcome, particularly linked to Colyton Primary School.	Supports traffic-free cycling routes linked to Colyton Primary School	Point noted No change necessary as a result of this comment
350	Para 10.10 add....and would encourage off-road cycle routes	Suggests addition to para. 10.10	Add " <i>and would encourage off-road cycle routes</i> " to end of para. 10.10
351	para. 10.13 still no crossing on the 3052 even though it has been out is too dangerous	Complains about lack of action on pedestrian crossing	This matter is outside the scope of the NP No change necessary as a result of this comment <b>Refer comment to PC</b>
352	Para 10.13 Crossing the A3052 in Colyford can be extremely hazardous for local residents. Traffic speeds are too high – also on the Seaton Road. It is local people who use the local facilities 7 days a week who need a crossing.	Points out the road safety issues at Colyford	Point noted No change necessary as a result of this comment
353	the lack of a continuous designated or weather footway or cycle way from Colyton through Colyford and on to Seaton does not encourage alternatives to using motorised vehicles. Although there is a cycle route along Cownhayne Lane from Colyton to Colyford it has no footway and from the southern end of Colyton (footbridge by Coles Mill) the distance to Cownhayne Lane is virtually the same as the distance to Colyford Memorial Hall the only consolation is that it has slightly less distance uphill. Whilst I appreciate the local topography presents challenges in terms of cycle routes and some may relish the exercise potential of some routes many will choose a route which is easier and shorter even if using public roads is necessary this point is illustrated by the present cycle route through the Seaton wetlands it is certainly more pleasant but also slower as it is shared with pedestrians and is less direct and the public road is therefore an attractive option to commuters etc.	Advocates easy cycling routes	Point noted No change necessary as a result of this comment
354	policy no.15 it appears there is an "intention" to improve walking and cycling routes but nothing specific as to how this will be achieved such as for example setting up a new parish committee to especially investigate potential funding sources from both local and central government. The Stoplevel Way in particular was to be constructed ..... I hope that the next few years will demonstrate some progress on this important route, but sadly I have not yet seen any evidence of any enthusiasm or additional funds in this part of East Devon.	Calls for an implementation strategy	<b>Refer comment to PC</b>
355	Full support for improved walking and cycling routes. However, to make these fully safe, especially as a number of them e.g. the B3161, are alongside a major entry routes, where traffic levels will likely grow e.g. as a result of development of the Ceramtec site. Could we under the Aim of "Improving Road Safety in the Parish" adopt an Objective to commit "to calming/ slowing the vehicles" e.g. through 20mph limits, speed humps or chicanes.	Advocates easy cycling routes	Point noted No change necessary as a result of this comment

356	Risk that this policy might lend support inadvertently to a proposal that is otherwise unacceptable if it, for example, includes a footpath/cyclepath. To overcome this, it may be preferable to support proposals for i, ii, iii rather than supporting development proposals that will achieve them. Alternatively, as these will not necessarily be development proposals requiring planning consent in isolation, there could also be a requirement for new development proposals to make these provisions where appropriate / possible and proportionate to the development. <b>EDDC</b>	Suggests that policy wording should be changed	Amend policy Coly15 to begin: <i>“Proposals to:</i> <i>i. improve and extend existing walking and cycle routes and link them to the wider network; or</i> <i>ii. provide pedestrian and cycle links between settlement area; or</i> <i>iii. create wider and safer footpaths in settlement areas.</i> <i>will be supported.</i>
357	If there are details as to where these routes are, a supporting map would be useful, and/or identification in the policy. Noted that the Plan text refers to some specific wants – including a riverside walk linking Colyton and Colyford, and pavement provision on the A3052 in specific places. The policy could then say that development affecting these specific walks/pavements should include measures to safeguard or deliver them (depending on the nature of the development). <b>EDDC</b>	Suggests addition to the policy to ensure development does not affect potential walking cycling routes	Add suitable safeguarding clause to policy Coly15 to protect pedestrian routes
358	Consider whether links between the tramway stations and the centres which currently has a standalone policy (Coly12) could be incorporated and combined with this policy. Similarly, suggest consider the relationship/potential overlap with Policy Coly3 Public Rights of Way. <b>EDDC</b>	Suggests merging policies or aspects of policies	In the interests of ensuring each planning aspect gains equal attention and consideration, no change necessary as a result of this comment
359	It would be splendid to be able to walk from Umborne Bridge to Chantry Bridge along the edge of the football field – a footbridge needed.	Advocates specific walking route and a footbridge	<b>Refer comment to PC</b>
360	10.11 There are many things that divide the two communities, but the lack of a footway is not one of them. The lack of a footway is entirely consistent with the previously stated need to prevent coalescence of the two communities. It is a rural reality dictated by topography and historical development.	Makes point about rural roads	Point noted No change necessary as a result of this comment
361	Para 10.11 Riverside route, yes please need a hard surface on existing path from footbridge of B3161 then hard surface to A3052 at White Hart	Supports improved riverside walk	Point noted No change necessary as a result of this comment
362	Promote new footpaths from Shells Lane to Courtney Drive restore closed footpath from Whitwell Lane to Holyford Lane.	Advocates specific footpaths	<b>Refer comment to PC</b>
<b>POLICY Coly16</b>			
363	In particular the wording in Policy No Coly 16 needs to be addressed to help prevent coalescence. The wording needs to be changed to acknowledge that there are two different types of problem with the Primary School in Colyton and the Grammar School in Colyford. 1. The Primary School in Colyton is located in a densely developed part of the village with narrow access roads, no off-street parking, no visitor or staff parking and very little on street parking, which leads to several severe traffic related problems. This makes it difficult and, in some ways, dangerous for pedestrian and cycle access. Parent drop off and pick up and visitors are all affected by this and severe traffic related	Expresses concerns about the possible unintended impact of the policy	Delete draft policy in the light of the concerns expressed by several respondents. Include reference in Section 10 to the problems associated with parking at the two school sites and their different characteristics.

