



# The Cranbrook Plan

2013-2031

## Consultation Statement

**In accordance with Regulation 19 of The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended)**

---

## Contents

Introduction and Process Summary.....	1
Context for Cranbrook Plan .....	4
Consultation – Stage 1 (Initial consultation) .....	5
Consultation – Stage 2 (Issues and Options) .....	9
Consultation – Stage 3 (Preferred Approach).....	16
Consultation – Stage 4 (Pre-submission Consultation) .....	19
Appendices.....	20
Appendix 1 – Consultation Bodies.....	21
Appendix 2 – Initial Consultation – Consultation text.....	23
Appendix 3 – Respondents to initial consultation .....	25
Appendix 4 – Detailed summary of feedback from initial consultation .....	26
Appendix 5 – Issues and Options Consultation form .....	34
Appendix 6 – Issues and Options respondents .....	43
Appendix 7 – Preferred Approach summary of issues, actions and updates.....	45
Appendix 8 – Preferred Approach respondents.....	71
Appendix 9 – Representation form used for pre-submission consultation .....	75
Appendix 10 – Detailed Summary of issues raised in Pre-submission consultation.....	76
Appendix 11 – Summary list of respondents to Pre-submission consultation.....	77

---

## Introduction and Process Summary

- 1.1 This document explains how East Devon District Council has undertaken community consultation and stakeholder involvement to produce the Cranbrook DPD (the Cranbrook Plan). The statement has been produced to fulfil in part the requirements set out in the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended) Regulation 19 and forms the statement defined at Regulation 17(d) setting out:
- which bodies and persons were invited to make representations under regulation 18;
  - how those bodies and persons were invited to make representations;
  - a summary of the main issues raised by those representations; and
  - how those main issues have been addressed in the Cranbrook Plan.
- 1.2 Following the end of the period for representations on the Proposed submission version of Cranbrook Plan and as (required by regulation 20), this statement will be updated to include the number of representations made pursuant to regulation 20 and a summary of the main issues raised in those representations. The updated statement will then be submitted to the Secretary of State for Examination alongside the Plan itself and other relevant documents.

### Legal Compliance

- 1.3 The Cranbrook Plan has been prepared in full compliance with the Council's [Local Development Scheme](#)<sup>1</sup>; Statement of community involvement (discussed below) and sits under the established framework provided by the [East Devon Local Plan](#)<sup>2</sup>. In addition the Plan has been prepared having regard to the Habitat Regulations and the Public Sector Equality Duty. The publication of the Plan is accompanied by an integrated [Sustainability Appraisal](#)<sup>3</sup> and Strategic Environmental Assessment.

### Statement of Community Involvement

- 1.4 The Council's [Statement of Community Involvement](#)<sup>4</sup> sets out how East Devon District Council should undertake consultations: its requirements have been met at all stages of preparing the Cranbrook Plan. All consultation responses made directly to East Devon District Council are in the public domain and can be viewed on the Council's website at:

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://eastdevon.gov.uk/media/2550925/lds-at-summer-2018-ver-02.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> <http://eastdevon.gov.uk/media/1772841/local-plan-final-adopted-plan-2016.pdf>

<sup>3</sup> <http://eastdevon.gov.uk/media/2761733/sustainability-appraisal-of-publication-of-cranbrook-plan.pdf>

<sup>4</sup> <http://eastdevon.gov.uk/media/344008/statement-of-community-involvement-2013.pdf>

[www.eastdevon.gov.uk/thecranbrookplan](http://www.eastdevon.gov.uk/thecranbrookplan). This consultation statement also includes hyperlinks throughout so that 'online' readers can readily access the specific documents referred to.

### **Duty to cooperate**

- 1.5 In addition to the requirement to consult in accordance with the Local Planning Regulations and the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement, there is a 'Duty to Cooperate' contained within the Localism Act 2011. This places a legal duty on Local Planning Authorities to engage constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis to maximise the effectiveness of Local Plan preparation in the context of strategic cross boundary matters. Meeting the 'Duty to Cooperate' is one of the 'legal' tests that must be satisfied as part of the Local Plan examination.
- 1.6 A separate document has been prepared which demonstrates that the Council has complied with the Duty in developing the Cranbrook Plan DPD. This can be accessed through the Council's website site.

### **Statement of Common Ground**

- 1.7 Recently introduced into the plan making process is a requirement to prepare a statement of common ground. This seeks to strengthen the need to cooperate between Local Planning Authorities, County Councils and other prescribed bodies on strategic matters that cross administrative boundaries. The 2019 version of the NPPF recognises that the Statement of Common Ground is the means by which it can be demonstrated that effective and ongoing working on cross boundary matters is being addressed and that there is ongoing cooperation. The Council have prepared a statement which is signed by the relevant Authorities and prescribed bodies.

## Consultation Process summary

- 1.8 The Cranbrook Plan arises out of the context of the adopted East Devon Local Plan 2013-2031 and the need set out within Strategy 12 of that plan to find a further 1550 dwellings within an identified area of search coupled with the need to set town specific policies to help ensure the successful delivery of a refreshed vision. This document summarises key stages in the preparation of the Cranbrook Plan with reference to the Local Plan for context. The key milestones in the preparation of the Cranbrook Plan are set out in Table 1.

<b>Cranbrook Plan key milestones</b>			
<b>Regulation</b>		<b>Consultation Stage</b>	<b>Dates</b>
<b>18</b>	<b>Preparation of a local plan</b>	Initial consultation including parish council engagement	16 June 2015 – 7 August 2015
		Initial Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment (2015)	September 2015 – October 2015
		Issues and Options Consultation	13 June 2016 – 25 July 2016
		Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment (2017)	10 November 2017 – 8 January 2018
		Preferred Option Consultation (Masterplan and Policy Document)	
<b>19 and 20</b>	<b>Publication</b>	Sustainability Appraisal (2019)	11 March 2019 – 24 April 2019
		Habitat Regulations Screening (2019)	
		Proposed Submission version of the Cranbrook Plan (2017)	
		Habitats Regulations Assessment	

Table 1 – Cranbrook Plan – Key Milestones

## Context for the Cranbrook Plan

- 2.1 The Local Plan which was adopted in January 2016 spans the period from 2013 – 2031 and identifies as a strategic policy requirement, the delivery of 17,100 houses. This is slightly in excess of the required calculation but allows for a number of houses to come through as windfall developments (whose numbers can by their nature vary).
- 2.2 As part of the delivery of housing, the Local Plan through Strategy 12 made provision for 7850 houses at Cranbrook of which 6300 were on allocated sites. The remaining 1550 were identified as coming forward within an area of search but for which there was no direct allocation.
- 2.3 It was considered that the process for the production of the DPD would allow the Local Planning Authority to gather evidence and provide a land allocation for the remaining 1550 houses that are required. In addition the Cranbrook Plan would also allow the Authority to refresh its vision for the town and address a number of Cranbrook specific policy issues which were set to arise as a result of the existing and further required allocations as well as experience that was arising from the development of Cranbrook Phase 1.
- 2.4 Following this commitment the Local Planning Authority launched the initial consultation for the Cranbrook Plan in June 2015. Since that time the Authority has worked towards its publication recognising the wider commitments necessary under sound plan making, seeking to cooperate with neighbouring Authorities and other prescribed Bodies. Details of this part of the process are set out in a statement which addresses the duty to cooperate and the statement of Common Ground.

## Consultation – Stage 1 (Initial consultation)

Initial consultation:	Emerging Plan consultation (Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning Regulations 2012 (as amended))
Dates:	16 June 2015 – 7 August 2015
Purpose:	To understand the scope of the plan

### Objectives for the consultation

- 3.1 In pursuing the preparation of the DPD it was considered that significant early engagement was fundamental to the success of the scheme in that it not only needed to set the framework for future housing locations, but needed to ensure that all such land was deliverable; the plan viable; and ultimately provided a structure for the successful place making of a significantly enlarged town.
- 3.2 From its earliest inception it was set out that initial views would be sought which would help to shape the future of Cranbrook by informing both the DPD itself but also the supporting evidence documents that sit behind this.
- 3.3 Included within this initial request for information was a recognition of the following components:
  - The need to allocate specific sites and land areas for development;
  - Designation/safeguarding of land for specific purposes;
  - Inclusion of policies for such aspects as new housing, gypsy and traveller provision, community facilities education facilities sports and leisure, open space, employment.
- 3.4 In addition there was recognised a need to ensure that necessary infrastructure was identified together with the promotion of high quality development affects both forms of development and design standards.
- 3.5 Finally there was also a recognition from the outset that there was a need to identify mitigation that would be required to offset potential adverse impacts that might otherwise arise in respect of adverse effects on designated environments.

- 3.4 Various stakeholders were consulted at this very initial stage of the DPD preparation, this included statutory consultation bodies and professionals in specialist areas including with other internal teams to ensure that a meaningful and well-grounded document could be delivered. Essentially the purpose of the initial engagement was to establish the full scope of the Plan, land that was available and the nature and extent of policies that would be required. It provided an opportunity to understand the constraints as well as opportunities.

### **Who was consulted**

- 3.5 Consultation was in the form of an email to all of the 'Specific Consultation Bodies' specified in the Regulations and a number of 'General Consultation Bodies' (including Community Groups, Hard to Reach groups and businesses with a local interest). A copy of the consultation text which was also posted on the Councils website inviting representations is set out in appendix 2. Consultation was undertaken in accordance with the Councils Statement of Community involvement.

### **Main Issues**

- 3.6 A feedback report to East Devon District Councils Development Management Committee was presented on the 6<sup>th</sup> October 2015. This provided a summary of the consultation comments that has been received and which are further outlined below. In addition the full summary table and the list of the 25 respondents (individuals and organisations) who commented are reproduced in Appendix 3.
- 3.7 Reflected within the summary table and as was reported to the Council's Development Management Committee the responses provided were set out by topic/theme and rather than being attributed to individual responses. In addition it was noted that a number of respondents referred to not just potential content of the plan and process/structure issues but also to wider issues including some non-plan making but more operational concerns. These wider comments, and all comments, were welcomed as it was considered that they added to the overall knowledge and understanding of Cranbrook. A brief summary is included in the following pages with the full summary set out in appendix 4.
- 3.8 Main Issues:
- **Procedural Matters** – including the importance of demonstrating compliance with the Public Sector Equality Duty in the 2010 Equality Act.
  - **Structure of the DPD** – there is a need for a clear vision; robust evidence base; ability to learn lessons and identification of the legislative and policy format.
  - **Timely delivery of the Plan**

- **Recognition of the current residents** – the need to identify the age profile with the District and the community spirit within the town
- **Infrastructure Provision and Developer Contributions** – and how CIL and Section 106 will work
- **Cranbrook Town Council and Neighbourhood Plans** – will need to be engaged and ensure local input into the plan
- **Ability to learn from history** – recognise the success and failures of other new towns that have been developed
- **Long term development of the town** – plans will need to show flexibility through its development but for this to be set within clear parameters. Small scale infill development will also need to be addressed.
- **Relationship with surrounding areas** – towns growth will need to be provided for whilst recognising the context of the surrounding areas
- **Housing** – aim to achieve greater mix of type and provision across all sectors including affordable housing and provision for the elderly
- **Commercial** – aim to deliver commercial space for small start-up businesses and provide jobs for local people
- **Town centre** - need to specifically promote the Town Centre seeking to deliver this through an integrated community, commercial and residential focussed scheme
- **Social and community provision** – whereby the lag to delivery is minimised and a suitable range of facilities including public house, allotments, place of worship and leisure and sports resources are provided
- **Green infrastructure** – Important to deliver adequate infrastructure including SANGS for the enlarged town
- **Built environment** – need to aim for local distinctiveness and address guidance in secure by design
- **Water** – SWW confirmed that their plans provide for growth; need to ensure plan reflects climate change, Water Framework Directive and Flood risk
- **Transport** – need to establish clear overarching principles and address a number of key components
- **Railway** – Need to recognise importance of rail as well as the risks that arise from an increased population and the number of movements over crossing
- **Healthy living environment** – requirement for positive objectives and a need for plans to develop active design principles
- **Telecommunications** – seeking a policy for mast provision
- **Waste** – minimise waste arising from development, reuse and recycle and ensure adequately located bins

**Next ...**

- 3.10 The Council considered the representations made during the initial Regulation 18 consultation and addressed these in developing the Cranbrook Plan by preparing an Issues and Options version of the plan for consultation. This included:
- Preparing a draft Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment for consultation
  - Engagement with CABE to facilitate three workshops which met with a wide range of partners including local Parish and Town Councils
  - The commissioning of a detailed noise study to consider issues arising from the proximity of the potential expansion area to Exeter Airport
  - Development of economic and cultural development strategies

## Consultation – Stage 2 (Issues and Options)

Initial consultation:	Issues and Options consultation (Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning Regulations 2012 (as amended))
	Accompanied by: Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA)
Dates:	13 June 2016 – 25 July 2016
Purpose:	To explore alternative options within the community and other interested stake holders and allow the future preparation of a single preferred approach for the delivery of the expansion area

### Objectives for the consultation

- 4.1 The Issues and Options document described the issues facing Cranbrook and key objectives for future plans.
- 4.2 Responses to the issues identified were to be used for assessing options for how the town will grow although it was considered likely that a combination of options may be necessary. The outcomes were identified as being necessary to steer the development of Cranbrook to 2031 to deliver the requirements of the East Devon Local Plan.
- 4.3 The document provided information to the local community and other stakeholders in Cranbrook about the purpose and background of the plan and invited comments and views on:
  - A draft vision for Cranbrook
  - The draft objectives of the Plan
  - The issues being addressed by this Development Plan Document
  - How different choices affect development
- 4.4 Published at the same time as the Issues and Options Consultation was the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Sustainability Appraisal (SA). These are high level evaluations of the options and was carried out by external consultants assessing the possible social, environmental and economic impacts of the proposals. The draft SA can be viewed on the [Councils website](#)<sup>5</sup>.

---

<sup>5</sup> <http://eastdevon.gov.uk/media/2263289/sa-of-cranbrook-masterplan-oct-2017-ver-04.pdf>

## Who was consulted

- 4.5 A report to the Development Management Committee on 31<sup>st</sup> May 2016 which sought authorisation for consultation on the Issues and Options Paper included within it an appendix which set out a proposed consultation programme. In addition and set out with a feedback report to Strategic Planning Committee on the further records of the actual consultation that took place is also recorded. The campaign was based around three talking heads, (the family, a youth and a single person) and used the phrase:

---

*“Cranbrook: Your Town, Your Future, Your Say”.*

*“What do you want your town to be like in 15 years time?”*

---

- 4.6 Using this brand consultation took place with the general and specific consultation bodies as well as other key persons. In addition the following consultation also took place :
- Flyers were delivered to each household in Cranbrook and a non-technical summary leaflet was produced for this.
  - The Cranbrook Herald, a monthly newspaper, was used to publicise the consultation as it had a high local readership.
  - A static unmanned display was available to view at Younghayes Centre reception area throughout the consultation period
  - Paper reference copies of the documents were made available in the East Devon District Council main offices and Public Libraries. Copies of the DPD were also provided to relevant Town and Parish Councils
  - A banner was posted on the Council’s home webpage.
  - All information was made available through the East Devon District Council website and specifically a friendly URL ([www.eastdevon.gov.uk/plancranbrook](http://www.eastdevon.gov.uk/plancranbrook))
  - The information was also made available through the Exeter and East Devon Growth Point website as it was understood that many Cranbrook residents used this website for information about the town.
  - An email address ([plancranbrook@eastdevon.gov.uk](mailto:plancranbrook@eastdevon.gov.uk)) was set up for the consultation to enable residents to clarify information about the consultation.
- 4.7 In addition a series of public exhibitions were held to which members of the team attended comprising public drop in events at:
- Younghayes Centre, Cranbrook
  - @143 (Café) Cranbrook
  - Youth bus in Cranbrook
  - Schools – St Martins Primary and the Cranbrook Education Campus
  - Coffee Mornings,

- Community Market,
- School Fetes, etc.