	<p>issues go on throughout the day, not just in the morning and afternoon.</p> <p>2. In Colyford the situation is different in that the only disruptive times are during the morning and afternoon when the school buses deliver and pick up the students, as the Grammar School has its own staff and visitor parking. Bus access to the Grammar School site is not easy, so the buses are constrained to deliver and pick up on the main A2052. This causes brief disruption to traffic in the morning and afternoon, which could easily be mitigated by better organisation of bus timings and staggered start and finish times for students. The wording of Policy No Coly 16 needs to be changed to reflect this difference in the two schools to accurately identify the actual problems and suggest solutions which do not rely on development in the Green Wedges.</p>		
364	<p>Para 10.15 Delete the words “<i>major and nuisance</i>” and add “<i>significant</i>” instead of “<i>major</i>”.</p>	<p>Wants to change wording in para. 10.15</p>	<p>Revise text to describe parking problems at both schools Use “<i>significant</i>”</p>
365	<p>Paras 10.15, 10.16 and 10.17 These need to be re-jigged and re-written, one para to describe Colyton Primary School, and another to describe Colyton Grammar School, Colyford. They have two differing problems that need resolution.</p>	<p>Calls for description of the ‘issues’ at the two schools to be separately described in the supporting text</p>	<p>Revise text to describe parking problems at both schools</p>
366	<p>Para 10.17 The word “<i>major</i>” and “<i>nuisance</i>” must be deleted from both this Para and Para 10.15. The legal definition of “<i>urgent</i>” is actions which cause a substantial and unreasonable interference with the use and enjoyment of a person’s land. The word “<i>nuisance</i>” could be used by a Developer to gain Planning Permission to build in the Colyton/Colyford Green Wedge, by offering a free Bus Park in return for permission to develop this whole Green Wedge site!!</p>	<p>Wants to change wording in supporting text</p>	<p>Revise text to describe parking problems at both schools</p>
367	<p>Para 10.16 It is very dangerous to propose the use of land for bus parking in Colyford. It is a Grammar School problem, not a Parish Council problem. At the recent Old Cricket Ground Appeal Hearing, Mr James Carthy requested that if the Appeal was upheld, would a proviso be put into the permission to allow access beyond this site for a Link Road. Fortunately. the Appeal was rejected!!</p>	<p>Concerned about reference to land for coach parking in para. 10.16</p>	<p>Revise text to describe parking problems at both schools</p>
368	<p>Para 10.17 Delete the word “<i>nuisance</i>”, and replace with the word “<i>inconvenience</i>” (see Paras 10.15 and 10.17 above)</p>	<p>Wants to change word in para. 10.17</p>	<p>Revise text to describe parking problems at both schools</p>
369	<p>the wording in Policy No Coly 16 needs to be addressed to help prevent this coalescence. Policy 16 should make it crystal clear that whilst it is intended to support development proposals which will ease traffic congestion around the schools in Colyton and Colyford that this will only be appropriate if it does not compromise the protection given to areas or assets of particular importance such as the Green Wedge or AONB. The way the current neighbourhood plan proposal is drafted, it is both unclear and ambiguous at best. The wording of Policy No Coly 16 needs to be changed to reflect the difference in the two</p>	<p>Wants to change wording in policy</p>	<p>Delete draft policy in the light of the concerns expressed by several respondents.</p>

	schools in Colyton and Colyford to accurately identify the actual problems and suggest solutions which do not rely on development in the Green Wedges.		
370	<p>1. The confusion of Colyton Grammar School being in Colyford does have to be spelt out.</p> <p>2. Colyton Primary School is a different problem to that of Colyford.</p> <p>3. The Grammar School buses pupils into the area and out again at night.</p> <p>4. The traffic inconvenienced is for at most 30 minutes.</p> <p>5. All the land that has not been developed in Colyford should remain a part of the Green Wedge between Seaton and Colyton.</p> <p>6. The long-term solution would be to control buses in an area at the top of Harepath Road.</p> <p>7. A mini roundabout at the bottom of Harepath Hill/Road and a parking area on the adjacent field. A number of buses park on the road here as it is, so it seems they have found the only sensible solution!</p> <p>8. This would not stop development occurring in other parts of Colyford, but would stop the daily congestion in the middle of the village.</p> <p>9. I am sure this has been mentioned before and is not a cost-effective solution for one part of the problem. It also moves it to new area where feelings will run high.</p> <p>10. It is a great pity that any housing developments are not required by law to address the infrastructure problems that exist now and will increase.</p>	Wants separate descriptions to distinguish between the problems associated with the two schools	Ensure the NP text distinguishes between the two locations
371	<p>Whilst I feel much of the plan is acceptable, I have concerns regarding Policy No Coly 16. My concern is that the wording of this section is not strong or clear enough to protect against development of the Green Wedges. Policy 16 as drafted suggests that the traffic problems at the schools in Colyton and Colyford are the same - this is not true, and the policy document should be amended to identify this. Whilst the primary school in Colyton suffers traffic related problems that stem from its location in a densely developed part of the village with narrow roads, little or no off-street parking and no adequate on-site facilities for staff and visitor parking, which create severe traffic related problems throughout the day, this is not the case at Colyford school. Here the problem is only present whilst the school buses are picking up or dropping off students. The wording of Policy 16 should identify that these traffic problems are not identical. But most importantly the document should make it clear that any support for proposals to ease traffic congestion around the schools in Colyford and Colyton will only be appropriate if it does not compromise the protection given to areas or assets of particular importance such as the Green Wedge or AONB. The current wording is weak unclear and ambiguous. As such I cannot support the Neighbourhood Plan in its current form.</p>	Wants to change wording of policy	Delete draft policy in the light of the concerns expressed by several respondents.

372	<p>I wish to raise my concerns relating to Policy No.16 and its lack of the protection for the Green Wedges that our communities enjoy.</p> <p>I wish to draw to the CPC's attention the traffic problems generated and experienced in Colyford by buses delivering and collecting students at the Colyton Grammar School, they are severe, but only for no more than 1 hour in the morning and evening and only during term time.</p> <p>This traffic issue is not clearly defined in Policy 16 or any supporting paragraphs which gives a misleading impression of the problem.</p> <p>The Policy No.16 comment must be amended before the Parish Plan is submitted in its final format.</p>	Wants the traffic issues associated with CGS to be better contextualised	Ensure the NP text distinguishes between the two locations
373	<p>I cannot support the draft Neighbourhood Plan as it is currently written.</p> <p>One of my main concerns is the wording of sections in Policy No Coly16 - school traffic and development proposals to ease the congestion. The policy is vague and does not identify that the school traffic problems in Colyford and Colyton are very different and should be treated in different ways. It is also misleading by suggesting that the traffic problem in Colyford is a major problem and nuisance - in reality it is an inconvenience for a short time at the beginning and end of the school day in term time.</p> <p>Any future plans to alleviate the problem by use of land for coach parking and parents drop off etc should not compromise the protection given to areas of particular importance such as the Green Wedge and AONB. All aspects of the Neighbourhood plan should protect the Green Wedge and AONB. Once these areas are lost to development they cannot be reclaimed.</p>	Wants separate descriptions to distinguish between the problems associated with the two schools	Ensure the NP text distinguishes between the two locations
374	<p>I wish to draw to the attention of the CPC Councillors, when considering their approval of the Steering Groups excellent works, an area of concern within the document that does not accurately record traffic congestion in Colyford. It is acknowledged that the primary school in Colyton suffers from several traffic related problems derived from the location of the facility in a densely developed part of the village with narrow roads, little or no off-street parking and no adequate on site facilities for staff and visitor parking, parent drop off/pick up points and difficult, possibly dangerous, pedestrian/cycle access.</p> <p>This creates severe traffic related problems throughout the day and not just at the start and end of the school day.</p> <p>The issue is however entirely different in Colyford where the problem is only present whilst the Colyton Grammar School student buses are dropping off or picking up students. The current wording of Policy No. Coly 16 in the Consultation Document does NOT make these distinct differences clear; they MUST be amended to accurately reflect the situation in both locations.</p> <p>Policy No. Coly16 - School Traffic</p> <p>The CPC Councillors MUST also be made aware that Policy No. Coly16 should make it abundantly</p>	Wants separate descriptions to distinguish between the problems associated with the two schools	Ensure the NP text distinguishes between the two locations