- 4.8 A commitment was made to the surrounding parishes (Broadclyst, Clyst Honiton, Rockbeare and Whimble) to present to a Parish Council meeting and this subsequently occurred.
- 4.9 Responses were invited either through a SNAP consultation response (software that was used to capture and help analyse the responses) or directly to the Council by letter or email. A copy of the consultation form prepared for the consultation has been reproduced in appendix 5 and a list of respondents are set out in appendix 6.

## Main Issues

- 4.10 There were 123 responses to the formal questionnaire including 89 from individual residents of Cranbrook. In addition 40 email responses including 31 from organisations. The main issues arising from this round of consultation were summarised in a detailed report entitled [Feedback Report on the Cranbrook Plan](#)<sup>6</sup>.

- 4.11 A summary of action points identified within the feedback is set out in the following paragraphs:

### **Vision (Q4)**

- 4.12 While the vision was generally supported it is recognised that a number of specifics needed reviewing/redrafting. It was identified that such work should also reflect emerging evidence

### **Objectives (Q5 – 7)**

- 4.13 Respondents were strongly in agreement with the objectives although the following need further work:
- there is room to further promote positive health
  - a reduction in the delays to the delivery of health facilities be delivered
  - opportunities to encourage and support more cultural, sporting and community facilities
  - continue to actively promote the business potential for the town
  - actively plan or and promote energy efficiency as a desirable outcome
  - reappraise transport objectives noting the wide range of views expressed about how to deliver them
  - it is critical that landscape and biodiversity issues are properly addressed
  - Future success of the town will be influenced by quality of design and therefore master planning approach is important
  - Some concern was expressed about the siting of gypsy and traveller pitches

---

<sup>6</sup> <http://eastdevon.gov.uk/media/2260272/cranbrook-issues-and-options-consult-fback-rpt-ver-04.pdf>

- Address the challenge of delivery infrastructure and facilities alongside new housing

### **Health and Wellbeing (Q 8 – 10)**

- 4.14 World Health Organisation Limits on noise (while higher than some other standards) are necessary to ensure a high quality living environment for future residents and to ensure the future operation of the airport is not prejudiced.
- 4.15 Practical solutions to further assist noise mitigation were also put forward which were considered worth exploring comprising:
- Securing building orientation so that they are less prone to noise
  - Improving sound insulation
  - Placing less noise sensitive uses in the noisier areas
- 4.16 On wider health matters there remained a strong desire to improve the timeliness of facility delivery

### **Culture Community and Sport (Q 11 – 12)**

- 4.17 There was a general view in favour of sports facilities although a mixed response concerning the potential to provide larger facilities (noting the potential for economies of scale) versus the accessibility and choice that a more dispersed provision of local facilities would offer. This will need to be balanced in future versions of the plan.

### **Economy and Enterprise (Q 13 – 18)**

- 4.18 There was general support for initiatives that support business activity. Concerns were noted about the potential co-location of business and employment opportunities including on issues of congestion and adverse amenity. In taking this forward a policy approach which engenders great care in minimising amenity risk between such uses (particularly where this affects adaptable buildings) is necessary.
- 4.19 Where small business units are provided for start-up units, encouragement should be given to ensure that these are provided ahead of adjacent housing rather than lagging behind. There remained mixed views on the use of shipping containers for employment opportunities.
- 4.20 The plan will need to promote and encourage a wide range of uses in the town but will need to use innovative ways in which to secure such provision.
- 4.21 Mixed views were expressed about the potential to separate different uses within the town centre and this would need to be reviewed during the preparation of the plan. More generally additional consideration was needed for the potential locations for business development across the town.

### **Energy and Climate change (Q 19 – 21)**

- 4.22 Despite concerns about potential cost and associated viability there was general support (subject to efficiency of particular type) for the provision of renewable technologies (especially solar panels). During the plan preparation options for further promotion of renewable technology will need to be reviewed.

### **Transport (Q 22 – 26)**

- 4.23 A wide range of views around measures to reduce car dependency. The Cranbrook Plan will need to encourage walking and cycling (for which there was significant support) as well as public transport whilst also noting and making adequate provision for the fact that many people do use cars.
- 4.24 There were polarised views on the benefits of a second railway station to serve the town resulting in the general summary within the feedback report that “integrated transport systems, with links between train, bus and even airport services, which access the whole community, wider communities and commercial areas would be key ... and should underpin future development in the town”
- 4.25 Within the feedback it was noted that speed limits and parking restrictions should be enforced as existing roads were considered narrow and dangerous. In addition new housing should be provided with an adequate quantity and size to make it usable.

### **Landscape and Biodiversity (Q 27 – 31)**

- 4.26 Dominant opinion suggested that character of Cranbrook and other settlements should be protected. Whilst the need for housing was itself considered contentious if this is need care should be taken over the heights of development to avoid impacts on the skyline.
- 4.27 There was significant objection to the potential for development to take place on the sloping land to the southwest which would be visible from Rockbeare. In addition the feedback report also noted the potential for an expanded Cranbrook to be affected by Airport noise but also the risk that the town’s rural character and setting would be diminished.
- 4.28 The provision of SUDS was overwhelmingly supported - particularly where the features could be multifunctional and attractive.
- 4.29 In recognising the potential benefits of undergrounding the overhead lines, it was considered that the Council would examine costs associated with such work as there was merit in such an approach.

### **Design and Mix of Use (Q 32 – 40)**

- 4.30 There needs to be a wide range of housing type and design in Cranbrook which is diversified from the current provision. Some support for a “Cranbrook style” although this could be difficult to define.

- 4.31 There was high level of opposition to higher density housing and if this was taken forward care would be needed, particularly recognising the need for high standards in planning, public space provision, and public transport. In addition there would need to be a density hierarchy to provide lower density at the periphery of the town.
- 4.32 Whilst there was a majority of respondents who were opposed to the development south of the London Road, should this option be pursued it was set out that care would need to be taken in respect of sensitivities identified including the scale of development and the future relationship with Rockbeare.
- 4.33 The status of London Road itself would to some extent depend on the scale of development that is south of the road but access to it and across it will be needed. Design solutions will need to be explored to minimise the potential for additional congestion while facilitating the ability to access all parts of Cranbrook including the business opportunities that exist.
- 4.34 Access concerns were recorded in terms of the future use of Lodge trading estate. However this could continue regardless of the Cranbrook Plan. If this were to be intensified significant access improvements would be very important. More general opposition to the expansion of Cranbrook would not accord with the Local Plan Policy for the town and therefore could not be sustained.
- 4.35 It was recognised that identifying sites for gypsies and travellers can be challenging however there remains a duty on the Council to do so. Cranbrook was considered to be well located in respect of highway access and lies close to historic routes used by the travelling community. Provision at Cranbrook was considered to accord with the local Plan Policy. There was some support for up to two sites where greater facilities could be provides but more support for a wider range of smaller sites to allow better integration.

#### **Delivery and Flexibility (Q 41)**

- 4.36 84% of respondents were very sportive about the possibility of providing temporary spaces for flexible uses and while the importance of providing permanent premises were repeatedly stressed it was considered that allocation of space for temporary uses now could provide flexibility and space for future uses as the town evolves.