	<p>clear that whilst it is intended to support development proposals which will ease traffic congestion around the Primary school in Colyton and the Colyton Grammar School located in Colyford this support statement will only be appropriate if it does NOT compromise the protection given to areas or assets of particular importance such as the Green Wedge or AONB. As it is drafted in its Pre-Submission format it is needlessly unclear, ambiguous at best and amended accordingly</p>		
375	<p>I wish to reject the pre-submission version of the Neighbourhood Plan. This is due to Policy No Coly 16 – School Traffic - and would like to ensure this policy is more sympathetic to the protection of the Green Wedges between Colyton and Colyford and Seaton and Colyford. I feel that the villages of Colyton and Colyford and the town of Seaton should be kept with their own identities and should not be joined together by development on the Green Wedges that lie between them. All three are within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and should be protected for local people and visitors to enjoy and wildlife to thrive.</p> <p>I therefore feel that the wording in the section below, should have an extra point to ensure this protection is put in place as follows: Development proposals to ease traffic congestion around local schools will be supported provided they do not have an adverse impact on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. local character;</li> <li>ii. residential amenity;</li> <li>iii. highway safety; and,</li> <li>iv. flood risk (including local surface water flooding). PLUS</li> <li>v. the protection given to areas or assets of particular importance such as the Green Wedge and AONB.</li> </ul> <p>Policy 16 should make it clear that it supports development proposals which will ease the traffic congestion around the schools in Colyton and Colyford. However, this would only be appropriate if it does not compromise the protection given to areas or assets of particular importance as the Green Wedges between Colyton/Colyford and Colyford/Seaton and also on AONB. The draft is currently unclear and ambiguous and requires amendment.</p> <p>I would like to thank the Neighbourhood Plan Committee for all their work and am sure they wish to ensure the Plan reflects the needs of all residents in the Parish.</p>	Expresses concerns about the possible unintended impact of the policy	Delete draft policy in the light of the concerns expressed by several respondents.
376	<p>Paras 10.15/10.16/10.17 – I think that it would be clearer if both schools were discussed separately as they have different needs, settings, problems and solutions. Grouping them together isn't helpful.</p>	Wants separate descriptions to distinguish between the problems associated with the two schools	Ensure the NP text distinguishes between the two locations
377	<p>Para 10.16/10.17 - This para needs to be reworded. Foresight and caution must be given to the green wedge and the danger posed to it by developers wanting to offer bus parking and piggy backing on permission to develop. The green wedge is sacred and part of a field system</p>	Wants to change wording of supporting text	Revise text to describe parking problems at both schools

	which must remain intact in order to preserve its integrity.		
378	10.15 and 10.16 must be rewritten carefully. There should be a very clear distinction made between the primary school and grammar school because they have very different issues and solutions concerning parking. The proposal of coach parks (on green wedge land, which is what the Grammar school is surrounded by) could well leave Colyford Village open to development. The word “nuisances” is hard hitting and inflammatory and not appropriate for Colyford. Primary School and Colyton is general, has a 24 hour parking problem, whereas Colyford is only disrupted for a short time during Grammar school pick up times which could be mitigated by the school with better organization. It is important that we protect the Green wedge and that that is made clear in the document at every opportunity.	Wants separate descriptions to distinguish between the problems associated with the two schools	Revise text to describe parking problems at both schools
379	The whole of this policy needs more detail – specific detail for each situation. The two schools are entirely different in their locality and needs. Colyton Primary School is set in a densely populated area with precious little room for additional vehicular traffic. The main issue with Colyton Grammar School is the congestion caused by the buses bringing and fetching around 1,000 children at the beginning and end of each school day. Colyton Grammar School moved to its current location nearly 100 years ago with about 100 pupils. This school has grown and grown but has never found a suitable way of accommodating the ever increasing number of buses needed to deal with the burgeoning student cohort. The wording of the policy is not tight enough. Whilst local character and residential amenity are listed, it is essential that any development which might impact on the Green Wedge or other local designations should not be countenanced. The policy should include another numbered item in the list such as: ‘v. Any local asset designation such as the Green Wedge or AONB.’ We urge Colyton Parish Council to address these two situations separately.	Wants separate descriptions to distinguish between the problems associated with the two schools	Delete draft policy in the light of the concerns expressed by several respondents.
380	Policy 16 should make it very clear that the intention to support development proposals to ease traffic congestion around the schools in Colyton and Colyford recognises that these traffic problems are not the same. Protection of the Green Wedge and AONB must remain paramount. Currently these matters are not clear.	Wants separate descriptions to distinguish between the problems associated with the two schools	Ensure the NP text distinguishes between the two locations
381	Para 10.15 The wording should be changed from “major problem/nuisance to “significant problem”. Also, it should make clear that the primary school has an ongoing problem throughout the day, whereas the grammar school creates a short window of congestion in the morning bus drop off and afternoon bus pick up periods. These are two totally different problems. <b>CVRA</b>	Wants to change wording	Ensure the NP text distinguishes between the two locations

382	<p>These comments relate to Policy Coly 16 which is one of a number of policies in the draft Neighbourhood Plan and, should a relevant planning application be made, it will have a material impact on how that application is determined by EDDC or at Appeal:</p> <p>If the planning application includes a range of proposals for development in the Green Wedge, one of which relates to measures to alleviate the school bus issues in Colyford, then this policy will become relevant and will influence the decision to approve or refuse the application. It is therefore very important it is correctly worded and does not unduly favour one type of development in this case, a coach park, and should not incorporate inappropriate wording which could benefit speculative developers</p>	Expresses concerns about the possible unintended impact of the policy	Delete draft policy in the light of the concerns expressed by several respondents.
383	<p>As currently drafted the policy is confusing and ambiguous by referencing the traffic issues at Colyton for the primary school, and Colyford for the Grammar School as though the locations, settings and issues are the same. This is not the case. It also specifically mentions the use of land to provide a coach park for the Grammar School here as stated in the draft:-"But the use of land for coach parking, staff and visitor parking, parents' drop-off, walking routes etc is probably necessary if an effective and permanent plan is to be put in place." The Green Wedge adjacent to the grammar school would be the obvious location for this if access/highways issues could be resolved. The current wording of Policy 16 will encourage, and be cited by developers, as providing support for speculative development in the Green Wedge which includes modest measures which may alleviate the school bus issue. We believe the wording here needs to be changed to avoid that. <b>CVRA</b></p>	Concerned about reference to land for coach parking in para. 10.16	Ensure the NP text distinguishes between the two locations
384	<p>A shrewd developer will produce a proposal which takes advantage of the way in which it has been written to claim policy 16 is supportive of a wider mixed development which incorporates elements such as a coach park. We know that such a proposal already exists and is highly likely to be brought forward especially if Policy 16 is not amended. <b>CVRA</b></p>	Expresses concerns about the possible unintended impact of the policy	Delete draft policy in the light of the concerns expressed by several respondents.
385	<p>A coach park would enable the school buses to arrive and depart the village with a minimum of disruption to traffic on the A3052 around the Memorial Hall and Fairview Lane which would be a very good outcome. However, this would come with a huge disproportionate cost to the village. This is because the favoured location is on Green Wedge land to the west of Fairview Lane at Stafford Lane.</p> <p>However, the existing road access is very poor and could not cope with buses and coaches in its present form. These roads could not be significantly widened or improved. A proposal has been put forward to create a new road across the north of Colyford from Coly Road (the old cricket ground site) in the east to the Grammar School in the west. However such a road would cost in the order of £5 million and could not be funded without substantial</p>	Concerned about reference to land for coach parking in para. 10.16	Delete draft policy in the light of the concerns expressed by several respondents.