#### **Other Comments (Q 42 – 44)**

- 4.37 There was demand for self-build homes and a suggested requirement of at least 10% of new homes to be provided on this basis.

#### **Next Steps (Q 45)**

- 4.38 Through this question within the consultation, 4 options for development expansion were explored. Option 2 of all the options tabled, received the highest endorsement level at 43%, although there remained mixed views regarding density, best use of available land and the need to expend onto more constrained land.

### **Other Comments (Q 46)**

- 4.39 In total 39 “other” comments were received which addressed a wide range of topics including how well the plan had been written; concern that there should have been more face to face consultation (particularly to help explain a lengthy and complex document); to the failure to deliver promised infrastructures. The Councils response was to note these comments for future work.
- 4.40 Outside the scope of the questionnaire were a series of consultation comments from other interested stake holders including a number of land owners and developers as well as individuals. Comments within this wide section highlighted issues associated with infrastructure delivery, land promotion and the additional complexity that a formal DPD would add to the planning process for Cranbrook. The Council did not provide a direct response to the comments within the feedback document (other than noting them) wrapping them all up in a concluding section which considered the next steps. These are outlined below

### **Next ...**

- 4.41 Within the feedback report it was reported that “the Issues and Options document will be used to help inform on-going master plan work for Cranbrook. The masterplan and issues feedback will also inform a preferred Approach draft of the Cranbrook Plan. This Preferred Approach draft will set out policy proposal for Cranbrook and most importantly it will allocate or identify land for development. By allocating land it will advise on what uses, such as houses, shops, parks or roads are expected to be built on differing plots of land. The plan may also include some more generic guidance or policies about standards expected in future development”

## Consultation – Stage 3 (Preferred Approach)

Initial consultation:	Preferred Approach for the Cranbrook Plan (Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning Regulations 2012 (as amended))
	Accompanied by: List of proposed policy requirements Cranbrook Masterplan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)
Dates:	10 November 2017 – 8 January 2018
Purpose:	Test a single detailed development option for the expansion of Cranbrook

### Objectives for the consultation

- 5.1 The consultation on the plan at this stage presented an opportunity for people to comment on the future development at Cranbrook - looking at the distribution of required housing as well as the type and location of associated infrastructure. In particular it focussed on a draft masterplan for the town (including the background evidence) setting out a number of key aspects:
- The spatial distribution and actual numbers of houses that could realistically be archived in each expansion area
  - The distribution of key infrastructure including neighbourhood centres and schools
  - Employment provision
  - Green space and importantly the location and quantum of available SANGS
  - The location of potential sites for gypsy and traveller provision
  - Land that needed to be safeguarded for a second railway station and for an enhanced energy centre.
- 5.2 Together with the masterplan and its accompanying evidence, views were also sought on the list of likely polices that would be included within the Cranbrook Plan, together with the SA and SEA.
- 5.3 In summary it was an opportunity for the Council to test a final single option for the expansion of Cranbrook setting out a significant level of detail to help elicit meaningful comment, before preparing a final “publication version” of the plan.

## Who was consulted?

- 5.4 Consultation was made with the general and specific consultation bodies identified by the Regulations as well as other interest groups that had previously been identified. Consultation followed the requirements of the Council's Statement of Community Involvement
- 5.5 Manned consultation events were planned where possible to coincide with other public events in the run up to Christmas 2017 (for example Christmas markets). In total, Officers attended two events in Cranbrook and one each in Rockbeare, Clyst Honiton and Broadclyst as well as being available to answer public questions and queries at varying times of the day at the Younghayes Centre, Cranbrook on half a dozen other occasions. At the centre a static consultation display was permanently available to view.
- 5.6 A paper copy of the consultation material was placed at Clyst Vale Library. Officers also attended Town and Parish Council meetings in Cranbrook, Rockbeare, Clyst Honiton, Broadclyst and Whimble and a presentation was given to secondary school aged students at Cranbrook Education Campus. Approximately 2,500 organisations and individuals on the Council's Planning Policy database were invited to participate in the consultation and 5,000 postcards advertising the consultation were distributed to residents and businesses in the local area and posters displayed in public locations throughout the plan area. Further advertisement of the consultation was made on social media during the consultation period to encourage engagement

## Main Issues

- 5.7 A total of 138 consultation responses were received during the consultation period. Of these, 6 were from Town and Parish Councils, 2 from County Councils (Devon and Somerset), 2 from District Councillors, 16 from other groups and consultation bodies, 12 from developers or agents and the remaining 100 from members of the public. The majority of the representations from members of the public were from residents of Cranbrook and the surrounding settlements of Broadclyst Station, Rockbeare and Whimble. The list of publishable names are included in appendix 8, whilst full copies of the 138 consultation responses can be viewed on plan the making pages of the [Councils website](#)<sup>7</sup>.
- 5.8 It should be noted that personal information has been removed from the published documents, other than where made by groups or organisations or where a respondent gave express permission to publish their name. In addition, a small amount of text has been redacted where it provided personal information which may identify someone or contained inappropriate comments. The consultation documentation and the associated questionnaire split the document into a series of different topics on which feedback was sought. The table at appendix 7 of this report sets out the main issues arising from the consultation responses the initially intended actions to address the specific matter raised, where appropriate and an up to date commentary on the work the final approach that has been taken. The table is not a comprehensive list of all individual matters raised; but has been collated as a meaningful

---

<sup>7</sup> <http://eastdevon.gov.uk/planning/planning-policy/cranbrook-plan/>

summary of the issues. All comments submitted were considered and where appropriate have been addressed.

### **Relationship with Neighbourhood plan areas**

- 5.9 One matter of particular note arising from the Cranbrook Plan Preferred Approach document and consultation was the relationship of the proposed plan with the Neighbourhood Plans and Plan Areas of adjoining parishes. Strategy 12 of the Local Plan states that the required additional 1,550 homes and associated jobs and infrastructure will be accommodated within the Cranbrook Plan area but outside the designated Neighbourhood Plan Areas of Rockbeare, Broadclyst and Clyst Honiton. The preferred approach document indicated development occurring within parts of the Rockbeare and Broadclyst Neighbourhood Plan Areas. In the Broadclyst Neighbourhood Plan Area the encroachment was a small area of land adjacent to Station Road. During consultation Broadclyst Parish Council did not raise specific objection to the inclusion of a small parcel of land within their Neighbourhood Plan Area as part of the Cranbrook Plan, although they were concerned more generally with the relationship between Cranbrook and Broadclyst Station, the residents of which are very keen to retain a buffer between the two.
- 5.10 In the Rockbeare Neighbourhood Plan Area the encroachment was of a larger parcel of land to the South of London Road (B3174), encompassing land for a range of uses, including housing development and Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANGS). This resulted in an outstanding objection from the Neighbourhood Plan group and needed to be kept under review.