	<p>additional speculative development. This would mean some 2/300 houses constructed in a major part of the Green Wedge to the north of Colyford. A development on this scale would inevitably create major traffic congestion at its only entrance/exit in Coly Road which would also severely impact the nearby busy junction at the A3052 creating an even greater inconvenience to the residents of both Colyford and Colyton than already exists. <b>CVRA</b></p>		
386	<p>Mr James Carthy made verbal representations to the planning inspector at the recent planning appeal hearing earlier this year. He requested that if the appeal for development of the old cricket ground site were to be upheld it should include conditions requiring the developer to leave access clear for the development of the remaining Green Wedge to the west of the site. This would effectively destroy the Green Wedge to the north of Colyford. The plan needs to be robust enough to ensure this doesn't happen. It would also leave the way clear for the major housing development previously proposed in the southern Green Wedge to be resurrected leading to the substantial erosion of the open farmland between Colyford and Seaton. The majority of the land to the north and south of Colyford which lies within the Green Wedge is in the same ownership and as major development to the south of Colyford has previously been proposed and rejected we know this landowner is highly sympathetic to development within the Green Wedge. <b>CVRA</b></p>	<p>Expresses concerns about the possible unintended impact of the policy</p>	<p>Delete draft policy in the light of the concerns expressed by several respondents.</p>
387	<p>Paras 10.16 and 10.17 The reference "the use of land for coach parking" should be removed. The two schools in the parish have completely different problems and this should be reflected in the wording, in particular the word "nuisance" should be replaced by "inconvenience" in 10.17. It is likely that the grammar school will experience further pressure to expand in the future and as it has already admitted that it is at maximum capacity for its current site, an alternative solution to its access problems might be to review the location of the school rather than trying to solve them at the existing site. Solving these at the current site would potentially be cost prohibitive and very unpopular within the village of Colyford and would potentially change the nature, amenity and character of the village greatly. The Grammar School busses in the majority of its pupils from around the Devon/Somerset/Dorset areas, very few come locally from the parish, so future consideration could be given for the school needing a bigger site where existing access is easy and straightforward, the current site is never likely to fulfil this requirement nor provide potential for any growth in capacity. <b>CVRA</b></p>	<p>Concerned about reference to land for coach parking in para. 10.16</p>	<p>Revise text</p>
388	<p>I wish to express that I am unhappy with the above plan as it is currently presented. In particular the wording of Policy No Coly16 regarding School Traffic.</p>	<p>Wants separate descriptions to distinguish between the problems associated with the two schools</p>	<p>Delete draft policy in the light of the concerns expressed by several respondents.</p>

	The policy addresses the issues regarding the two schools in the same statements. However, clearly this is not appropriate. The two schools are in quite different locations and have different issues of differing severity. The problems experienced in Colyton occur throughout the day, whereas those in Colyford are only at the beginning and end of the school day. In Colyton they are of far more concern than those in Colyford which are an inconvenience. Any proposals to support alleviation of these issues should also only be appropriate if they do not compromise the protection of areas or assets of particular importance such as the Green Wedge and AONB. This is not clearly referenced in the plan and should also be included.		
389	10.15 Different schools, different issues. Colyford GS creates traffic jams each evening with up to 10 coaches preventing emergency services gaining access to residents or properties within the villages.	Wants separate descriptions to distinguish between the problems associated with the two schools	Ensure the NP text distinguishes between the two locations
390	10.17 Parish Council does not liaise with CGS apart from occasional response. On a general note, with Covid 19 prevalent it is not a suitable time to operate a consultation process when most elderly are isolating and unhappy with mixing with others.	Says PC does not often liaise with CGS	Point noted. No change necessary as a result of this comment
391	10.16 Whilst the congestion surrounding CGS is both morning and particular evenings issues over the numbers are increasing and to increase the size of the school intake without recognising the need to change the infrastructure is short-sighted and to ease congestion by creating elsewhere parking is supported however it must not be created on agricultural land or green wedge or impinge on AOB and the need to maintain the village environment is important, and policy 16 should be more precise and less ambiguous.	Concerned about reference to land for coach parking in para. 10.16	Delete draft policy in the light of the concerns expressed by several respondents.
392	10.17 As a local resident experiencing this congestion on a daily basis together with many others who likewise have the extra issues of staff and pupils parking on Stafford Lane, Colyford in addition to many vehicles on the school's inadequate parking provision further enhanced by the lack of pedestrian walkways in Elm Farm Lane and Fairview Lane.	Supports call for better walkways near schools	Revise text
393	10.16 Part of the solution is changing travel to school habits and managing drop-off and pick-up traffic. However, the use of land in sustainable locations to provide staff and visitor parking parents drop-offs, walking routes etc for the primary school in Colyton and for measures to alleviate the congestion at the start and end of the school day in Colyford may be appropriate provided it does not compromise the protection given to areas or assets of particular importance such as the green wedge or AONB.	Expresses concerns about the possible unintended impact of the policy	Revise text
394	10.17 change nuisance to inconvenience	Wants to change wording	Revise text
395	Policy 16 does not differentiate between CGS and Colyton Primary School in relation to their different locations. This should be properly stressed in policy 16.	Wants separate descriptions to distinguish between the problems associated with the two schools	Ensure the NP text distinguishes between the two locations

396	Changes to policy 16 School Traffic 10.15 the traffic generated at the beginning and the end of the day in term time around the primary school in Colyton and the lack of a dedicated parking area have been recognised as major problems/nuisances for some time. In Colyford the traffic congestion generated by Colyton Grammar school bus drop-off and pick-up periods at the start and end of the school day during term time causes significant inconvenience and frustration to local residents	Suggests re-wording of supporting text	Ensure the NP text distinguishes between the two locations
397	para 10.15 add... significant – omit ‘major’	Wants to change wording of para. 10.15	Revise text
398	para 10.17 omit ‘nuisance’, add ‘inconvenience’	Wants to change wording of para. 10.17	Revise text
399	I have studied the Pre-submission Colyton Parish Neighbourhood plan at some length and the reason I am contacting you is that I have concerns with Policy No Coly16 in the draft plan and do not support it as it is currently written. Policy 16 is too vague and does not identify specific issues at the two school locations which are quite different. The draft conveys that the same problems are shared but this is not true, and it should be amended The two schools are in very different locations and this should be properly identified. The problems experienced in Colyford are limited to school bus pick up and drop off time unlike those in Colyton which are more diverse and complex.  It should be made clear in the Plan that whilst it is intended to support development proposals which will ease traffic congestion around Colyton and Colyford schools this will only be appropriate if it does not compromise the protection given to areas of particular importance such as the Green Wedge or AONB. At the moment the wording is unclear and ambiguous.  I do appreciate all the hard work which has gone into the Plan but I feel the above is a very important.	Wants separate descriptions to distinguish between the problems associated with the two schools and a separate policy approach for each school	Delete draft policy in the light of the concerns expressed by several respondents. Ensure the NP text distinguishes between the two locations
400	I have been a resident of Elm Farm Lane, Colyford, for more than 40 years. Obviously, as this is one of the main access routes to Colyton Grammar School, I experience first-hand the twice daily increase in traffic, both pedestrian and vehicular, associated with the pupils coming and going to the school. I would like to place on record that during these times I experience only the slightest inconvenience which any resident living near or by a school would and should expect. Essentially, two episodes of a maximum of 30 minutes, at the beginning and end of the school day, term time only.  I therefore wish to challenge the contention in Para. 10.16/17 of the Neighbourhood Plan that traffic/parking is a ‘major problem/nuisance’. The very idea that to overcome this inconvenience, elaborate road construction and coach parking on green field sites, with the attendant risk of opening up the potential development of the Green Wedge between Colyford and Colyton, is appalling.	Wants the traffic issues associated with CGS to be better contextualised	Revise text

	I sincerely hope that when the Parish Council consider the Plan, they will treat this very real risk with due diligence.		
401	<p>I have a real concern with Policy No Coly16 in the draft Neighbourhood Plan and do not agree with what has been written. I do appreciate all the hard work gone into the draft, but I feel that Policy 16 is too vague and does not identify specific issues at the two school locations mentioned as these are quite different.</p> <p>The two schools are in very different locations and this should be properly identified. The problems experienced in Colyford are limited to school bus pick up and drop off time unlike those in Colyton which are more diverse and complex. It should be made clear in the Plan that whilst it is intended to support development proposals which will ease traffic congestion around Colyton and Colyford schools this will only be appropriate if it does not compromise the protection given to areas of particular importance such as the Green Wedge or AONB. At the moment, the wording is unclear and should be amended to properly reflect the situation in both locations.</p>	Wants separate descriptions to distinguish between the problems associated with the two schools and a separate policy approach for each school	Delete draft policy in the light of the concerns expressed by several respondents. Ensure the NP text distinguishes between the two locations
402	<p>The policy should make it clear that any development to ease traffic around the schools should not compromise the protection given to areas of importance such as the green wedge and AONB.</p> <p>The policy should also make it clear the difference in the traffic issues between the two schools in Colyton and Colyford. The problem at Colyton is parent car parking whereas at Colyford it is the school bus parking on the main road which is a problem. Solutions will need to be different.</p>	Expresses concerns about the possible unintended impact of the policy	Delete draft policy in the light of the concerns expressed by several respondents.
403	Para 10.16 Coaches for CGS do cause a problem. Especially in the afternoons. But as a person who lives very close and is affected by it, like most Colyford people would rather live with the situation than have green wedges used for new roads and housing. None of that.	Wants the traffic issues associated with CGS to be better contextualised	Revise text
404	<p>The Wording in policy 16 makes our green wedges very vulnerable. The wording must be changed. Do not know why you refuse to strengthen policy 16. The Neighbourhood Plan is supposed to follow wishes of community but as ever you do not appear to listen. The community does not wish the green wedges built on. the CGS and other 'get-rich-quick' landowners' wishes should not override the wishes of the local community.</p> <p>You have been told what wording needs changing, so please do it.</p>	Wants to change wording	Delete draft policy in the light of the concerns expressed by several respondents.
405	<p>Policy 16 gives the impression that both Colyton and Colyford school problems are the same. This is not so. Colyton Grammar School is not in Colyton. It is in Colyford and has a much simpler problem.</p> <p>We have lived in the centre of Elm Farm Lane for 22 years and have never ever had a problem. The children are well behaved and well supervised by the staff. There are about 700 plus walking along this lane twice a day.</p>	Wants separate descriptions to distinguish between the problems associated with the two schools and a separate policy approach for each school	Revise text

	<p>We residents adjust our comings and goings to avoid the peak half hour.</p> <p>The coaches on the main road should be encouraged to spend minimum time there and to turn their engines off to avoid harmful air pollution. The private cars – parents, service vehicles, people carriers etc should be strongly requested to stagger and minimise their time in the area – possibly picking their students up further afield or in the village car park. After all the school was here long before the residents many of whom attended the school themselves and their children and grandchildren are proud to have done so.</p> <p>We strongly feel the astronomical cost of providing a coach park and new road and potential further housing eating at the green wedge to be totally unwarranted and out of all proportion to the problem in this lovely rural area. Let us all calm down use our common sense and not try to make mountains out of mole hills.</p>		
406	<p>As drafted Policy 16 gives the clear impression that the problems experienced around the schools in Colyton and Colyford are the same and have the same impact and severity in both locations. This is not the case and the policy should be amended to clarify this.</p> <p>The primary school in Colyton suffers from several traffic related problems derived from the location of the facility in a densely developed part of the village with narrow roads, little or no off=street parking and no adequate on-site facilities for staff and visitor parking, parent drop off/pick up points and difficult, possibly dangerous, pedestrian/cycle access. This creates severe traffic related problems throughout the day and not just at the start and end of the school day. The issue is entirely different in Colyford where the problem is only present whilst the school buses are dropping off or picking up students at the start and end of the school day during term time. This is not clear from the wording of Policy 16 which must be amended to properly reflect the situation in both locations.</p> <p>Furthermore, Policy 16 should make it clear that whilst it is intended to support development proposals which will ease traffic congestion around the schools in Colyton and Colyford this will only be appropriate if it does not compromise the protection given to areas or assets of particular importance such as the Green Wedge or AONB and that any proposals should be proportionate in scale to the inconvenience encountered by local residents. References to the use of land for the provision of a coach park should be deleted as this unduly favours one particular widely known development proposition which is not the purpose of a Neighbourhood Plan. All sustainable proposals should be treated equally and without bias which the current drafting does not recognise. As it is currently drafted it is needlessly unclear and ambiguous at best.</p>	<p>Wants separate descriptions to distinguish between the problems associated with the two schools and a separate policy approach for each school</p>	<p>Delete draft policy in the light of the concerns expressed by several respondents.</p>



	<p>The Public Consultation Notice on the Parish Council website states that “all comments will be publicly available” and I would be grateful if you could please confirm when all Regulation 14 comments will be published for the public to view and how they will be made easily available to all in the Parish community.</p>		
407	<p>This policy combines the issues with parking and traffic for Colyton Primary School and the Colyton Grammar school in Colyford, although they are in different areas with different histories and concerns.</p> <p>After conflating the two schools in 10.15 in 10.16 it is stated that, ‘ the use of land for coach parking, staff and visitor parking, parents’ drop-off, walking routes etc is probably necessary if an effective and permanent plan is to be put in place.’</p> <p>Which school is this referring to? If this is referring to The Grammar School then this implies that it is policy and it has been already decided on, to create extra parking and a bus park for the Grammar School. The implication here is that it has been agreed that Green Wedge Land will be sacrificed with an access road built between Coly Road crossing Fairview into adjacent land with house building to pay for this project or in between Fairview Lane and Stafford Lane, with bus access using Stafford Lane which would require considerable up grading of the road; including removing hedges and covering gullies. This no doubt would also include house building to pay for this project. Either project would result in destroying the local character of Colyford and destroying natural habitats and corridors used by wildlife. This would also invalidate any commitment to the Green Wedge both in the local plan and is also contrary to Strategy 8 of the East Devon Local Plan.</p> <p>It needs to be stated that including the coach pick up and drop off for The Grammar School as ‘major problems/nuisances’ is unfounded. There is a very vocal minority in Colyford who spend a lot of their time focusing on this issue and this opinion is not held by the majority of people in Colyford. I would challenge the Parish Council to provide evidence to the contrary.</p> <p>Paragraph 10.17 also conflates the need for parking etc for the primary school with bus pick up and drop off for the grammar school. I note that NPPF (para.110) also states that ‘...the impact of development would not cause unacceptable harm to the surrounding area.’</p> <p>What 10.15 needs to say is; The traffic generated by Colyton Primary School at the beginning and the end of the school day and the lack of an adequate dedicated parking area for the Primary School, has been recognised as major problems/nuisances, for some time. There are also concerns expressed by some residents in Colyford regarding the coach pick up and drop of from The Grammar School in Colyford.</p> <p>10.16 There is however no simple and straight-forward solution. Discussions have been held with the schools to explore ways to alleviate the</p>	<p>Wants separate descriptions to distinguish between the problems associated with the two schools and a separate policy approach for each school</p>	<p>Ensure the NP text distinguishes between the two locations</p>