### **Next ...**

- 5.11 In the report to the Strategic Planning Committee on the 20<sup>th</sup> March 2018 it was set out that the refinement of the Cranbrook Plan was needed to take place. This would include:
- gathering and updating evidence as required
  - incorporating and drafting the final wording for the policy text
  - refining the masterplan
  - viability testing the plan to ensure that it represents a deliverable set of proposals
  - preparation of statutory documentation to accompany the publication version of the plan including an updated SEA and SA.
- 5.12 Subsequent to the reporting of the consultation results to the Strategic Planning Committee the Rockbeare Neighbourhood Plan was 'made'. This resulted in additional weight being given to it and without further landscape constraints to the east, a decision was taken to respect the position set out within that plan. Whilst there was previously no common ground found between Officers who attended meetings with both Rockbeare Parish Council and the Rockbeare Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group the change to the allocation area is expected to address this concern

## Consultation – Stage 4 (Proposed submission Consultation)

consultation:	Proposed submission version of the Cranbrook Plan (Regulation 19 and 20 of the Town and Country Planning Regulations 2012)  Accompanied by: Masterplan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)
Dates:	11 March 2019 -
Purpose:	To advertise the final suite of documents that comprise the future submission to the Secretary of State (Planning Inspectorate) in accordance with the Regulations

### Objectives

### Who was consulted

### Main Issues

Page to be completed after Pre submission consultation

### Next...

## Appendices

1. Consultation Bodies
2. Initial Consultation - Consultation Text
3. Respondents to initial consultation
4. Detailed summary of feedback from initial consultation
5. Issues and Options Consultation Summary
6. Issues and Options Consultation Form
7. Preferred Approach summary of issues, actions and updates
8. Preferred Approach respondents
9. Representation form used for pre-submission consultation
10. Detailed Summary of issues raised to Pre-submission Consultation
11. Summary list of respondents to Pre-submission consultation

## Appendix 1 – Consultation Bodies

(Extract from [Statement of Community Involvement](#)<sup>8</sup>)

### Consultation Bodies

The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2012 require the Council to consult the following ‘specific’ and ‘general’ consultation bodies if proposals in planning policy documents affect them. A number of these bodies are also considered to be Duty to Co-operate bodies. It is important to note that the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (schedule 1) also requires qualifying bodies to consult the same consultation bodies in the preparation of Neighbourhood Development Plans. In instances where any of the organisations (bodies) detailed below cease to exist, successor bodies will be consulted.

Specific Consultation Bodies	
<b>Local Planning Authorities</b>	The Coal Authority
- Devon County Council	Homes and Communities Agency
- West Dorset District Council	Natural England
- South Somerset District Council	The Environment Agency
- Mid Devon District Council	Historic England
- Taunton Deane Council	Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd
- Exeter City Council	Highways England
- Teignbridge District Council	Marine Management Organisation
<b>Town / Parish Councils</b>	Relevant telecommunications companies
- All Town and Parish Councils within and adjoining East Devon District	Devon and Cornwall Constabulary/ Police and Crime Commissioner
<b>Local Enterprise Partnerships</b>	Relevant health bodies e.g. CCG, NHS PCT
- Heart of the South West Local Enterprise Partnership	Relevant electricity and gas companies
	Relevant sewerage and water undertakers

<sup>8</sup> <http://eastdevon.gov.uk/media/2692931/2018-sci-v6.pdf>

In addition to the specific consultation bodies listed above, the council/qualifying body will involve as many people and groups as possible in the categories below:

<b>General Consultation Bodies</b>
voluntary bodies some or all of whose activities benefit any part of the local planning authority's area
bodies which represent the interests of different racial, ethnic or national groups in the local planning authority's area
bodies which represent the interests of different religious groups in the local planning authority's area
bodies which represent the interests of different gender and sexual orientation groups in the local planning authority's area
bodies which represent the interests of disabled persons in the local planning authority's area
bodies which represent the interests of persons carrying on business in the local planning authority's area

<b>Examples of organisations which are General Consultation Bodies</b>
Environment and conservation groups (e.g. the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds and Devon Wildlife Trust)
Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) Partnerships
Minority ethnic groups
Gypsy and Traveller groups
Sport England
Youth groups, schools, colleges
Health care groups
Transport providers/operators
Housing interest groups
Landowners and developers
Local businesses/ bodies which represent local businesses
Local resident associations
Older persons groups
Religious groups

## Appendix 2 – Initial Consultation – Consultation text

Text for the consultation is set out below, was directly reported to Development Management Committee in the feedback report on the 6th October 2015 and remains available on the Council's website [here](#)<sup>9</sup>

### ***“Cranbrook: The Future Development Plan Document (DPD)***

*East Devon District Council would like to hear your views to help us develop plans and policies to guide the future expansion of Cranbrook new community.*

*The replies we receive will help us shape the future of Cranbrook in two ways:*

- 1) in the preparation of a Cranbrook Development Plan Document (DPD) - a formal planning policy document to explicitly guide and regulate development (notice of this consultation is given under Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning Regulations 2012).*
- 2) feed into wider work being undertaken by specialist consultants on our behalf to develop a ‘Cranbrook Plan’ – this will provide a framework for the future expansion of the new town, and will be compliant with the policies of the emerging new district-wide East Devon Local Plan.*

### ***What should be included?***

*The Cranbrook DPD may cover the topics listed below and we are particularly interested to know what alternative or additional issues you think should be addressed and what factors you consider should be taken into account in the overall plan production work.*

- 1) allocate specific sites and land areas for new development;*
- 2) designate land for ‘protection’ or safeguarding which will prevent or limit development;*
- 3) include policies, cross-referencing where appropriate to specific land areas, in respect of development of:*
  - a) new homes;*
  - b) gypsy and traveller accommodation;*
  - c) community facilities;*
  - d) education facilities;*
  - e) sports and play areas and facilities;*
  - f) shops;*
  - g) parks and open space;*
  - h) places of employment; and*

---

<sup>9</sup> <http://eastdevon.gov.uk/planning/planning-policy/cranbrook-plan/the-cranbrook-plan-dpd-and-initial-public-consultation/>

- i) other possible uses not detailed above.*
- 4) establish the supporting infrastructure and means for its delivery required by the above uses;*
- 5) establish forms and principles of development and materials and design standards to promote the highest quality outcomes;*
- 6) define mitigation required to off-set potential adverse impacts that might otherwise arise as a consequence of development;*
- 7) determine mechanisms for monitoring the success and quality of what is happening and being built and set targets; and*
- 8) determine whether planning applications submitted to the Council should be granted planning permission and what conditions might apply.*

*The on-going work on the Cranbrook Plan is already involving a wide range of stakeholders and we intend to ensure that this partnership approach continues.*

### **Getting involved**

*You can find out more about the Cranbrook DPD by viewing the Development Management Committee papers from the 16 June 2015 online at:*

*<http://eastdevon.gov.uk/media/1162155/160615-combined-dmc-agenda-compresed.pdf>*

*Then please either email your comments to*

*[localplan@eastdevon.gov.uk](mailto:localplan@eastdevon.gov.uk)*

*with 'Cranbrook DPD' in the subject box*

*or by post to:*

*Planning Policy Section*

*East Devon District Council*

*Knowle*

*Sidmouth, EX10 8HL*

*To arrive on or before: Friday 7 August 2015.*

### **Next steps**

*The Cranbrook Plan will form the overarching evidence base for the DPD and its conclusions and associated outputs will form the basis of, or feed directly into, the publication draft of the Cranbrook DPD. It is the publication draft that is made publically available for formal comment and any comments received will be submitted, along with the DPD, and supporting evidence to the planning Inspectorate for formal examination.*

*Please pass this communication on to anyone else you think might be interested in getting involved.”.*

## Appendix 3 – Respondents to initial consultation

Representor Number	Respondent	On behalf or/Organisation
28	Dr M Hall	CPRE
124	Mr M Dunn	South West Water
164	Mr G Parsons	Sport England
305	Mr E Moffatt	Diocese of Exeter
508	Mr Le Riche	Lympstone Parish Council
521	Mr M Calder	National Trust
526	Mr I Lings	Woodland Trust
540	Mono Consultants Ltd	Mobile Operators Association
553	Mr O Varney	Equalities and Human Rights Commission
595	Hilary Winter	Devon Countryside Access Forum
949	Mr C Twitchett	Office of Rail and Road Regulation
3209	Mr N Freer	David Lock Associates representing East Devon New Community Partners (EDNCp)
3712	Mr M Salmon	Environment Agency
6737	Mr J Keech	Devon County Council
6741		Honiton Town Council
6929	C Baxter	BEA Group
7007	Mr Gibson	Network Rail
7040		Devon Senior Voice
7169		Bilfinger GVA representing Skypark Development Partnerships (SDP)
7188	Mr A Wheatland	
7190		Bell Cornwell representing Cranbrook LVA LLP
7194	Mr P Smith	
7195	Mr A G Lascelles	
7343		PCL Planning Ltd representing Waddeton Park Limited