	<p>problems in the interests of safety and the relief of localised congestion. Part of the solution is changing travel to school habits and managing drop-off and pick-up traffic. But the use of land for coach parking, staff and visitor parking, parents' drop-off, walking routes etc is necessary for Colyton Primary School if an effective and permanent plan is to be put in place.</p> <p>10.17 The Parish Council will continue to liaise with the schools, the highways authority and other interested parties in the hope of arriving at a viable and deliverable scheme for Colyton Primary School that will help alleviate the traffic congestion and parking obstructions and reduce the nuisance experienced by residents near the school. Policy Coly16 is aimed at facilitating workable solutions for Colyton and Colyford that have the community's support, do not encroach on the Green Wedge and will help realise the aspirations of the NPPF (para. 110) to create places that are safe, secure and attractive, which minimise the scope for conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles as long as the impact of such development would not cause unacceptable harm to the surrounding area</p>		
408	<p>I'm particularly concerned about the current Policy wording in regard to School Traffic (Coly16), and its potential to encourage Green Wedge development between Colyton and Colyford, and also the reference to Affordable Homes (Coly8).</p>	<p>Wants to change wording</p>	<p>Delete draft policy in the light of the concerns expressed by several respondents.</p>
409	<p>I think paragraphs 10.15 to 10.17 need a complete rewording.</p> <p>The existing statements are rather too vague, and I think there's a need to identify the specific issues experienced at each site location. I'm aware that the Colyford Village Residents Association (I'm a member) has detailed quite a lengthy submission of proposed revisions.</p> <p>The impact of school traffic in Colyford is quite acute - 30 mins at the start of the day (around 8.30am) and then mid-afternoon (around 3.15/3.45pm). The number of coaches all parked up is ridiculous, and quite an inconvenience to local residents. Basically, the school has become too big for the village in which it is located.</p> <p>A solution must be found, but not one that compromises the Green Wedge.</p> <p>Policy 16 should make it clear that whilst it is intended to support development proposals that will ease traffic congestion around the schools in Colyton and Colyford, this will only be appropriate if it does not compromise the protection given to areas or assets of particular importance such as the Green Wedge or AONB.</p> <p>The draft document currently opens the door to a potential developer seizing the opportunity to build housing and a link road through to the school and a coach park (development from the Old Cricket Ground to the east right across to the Grammar School to the west).</p> <p>The solution for coaches could be to the south of Colyford, around the Lyme Bay Auctions site (Harepath Road Industrial Estate). Coaches could</p>	<p>Wants separate descriptions to distinguish between the problems associated with the two schools and a separate policy approach for each school</p>	<p>Delete draft policy in the light of the concerns expressed by several respondents.</p> <p>Take comment into account when reviewing the NP text</p>

	<p>drop off and pick up there, and school children walk to and from that location.</p> <p>Preferably an alternative brownfield site should be found for a Colyton Grammar School 'Sixth Form Centre' perhaps- somewhere in East Devon (it wouldn't have to be in Colyford).</p> <p>By reducing the number of students being educated in Colyford, this will reduce the traffic problem caused by coaches and by parents / 6th form student cars arriving and departing.</p>		
410	<p>There is a desire by the School to build a coach park on our favoured site. The school are a large employer in the area and we recognise the impact we have on the community and the contribution. <b>Colyton Grammar School</b></p>	CGS confirms that it wants to build a coach park	Revise text
411	<p>Aware that the community are concerned about this issue. As worded, however, the policy only relates specific proposals to ease traffic congestion. This would, for example, cover proposals for a new car park, but should this also relate to ensuring that new development within the vicinity of the school does not worsen, and where possible, improves the situation. <b>EDDC</b></p>	Wants to change wording to policy Coly16	Revise text
412	<p>Regarding the requirement for permeable surfaces – noted this was also said in policy re. new housing development parking, but not about new employment development or tourism business development etc. Consider a general policy to require this where practicable in all new development which would make the expectation clear and avoid repetition between policies. <b>EDDC</b></p>	Suggests need for permeable surfaces should be applied to all development	Point noted. Consider how best to include the requirement for permeable parking areas more generally in the NP
413	<p>The wording 'development proposals to ease traffic congestion around the local schools will be supported'. This sentence should be more specific especially for the Grammar School problem, support the much needed coach parking and access roads but not at the expense of high volume housing development to pay for improvements. If such provisions cannot be achieved without over development of housing then alternative sites for relocation of the Grammar School should be considered. Any expansion plans to increase pupil numbers should be resisted until the parking problems experienced by Colyford are resolved.</p>	Wants to change wording to policy Coly16	Revise text
414	<p>10.15 These are not major problems and certainly not a nuisance. These descriptors should be deleted. There are issues associated with the collection and Deposit of pupils at both locations requiring sensitive management by the schools' management and Devon County Council Highway Authority. In the case of Colyton Grammar School, the Headmaster and DCC have jointly agreed that the current arrangements present the lowest risk to the children staff and parents. No formal study has been undertaken to examine alternative options and it would be highly irresponsible of the parish council to prejudge the outcome of such a study and make the stated assumption that "... the use of land for coach parking staff and visitor parking ...etc is probably necessary". This statement needs to be deleted.</p>	Wants the traffic issues associated with CGS to be better contextualised	Revise text

415	Once coach parking is relocated away from the A3052 a pedestrian crossing long promised is urgently needed between the church and the village Hall. Research to be given for a local post bus linking Colyton and Colyford with the main Exeter/Lyme/Axminster service.	Calls for a pedestrian crossing	Point noted <b>Refer to PC</b>
416	School traffic refer to Section 8 vision statement	Cross references policy to aims and objectives	Any revised policy approach should recognise the approved aims and objectives
417	The Colyton Parish Neighbourhood Plan in its current form fails to plan for the needs of residents of Colyford. As a resident of Colyford I am amazed that so much attention has been given to the congestion to the A3052 twice daily during term time by the many coaches and double decker buses used to ferry the huge number of pupils to the Grammar School located in Colyford known as Colyton Grammar School. This is a selective school that sets its own entrance exam and pass mark therefore benefiting very few local children and yet the plan suggests that Colyton Grammar School is an asset to the parish. The majority of the pupils attending the school are out of area and travel large distances to the school, hence the many buses and cars needed to ferry pupils to and fro. This school has a great deal of land with access from both Whitwell Lane and Stafford Lane which could be used as a drop off and pick up point and if the roads to the school are deemed too narrow then smaller buses could be used. Transport is arranged and paid for by the parents and must be considered before they choose to send their child to the school. This is a choice they make rather than sending their child to the school that serves their local area.		
<b>POLICY Coly17</b>			
418	Para 10.19 add residents of Colyton “and Colyford” etc THE REASON being that Colyford residents have problems parking in Colyton to go shopping, and both Colyford residents, and businesses in the centre of Colyton are losing out as a result.	Suggests add “and Colyford” to 1 <sup>st</sup> sentence of 10.19	Add “ <i>and Colyford</i> ” to 1 <sup>st</sup> sentence of 10.19
419	Para 10.23 – The Government recently announced that the date for ceasing the sale of petrol or diesel cars is now 2030 and therefore even more urgent need for electric on street charging points. Many people do not have driveways or garaging. On street charging is a success in mainland Europe.	Points out that Govt target date has changed	Amend date to reflect new Government target of 2030
420	We are not sure why there is no mention of Colyford in this section? As far as we are aware there is no public car park in Colyford apart from on street. Does Colyford Memorial Hall allow ‘public car parking? We observe cars parked there in the summer months when visitors to the Wetlands walk from there down Popes Lane and into Wetlands from the top end. Some visitors to the Wetlands park along the Seaton Road at the entrance to the Wetlands – this can add to the danger of exiting from Popes Lane as the width of the road is constricted. Whilst there is parking for the Wetlands through Seaton Cemetery there is nowhere safe for people to park at the	Asks why Colyford is not mentioned	It is not mentioned because the policy applies to Colyton only No change is necessary as a result of this comment

	Colyford end unless it is permitted at the Memorial Hall.		
421	Para 10.19 Colyton and Colyford residents experience parking problems, as both use the shops in Colyton and Colyford. The Post Office in Colyford has parking problems at peak times. <b>CVRA</b>	Points out that Colyford residents have parking problems too	Point noted No change is necessary as a result of this comment
422	Para 10.24 Should reflect the need for new electric vehicle charging points all around the parish as stated in comment to Para 8.24 above. <b>CVRA</b>	Stresses need for electric vehicle charging points	No change is necessary as a result of this comment
423	para. 10.23 omit 2040 add 2030	Points out that Govt target date has changed	Amend date to reflect new Government target of 2030
424	a considerable effort needs to be found to identify a site(s) for additional public parking. At the same time, on-street parking restrictions must be applied to overcome serious issues in King Street in particular.	Calls for new public car park serving Colyton town centre	<b>Refer comment to PC</b> No change is necessary as a result of this comment
425	Many properties in Colyton and some in Colyford block off road parking facilities and provision must be made for cars linked to these properties to charge vehicles. Whilst charging points in Dolphin Street Car Park may exacerbate existing parking concerns, this is likely to be less so in the car park at the Peace Memorial Playing Fields where solar PV input from the youth centre might be utilised. In Colyford the Memorial Hall car park may be the best location for a charging facility.	Suggests locations for electric vehicle charging points	Point noted <b>Refer to PC</b> No change is necessary as a result of this comment
426	Electric vehicle charge points should be mandatory at the Dolphin Street, Peace Memorial Playing Fields and Colyford Memorial Hall Car Parks.	Suggests locations for electric vehicle charging points	Point noted <b>Refer to PC</b> No change is necessary as a result of this comment
427	given the progression towards non-fossil-fuelled vehicles, should we include an objective " <i>to encourage the adoption of electric vehicles by ensuring the necessary provision of charging stations for residents &amp; visitors</i> "	Suggests electric vehicle charging points should be added to objectives	The Aims and Objectives were 'approved' by the PC following consultation. They should not be changed as a result of this comment.
428	It seems unlikely there is much land within the Built Up Area Boundary for car parking, unless it is in association with (and potentially uses part of) parks or public open space. The PC could consider identifying space on the edge of the BUAB for car parking if it is required. As per earlier comment, suggest permeable surfacing be included/supported. If this were surfaced using 'grasscrete' or similar it would not need to be visually intrusive and, if it were used only at peak holiday time, could be grassed and grazed when not in use potentially. <b>EDDC</b>	Suggests the PC should seek land for car park on the edge of the BUAB	This was the original policy intention. It was opposed by NE and others during the SEA/HRA process. No change is necessary as a result of this comment but... <b>Refer suggestion to PC</b> for further discussions with EDDC
429	Paragraph 10.23 – note that referenced ban on sale of new diesel and petrol cars has been brought forward from 2040 to 2030	Points out that Govt target date has changed	Amend date to reflect new Government target of 2030
430	Electric charging requirement – suggest this should be more of a requirement, than simply 'supported'. <b>EDDC</b>	Suggests that the wording could be changed	This is not a development requirement. The policy refers to <u>existing</u> public car parks therefore the policy can only 'support'. No change is necessary as a result of this comment
431	Consider that the wording " <i>supported in their entirety</i> " is open to misinterpretation. Suggest it is made clearer that this means as a standalone	Questions wording of policy Coly17	Amend policy wording to read:

	proposal – and not seen as “entirely supporting” such proposals. <b>EDDC</b>		<i>“Proposals for public car parks, or public parking areas as part of new developments, within the Colyton built-up area boundary, will be supported...”</i>
432	Suggest also adding to the criteria to guard against loss of land for other more productive uses, e.g. employment uses. <b>EDDC</b>		Employment space, green spaces and community spaces are protected by other policies in the NP and development plan No change is necessary as a result of this comment
433	Para 10.19 Town Square also has residents living there who have cars – approx. 12 properties, some are flats.	Points out that people with cars live on Town Square	Point noted. No change is necessary as a result of this comment
435	Para 10.23 update 2040 to 2030	Points out that Govt target date has changed	Amend date to reflect new Government target of 2030
<b>SECTION 11</b>			
436	Para 11.1 How does the Grammar school help the “small” village of Colyford? All it does for the village is to cause severe traffic problems twice per day I suggest that the Grammar School is deleted from this Paragraph.	Questions benefit of CGS to Colyford	Point noted. No change is necessary as a result of this comment
437	Para 11.2 Surely Seaton Hospital provides very little health services, since being more or less closed by the NHS. Therefore, should Seaton Hospital be deleted from this Paragraph?	Questions reference to Seaton hospital	As it provides some health services No change is necessary as a result of this comment
438	Para 11.5 Does the Colyton Leisure Centre still offer excellent facilities since the part closure by the Grammar School?	Questions amount of public access to facilities at CGS	Point noted. Make reference to reduce public access
439	The LED facility in the grounds of the Colyton Grammar school is a vital source of community keep-fit activity, both the trainer-run classes and the hire of the sports hall facilities etc. There does seem to be a concern that availability of the facility was being eroded by the Colyton Grammar school in the couple of years prior to the Covid pandemic. The times of the classes had been reduced because the halls were not available before a certain time these “availability times” were being changed increasingly in favour of school use and therefore against community use. Whilst this is outside of planning considerations it is typical of the way some organisations find ways to get around the excellent policies outlined in documents such as the CNP. The building may still be there but if the school only allow its use for a very restricted period it fails to serve its original purpose.... I hope LED leisure activities at Colyton can be increased rather than reduced as and when Covid restrictions change to allow this.	Questions amount of public access to facilities at CGS	Point noted. No change is necessary as a result of this comment
440	Para 11.1 – The Grammar School does not really benefit Colyford per say as it causes severe traffic problems which are detrimental to the village. Further, it does not serve the children of the Parish as most are bussed in from afar. It could therefore be argues that this amenity should be deleted.	Questions benefit of CGS to Colyford	Point noted. No change is necessary as a result of this comment