## Appendix 4 – Detailed summary of feedback from initial consultation

General Subject Matter	Officer Summary of Issues Raised
<b>Procedural matters</b>	<p>A number of respondents referred to procedural matters that need to be followed in respect of production of the DPD</p> <p>It was specifically highlighted that the plan should be supported by Sustainability Appraisal. The importance of meeting obligations under the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) in the Equality Act 2010 was highlighted by the equalities and Human Rights commission.</p>
<b>Structure of the DPD</b>	<p>The Environment Agency recommended a number of potential sections or parts to the DPD, which included ensuring that it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Sets out a clear vision for Cranbrook going forward (the importance of a vision was made in other submissions as was the specific issue of making best use of development opportunities);</li> <li>b) clearly identifies the evidence base that has been used to inform the document;</li> <li>c) considers 'lessons learnt' from the Cranbrook development to date and how these are used; and</li> <li>d) identifies the legislative and policy framework that has been used to inform production.</li> </ul>
<b>Flexibility on policy in the DPD</b>	<p>Whilst the DPD will set out policy for future development it was suggested that the DPD should not be over-prescriptive and should allow for responses to the market and provide flexibility to respond to changing conditions in the future. It was also considered that the DPD work should not hold up delivery of suitable scheme and should not require a comprehensive development scheme to come forward from all different landowners. It should not, therefore, prevent discreet third party land areas 'at' Cranbrook coming forward for development. In representation the view was expressed that prescribed mitigation should not be set out in the DPD or conditions be pre-determined.</p>
<b>Timescale for master plan production and DPD production</b>	<p>There was a question raised by the agents for Skypark about the timescale for production of the Cranbrook master plan and the separate DPD, the relationship between the two and the determination of current extant planning applications at Cranbrook.</p>
<b>The current residents of Cranbrook</b>	<p>In representation it was noted that East Devon has an aging population and this fact should be reflected in the Cranbrook DPD, noting positive benefits the older population can offer (also reference was made to the current younger age profile of Cranbrook). A respondent noted that Cranbrook is a very community spirited town with lots of activities going on.</p>

<b>General Subject Matter</b>	<b>Officer Summary of Issues Raised</b>
<b>Consultation and Collaborative working</b>	<p>A number of respondents indicated or inferred the importance of working in partnerships in the plan making process and for the future of Cranbrook.</p> <p>A comment was made that in the future there should be greater and specific consultation, including with, public, private, charitable, Church and community representatives (comment was specifically made about the future of the County Park but has wider applicability). A number of respondents expressed a desire to be actively involved in future work, workshops and engagements activities on the Cranbrook Plan DPD.</p>
<b>Infrastructure provision and delivery and Developer contributions</b>	<p>Infrastructure provision featured in a many of the representations (with specific references elsewhere in this table). There was, however specific reference made to the importance of the DPD in promoting infrastructure delivery noting success of the current approach.</p> <p>There was, as well, a submission by Devon County Council advising that the DPD should be accompanied by an infrastructure schedule setting out the infrastructure required, the organisation responsible for its delivery, potential funding sources and timescale for delivery. The County Council advised that they would be happy to work with the district and town council to help inform this piece of work.</p> <p>The County Council also advised that the DPD should assess the mitigation required to make Cranbrook acceptable in planning terms. This they advised should be assessed against potential viability and the Community Infrastructure Levy and anticipated s106 should be amended accordingly.</p>
<b>Monitoring and Reviewing</b>	<p>Comment was made on the need for ongoing monitoring and assessment at Cranbrook.</p>
<b>Cranbrook Town Council and Neighbourhood Plans</b>	<p>The involvement and input of the local community was specifically highlighted as important and reference was made to the positive potential for Cranbrook to produce a Neighbourhood Plan. A respondent encouraged specific action for the Town Council to promote production of such a plan. Another respondent called for devolved planning and wider powers to the town council and greater 'planning gain' to go to the town council.</p>
<b>Learning from history</b>	<p>One respondent made comment specifically in respect of learning from and being informed by new town development in the past. The response highlighted some of the successes and failures of new towns from the 20<sup>th</sup> century, and more recent developments. The submission highlighted the relevance of master plan work to new town development and the links to high quality environmental standards.</p>

<b>General Subject Matter</b>	<b>Officer Summary of Issues Raised</b>
<b>Longer term development issues</b>	<p>There was comment made in respect of the longer term development of Cranbrook and the role the DPD should play. Devon County Council were of the view that the DPD should avoid precluding development, for example in terms of town centre uses and transport networks that may be appropriate in the longer term. They advised the DPD should, however, identify where there may be clear strategic boundaries to the built up area that need to be robustly maintained.</p> <p>Representation on behalf of the Cranbrook consortium (New Community Partners) focussed on the view that the DPD should plan for longer, post 2031 development, to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) the ultimate scale of Cranbrook (over and above the commitments in the Local Plan to 2031);</li> <li>b) the establishment of permanent safeguards for the existing villages of Rockbeare, Clyst Honiton, Whimble and Broadclyst and their relationships with Cranbrook – through the affirmation and expansion as appropriate of green wedge or similar policies;</li> <li>c) any development of policy in respect of the town centre for Cranbrook, having regard to its ultimate size;</li> <li>d) how smaller scale infill developments should be addressed over the longer term.</li> </ul> <p>A number of respondents raised concerns around the scale of future development and Cranbrook growing too much and too quickly. Some comments partly related to matters of ensuring timely infrastructure and service provision. On a general level particular importance was attached in comments to ensuring that services and facilities were provided in line with and proportionate to the pace of growth envisaged.</p>
<b>Relationship with Surrounding Areas</b>	<p>A number of respondents highlighted the fact that Cranbrook does not exist in isolation and it should be looked at within the context of surrounding locations, developments and land uses. This included reference to other major new developments to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) development at/near Blackhorse;</li> <li>b) Skypark;</li> <li>c) the airport; and</li> <li>d) intermodal.</li> </ul> <p>Comments addressed matters relating to wider service and community infrastructure provision and delivery. Representation also noted the importance of protecting surrounding settlements from development, specifically noting the role of Neighbourhood Plans in other areas.</p>

General Subject Matter	Officer Summary of Issues Raised
<p><b>Housing provision</b></p>	<p>Many of the respondents highlighted matters relating to future housing provision including a call for a greater mix of housing types and provision. Specific comments in submissions included matters relating to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) <b>Affordable homes</b> – provision of affordable housing featured in a number of representations with a specific submission advocating more 1-2 bed homes.</li> <li>b) <b>Minimum Space standards</b> – it was proposed that minimum space standards should be set out for new housing and new dwellings should be designed with flexibility to allow for subsequent extension and adaption.</li> <li>c) <b>Storage space</b> – it was proposed that new houses should incorporate greater storage space, noting decrease in average house sizes over recent years, and it was advised that lack of garage provision exacerbates storage deficiencies.</li> <li>d) <b>Density of housing development</b> - whilst there were representations that advocated higher density housing, including in central areas and responding to areas lacking constraints and landscape considerations, there was also a submission highlighting garden city concepts that considered that housing densities should be lower.</li> <li>e) <b>Self build Housing</b> - provision for self build housing was advocated in representations.</li> <li>f) <b>Parking provision</b> - higher standards of parking provision and better off-road provision were advocated in submissions, including for residents and visitors. A respondent noted that in the near future there will be large numbers of mobile teenagers.</li> <li>g) <b>Gypsy &amp; traveller accommodation</b> – there was acknowledgment of the need to plan for gypsy and traveller provision but also some opposition. There was also observation raised about potential impacts of provision, including in respect of delivery of employment sites and jobs (specifically at Skypark).</li> <li>h) <b>Elderly person housing</b> – a number of respondents called for specific housing provision for the elderly including in respect of care homes, extra care homes and provision with day services. Devon Senior Voice called for specific consultation with health and social care providers in respect of provision. One respondent promoted bungalow development specifically restricted to over 55 year olds.</li> <li>i) <b>Private sector rental</b> - there was a call for a specific policy targeted at Private sector rental development, with constraints placed on retention in this sector.</li> </ul>