441	Para 11.2 – Should Seaton Hospital be deleted from this paragraph as it offers little service and will probably close in the near future.	Questions reference to Seaton hospital	As it provides some health services No change is necessary as a result of this comment
442	Para 11.4 – The problem with the Grammar School is that it draws the majority of its pupils from outside the neighbourhood which isn't good for the community, which is a shame as many local children sit the entrance exam and are therefore keen to attend.	Questions benefit of CGS to Colyford	Point noted. No change is necessary as a result of this comment
443	11.1. We fail to see why as residents of Colyford we are 'fortunate' to have the Grammar School located in the village. It affords us residents no real benefit that we are aware of, just congestion and litter.	Questions benefit of CGS to Colyford	Point noted. No change is necessary as a result of this comment
444	11.5 The LED Leisure Centre in the grounds of Colyton Grammar School is a bit of a mystery to us and doesn't seem to be well advertised and is often closed in the holidays or at weekends. Maybe its use outside school hours should be encouraged through greater promotion.	Questions amount of public access to facilities at CGS	Point noted. No change is necessary as a result of this comment
445	Para 11.4 States that the Grammar School was founded in Colyton for the benefit of Colyton and is part of the heritage of Colyton, however when it outgrew its site and moved to Colyford in 1920 it moved outside the parish completely, it only became part of the parish again when Colyford joined Colyton parish in the 1970s. This facility no longer benefits the parish as hardly any parish pupils go to it. <b>CVRA</b>	Questions benefit of CGS to Colyford	Point noted. No change is necessary as a result of this comment
446	Para 11.5 and 11.15 The Colyton Leisure Centre at the Grammar School now provides no daytime activities in term time since the school insisted that the public were not allowed access during school hours due to security considerations. This has greatly reduced access to the leisure facilities for local residents, so they cannot now be described as "excellent". <b>CVRA</b>	Questions amount of public access to facilities at CGS	Point noted. No change is necessary as a result of this comment
447	Para 11.1 The Grammar School does not help the community at all. The School does not appear to be interested in the local community and seemingly considers it a nuisance. Our awareness of School is limited to the coaches and congestion twice a day in term times.	Questions benefit of CGS to Colyford	Point noted. No change is necessary as a result of this comment
448	Para 11.5 is the Colyton Leisure Centre actually providing much at all for the community now, as daytime use was discontinued?	Questions amount of public access to facilities at CGS	Point noted. No change is necessary as a result of this comment
449	This includes the provision of leisure facilities, it should be noted that the sports facilities are owned by the School. <b>Colyton Grammar School</b>	CGS points out that the facilities are owned by the School	Add reference to School owning the facilities in para. 11.5
450	A long-term vision statement that the three acres of land next to the Reece Strawbridge building is retained and dedicated as the site for a new primary school for Colyton a dream site in every sense to relieve the cramped quarters our present school injures.	Proposes site for a new primary school	<b>Refer suggestion to PC</b> No change is necessary as a result of this comment
<b>POLICY Coly18</b>			
451	Para 11.9 It is understood that in 2020, there is not a waiting list for allotments in the Parish.	Says there is no current waiting list	Ask PC and up-date in the light of information provided
452	Assuming this policy is intended to apply both inside and outside the Built Up Area Boundary, suggest being clearer about 'suitable locations' and the definition <b>EDDC</b>	Asks for definition of suitable locations	Add reference in supporting text to land being in reasonable proximity to

			residential areas where a demand is known to exist
453	need for this to apply only to 'redundant land'. <b>EDDC</b>	Questions use of "redundant"	Explain in supporting text it means land that is not currently in productive use
454	Suggest adding that alternative space should be "equally accessible and of a similar quality" to protect against a poor substitute being provided. <b>EDDC</b>	Suggests adding conditions to 2 <sup>nd</sup> part of policy	Add: <i>"and it is equally accessible and of a similar quality"</i>
455	Suggest remove reference to viability as this will then have to be proven and could prevent suitable proposals. We would usually apply viability to assess development where loss of allotments is proposed, but not to restrict provision of new ones. <b>EDDC</b>	Suggest re-wording the 1 <sup>st</sup> part of policy	Re-word to read: <i>"The use of redundant land for community allotments, orchards and community horticulture initiatives in suitable locations will be considered favourably."</i>
456	Suggest replacing 'interests' in "nature conservation interests" with 'and 'biodiversity'. <b>EDDC</b>	Suggest re-wording the last part of policy	Re-word to read: <i>"Proposals that have an adverse impact on nature conservation and biodiversity will not be supported."</i>
457	Perhaps there may be a role for the CLT here in meeting this aspiration. <b>EDDC</b>	Suggests role for CLT	<b>Refer suggestion to PC and CLT</b> No change is necessary as a result of this comment
458	Promote having land in reserve for extra allotments at Colyton also to earmark and plan to have land in reserve at Colyford for allotments and a community composting facility.	Calls for allotment development strategy	<b>Refer suggestion to PC</b> No change is necessary as a result of this comment
<b>POLICY Coly19</b>			
459	Para 11.15 Is the LED managed Colyton Leisure Centre still able to offer the facilities quoted in this Para, since the Grammar School took over this facility during term time?	Questions amount of public access to facilities at CGS	Point noted. No change is necessary as a result of this comment
460	para. 11.15 review if Colyton Leisure Centre and offers public use adequately to meet local needs	Questions amount of public access to facilities at CGS	Point noted. No change is necessary as a result of this comment
461	Page 42 para 11.16 – is there a boules piste at PMPF?	Asks question about facilities at PMPF	Amend description if necessary
462	Map 8 incorrectly shows the extent of the Peace Memorial Playing Fields and has omitted the football field and play area at Road Green and the play area off Whitwell Lane.	Says map 8 is inaccurate	Ensure map shows correct areas of the two locations that are the subject of the policy
463	We are aware there is a 4G pitch at Colyton Grammar school which is not currently shown on Map 8. Suggest consider whether this should be added. <b>EDDC</b>	Says map 8 omits 4G pitch and suggests it should be added	Ensure map shows correct areas of the two locations that are the subject of the policy
464	Criteria (ii) – as above, suggest replacing 'interests' in "nature conservation interests" with 'and 'biodiversity. <b>EDDC</b>	Suggests amendment to criterion ii	Amend criterion ii to read: <i>"they have no detrimental impact upon nature conservation and biodiversity"</i>
465	Criteria (v) – the wording "without harming existing residential and other uses" is a bit vague. Consider being more specific for clarity of meaning, for example, "without adversely affecting highway safety, traffic movement and amenity of residential and other surrounding uses". <b>EDDC</b>	Says criterion v is vague and suggests an amendment	Re-word criterion v to read: <i>"without adversely affecting highway safety, traffic movement and amenity of residential and other surrounding uses"</i>
466	Noted this policy does not have the permeable surfacing criteria for parking which is included in other policies and which could be appropriate to	Points out that policy lacks reference to permeable surfacing	Add criterion requiring permeable surfacing



	include within the policy or a general policy as noted above. <b>EDDC</b>		
467	Comma missing between “needs” and “address” in paragraph 11.14. <b>EDDC</b>	Typo Missed punctuation spotted	Add comma between “needs” and “address” in para 11.4
468	11.15 This section needs to be updated to capture the loss of public amenity occasioned by the Grammar School and EDDCs decision to exclude the public during school hours in term time.	Says that para. is out-of-date	Up-date para. to reflect current situation regarding public access to leisure facilities
469	Sports and recreation protect the leisure centre facilities at Colyton Grammar School to ensure these are used to full capacity. Address the excess light spillage from the all-weather pitch.	Asks that light spillage issue be addressed	The NP is about future development. It cannot be used to tackle problems with existing development. <b>Refer comment to PC</b> No change required as a result of this comment.
469A	.. the plan area includes several areas of flood risk associated with the watercourses named above, as well as others. Whilst one of the plan’s objectives is to support flood prevention measures, and flood risk is mentioned within the plan, we advise that consideration is given the multiple benefits that some of the green sites within the plan area can offer. For example, the Peace Memorial playing fields, cited within policy Coly19 is located within flood zone 3 (which represents a high probability of flooding). The plan could identify the importance of this site in offering flood storage and unrestricted flow during a flood event. This is especially important to be considered within the context of climate change and ensuring the parish’s resilience to future flood events. <b>Env. Agency</b>	Asks for recognition of the role of sports and recreation areas in flood attenuation and storage	Add criterion protecting the role of existing sports and recreation areas serve in flood storage
<b>SECTION 12</b>			
470	Para 12.2 Provision should be made for a regular review of the finally made Plan by the Parish Council. We suggest the maximum cycle for these reviews should be 2 years. <b>CVRA</b>	Suggests that the NP should be reviewed very frequently	<b>Refer suggestion to PC</b> No change required to 12.2 as a result of this comment.