General Subject Matter	Officer Summary of Issues Raised
<p><b>Commercial and retail provision and employment</b></p>	<p>Jobs and employment related matters featured extensively in submissions received, including in respect of such matters as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) <b>Nature of employment provision</b> - it was suggested in submission that the role of employment provision at Cranbrook should be in respect of workspace/ workshops which will assist start-up businesses or shared space. A respondent referred to provision of a business centre.</li> <li>b) <b>Distribution of facilities</b> - there was a specific call for shops and other services to be located across Cranbrook, with easy access to residents, and from Devon Senior Voice, for 'dementia friendly' services in a one building unit. There was also the view that provision should be made at an earlier stage/phased to be developed sooner.</li> <li>c) <b>Relationship with Skypark</b> - Agents for Skypark raised specific concern around employment provision and development at Cranbrook potentially adversely impacting on the delivery of the Skypark employment provision. Delivery of Skypark was noted to be of strategic importance though with particular infrastructure and land remediation challenges attached. Concern was expressed that too much employment land at Cranbrook could lead to an overall over-provision of employment land and adversely impact on Skypark delivery.</li> <li>d) <b>Jobs for local people</b> –one respondent considered that there should be an emphasis on providing jobs for local residents.</li> <li>e) <b>Benefits of an elderly population</b> - It was noted in a submission that incomes in the Cranbrook area/surrounds are lower than averages and elderly people were cited as a group that can bring positive economic benefits.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Town centre</b></p>	<p>There were comments specifically promoting provision of a town centre, and that the DPD should include its location, orientation and design criteria and should include an assessment of likely development quantum (i.e. the overall size of the town centre). A specific call was made for an 'an outstanding Town Centre' reflecting traditional Devon market town architecture and with a mix of national retailers and independents. Views expressed included that the town centre should be supported by a mix of commercial and community facilities and flats above.</p>


General Subject Matter	Officer Summary of Issues Raised
<p><b>Social and community facilities</b></p>	<p>Many respondents highlighted the specific need for social and community facilities at Cranbrook and some highlighted the importance of provision in line with development and had concerns in respect of a current lag in provision. Specific facilities (in addition to those noted above) included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) <b>Adequacy of school provision</b> - There was specific concern about the schools at Cranbrook not be sufficient to meet education needs and numbers of pupils.</li> <li>b) <b>Public Houses</b> – there was a specific call for provision of a pub.</li> <li>c) <b>Allotments</b> – respondents saw need for allotment provision.</li> <li>d) <b>Places of worship</b> – a general expansion of provision was identified as needed.</li> <li>e) <b>Health provision</b> – there was seen to be a need for more GP surgery provision and also community health services and there was also a specific call for a community hospital.</li> <li>f) <b>Leisure and sports facilities</b> – greater provision for sports and leisure was promoted with specific reference (explicitly by Sport England) to levels and standard of provision at Cranbrook that should be provided.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Green Space and Environmental Protection and Enhancement</b></p>	<p>The importance of environmental protection and enhancement featured in a significant number of responses with matters identified including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) <b>Green Infrastructure</b> – the importance of green infrastructure provision as a general heading (which covers such matters as open space, plantings, footpaths, water areas, etc) featured in representations with calls for detailed provision through and in policy of the DPD.</li> <li>b) <b>Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (or SANGs)</b> – SANGs are large open space areas provided as a means to attract damaging recreation activity away from the most important wildlife sites (the Exe Estuary and Pebblebed Heats) and submission specifically referred to the need for provision.</li> <li>c) <b>Trees and Woodland</b> – the need to protect existing trees and woodland was highlighted in a number of submissions as was a call for more planting and submission also highlighted the wider role and benefits that trees offer.</li> <li>d) <b>Resisting loss of Green assets</b> – there was submission specifically seeking to avoid the loss of green assets to development.</li> <li>e) <b>landscaping and development of Cranbrook</b> – the importance of landscaping issues and landscape setting featured in submissions. The National Trust were keen to promote links between Cranbrook and Trust land and assets and advised of the publication of a Trust publication ‘<i>A Prospectus for Action; Opportunities arising from the Exeter and East Devon Growth Point</i>’.</li> <li>f) <b>Woodland</b> – representation highlighted the importance of the woodland around Cranbrook and its relevance in considering future planning and development – the Woodland Trust advocated use of ‘the Woodland Access Standard’ and it was noted that new urban tree planting can have economic, social and environmental benefits.</li> </ul>

General Subject Matter	Officer Summary of Issues Raised
<p><b>Built Environment Quality and Design</b></p>	<p>Respondents commented on the overall design and build quality issues at Cranbrook, with these to some extent referring to development to date. Matters raised included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) <b>Local distinctiveness</b> – there was a call for development to establish locally distinctive forms and patterns of development and for individual areas in Cranbrook to come forward with distinct local characteristics.</li> <li>b) <b>Local Vernacular</b> – there were calls for locally distinct design styles and to be used.</li> <li>c) <b>Security</b> – in representation greater security and endorsement of principles of ‘Secure by Design; was called for.</li> <li>d) <b>Historic Environment</b> – it was considered that the historic built environment in and around Cranbrook should be protected (with more detailed assessment and investigation undertaken) and the historic environment should inform future development.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Water Infrastructure</b></p>	<p>A number of respondents commented on the importance of water and water resource issues and environmental quality issues and enhancement opportunities related to water. South West Water made reference to the fact that their strategic infrastructure plans would provide for growth.</p> <p>The Environment Agency specifically highlighted the need to take into account such factors as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Climate change,</li> <li>• the Water Framework Directive and</li> <li>• flood risk and</li> </ul> <p>policies should address areas liable to flood, the safeguarding from development of areas liable to flood, the use of sustainable urban drainage and design considerations in and of flooding related infrastructure.</p>
<p><b>Transportation Issues</b></p>	<p>Transport issues featured in many of the representations with matters raised including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) <b>Over-arching transport principles</b> – views expressed considered that the DPD should set out principles for the transport system within and linking to and from Cranbrook.</li> <li>b) <b>Understanding of transport routes</b> – which would include looking and promoting potential routes for different transport modes.</li> <li>c) <b>Setting design objectives</b> - such as route locations, widths, use of shared or segregated space in different areas.</li> <li>d) <b>interaction with surrounding</b> – which could include issues such natural surveillance.</li> <li>e) <b>2<sup>nd</sup> Railway station</b> - there was representation proposing provision of a second station given that the first is remote from much of Cranbrook. There was, however, concern expressed over delays in the opening of the first.</li> <li>f) <b>Congestion</b> - Existing congestion on streets was noted and it was highlighted in a comment that there should be parking restrictions and road humps to manage traffic.</li> </ul>

<b>General Subject Matter</b>	<b>Officer Summary of Issues Raised</b>
<b>Existing Railway operations</b>	<p>Specific concern was raised by the Office of Rail and Road Regulation in respect to rail crossings and the safety impacts associated with new development and potential for replacing a level crossing with a bridge. Network Rail also raised specific concerns and noted that development near to crossings, generating extra movements across the rail lines, could adversely impact on train services.</p>
<b>Healthy living environment</b>	<p>Whilst ensuring that Cranbrook is a healthy place to live should be an outcome of many of the comments and observations made (including matters such as sport and recreation provision) it is was specifically highlighted in representation as being a positive objective in its own right. Attention was drawn to the importance that Cranbrook should be developed to 'Active Design Principles' to include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access for all</li> <li>• Walkable communities</li> <li>• Connected walking and cycling routes</li> <li>• Co-location of community facilities</li> <li>• Network of multifunctional green space</li> <li>• High quality streets and spaces</li> <li>• Active Design in buildings</li> <li>• Management and maintenance.</li> </ul> <p>Others raised similar considerations to these and to links to wider surrounding areas and to protection of existing routes and provision of new links to open spaces. Allied to these matters there was a specific concern raised about quality and availability of footpaths and cycle paths and conflict between cars and pedestrians. It was advocated in representation that open space and recreation provision should be dispersed across Cranbrook. A respondent was also concerned about general lack of accessible green space to homes.</p>
<b>Tele-communications</b>	<p>There was a specific request for a telecommunications policy in the DPD from mobile operators (Mono consultants) a specific policy for mast provision was proposed.</p>
<b>Minerals reuse</b>	<p>The potential for use of minerals in the area such as sand and gravel deposits either including excavation prior to construction for use offsite and/or use of the deposits for the construction of the town was highlighted as an issue.</p>
<b>Waste considerations</b>	<p>Representation highlighted the potential to minimise waste generation throughout the construction of the development, and promoted a consideration of how to manage waste in accordance with the waste hierarchy once the development is 'operational'.</p>
<b>Collection of waste and provision of waste bins</b>	<p>A specific comment was made about the lack of waste bins (including for dog poo) with specific reference to current absence from the Country Park.</p>

## Appendix 5 – Issues and Options Consultation form

**Have your say!**  
Cranbrook Development Plan: Issues and Options  
2016



- It's easy to find out more and complete this questionnaire online at:  
**[www.eastdevon.gov.uk/cranbrook](http://www.eastdevon.gov.uk/cranbrook)**

- Alternatively, you can complete this paper copy and return it to us. Once you've completed the questionnaire please send it back to us in the pre-paid envelope provided or hand deliver it to the Cranbrook Team upstairs in the Younghayes Centre, 169 Younghayes Road, Cranbrook during normal office hours.

**We need all responses back by 25 July 2016.**

- This questionnaire is for residents, the public and also other interested parties, organisations and stakeholders.
- If there are any questions or sections you can't answer or don't want to answer please feel free to leave them blank.
- The questionnaire has 46 questions and will take roughly 35 minutes to complete, depending on how much of it you fill in and how many comments you make.
- Please continue your comments on a separate sheet of paper if necessary, refer to question numbers so we know which question your comments need adding to. Please attach any extra sheets to your completed questionnaire.

You don't have to complete this form, you can also make any comments by e-mail to [plancranbrook@eastdevon.gov.uk](mailto:plancranbrook@eastdevon.gov.uk) or by post to Communications, East Devon District Council, Knowle, Station Road, Sidmouth, EX10 8HL or hand deliver your letter to the Cranbrook Team upstairs in the Younghayes Community Centre, 169 Younghayes Road, Cranbrook during normal office hours.

**Please look at the accompanying documents when filling the questionnaire in or sending us your comments, all of these are available:**

- online: [www.eastdevon.gov.uk/cranbrook](http://www.eastdevon.gov.uk/cranbrook)
- at East Devon District Council's main offices at Knowle, Station Road, Sidmouth, EX10 8HL during office hours
- in the entrance area of the Younghayes Centre, 169 Younghayes Road, Cranbrook during office hours
- at our events, further details at [www.eastdevon.gov.uk/cranbrook](http://www.eastdevon.gov.uk/cranbrook)

If you would like a copy of any of the questionnaire or consultation documents on paper, in large print or any other format please call us on (01395) 517569 or e-mail [plancranbrook@eastdevon.gov.uk](mailto:plancranbrook@eastdevon.gov.uk)

Continued over the page...

**Your personal details**

- Full completed questionnaires and any other representations you make will be made available for public inspection at our council offices in Sidmouth on request with personal contact details removed. Contact details of businesses and organisations will not be removed.  
 - The completed questionnaires and other representations you submit on this document will be kept in full on our files, used in the plan process and may be kept and in use for the lifetime of the Cranbrook Development Plan Document and beyond.  
 - If you give us your contact details we will use these to keep you informed throughout the production of the Cranbrook Development Plan Document.

By submitting completed questionnaires and any other representations to us you are giving your consent for your completed questionnaires and any other representations to be kept, used and made available in this way. If you feel yours needs to be treated confidentially and not be made available in this way, please contact us.

**1. Personal details:**

Name:

Address line 1:

Address line 2:

Address line 3:

Address line 4:

Postcode:

Phone number:

E-mail address, please write in BLOCK CAPITALS:

**2. Are you filling this questionnaire in on behalf of an organisation?**

Yes  
 No - please move onto question 3

Your job title:

Organisation:

**3. If you are completing this questionnaire on behalf of someone else please put your own details here (agent details):**

We will then use these contact details for further correspondence.

Name:

Address line 1:

Address line 2:

Address line 3:

Address line 4:

Postcode:

Phone number:

E-mail address, please write in BLOCK CAPITALS:

Job title (if relevant):

Organisation (if relevant):

**Vision - pages 22 to 23**

**4. Do you agree with the proposed vision for Cranbrook?**

Yes  No

If yes, please tell us why you agree with it:

If no, please tell us how you would improve it:

**Objectives - pages 24 to 33**

**5. Do you agree or disagree with each of the objectives?**

**5a. Do you agree or disagree with each of the objectives for health and wellbeing?**

	Agree	Disagree	Don't know / unsure
4.a.1. Health and wellbeing is integrated into all parts of the town.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.a.2. A balanced, active community with the best health and wellbeing outcomes in the UK.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.a.3. A town that is designed to help prevent long-term health conditions such as obesity and depression from developing.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.a.4. From the start new technology helps health and wellbeing services work together to provide the most effective services.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.a.5. The best outdoor environment for everyone, including the young and vulnerable.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**5b. Do you agree or disagree with each of the objectives for culture, sport and community?**

	Agree	Disagree	Don't know / unsure
4.b.1. A supportive, balanced, diverse community with community, sport and cultural facilities for everyone.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.b.2. Strong cultural and community activity that brings the community together and attracts people in to the town.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.b.3. A range of flexible community buildings and spaces that enable the community to interact as and when they wish.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.b.4. A town that supports and encourages local creative projects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.b.5. Schools that are at the heart of the community.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.b.6. Sports activities are accessible to all, part of the fabric and community of Cranbrook.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**5c. Do you agree or disagree with each of the objectives for economy and enterprise?**

	Agree	Disagree	Don't know / unsure
4.c.1. Cranbrook secures its identity as a small enterprise town with a successful business community which is recognised for identifying new business opportunities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.c.2. Cranbrook residents are encouraged to start their own small businesses within the town.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.c.3. External businesses are attracted to Cranbrook because it is a thriving and vibrant town.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.c.4. All residents can access excellent education to develop the skills they need to fulfil their ambitions.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.c.5. Vibrant town and neighbourhood centres which are busy and successful both in the day and evening.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**5d. Do you agree or disagree with each of the objectives for energy and climate change?**

	Agree	Disagree	Don't know / unsure
4.d.1. Reduce the amount of harmful greenhouse gases Cranbrook sends into the atmosphere by being more energy efficient and making greater use of renewable energy.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.d.2. Be fully informed and prepared for the effects and impact of climate change.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.d.3. Encourage residents to minimise their carbon footprint by using public transport, walking and cycling and reducing the energy they use.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.d.4. To encourage the purchasing of local goods and materials by residents and developers and ensure waste is recycled wherever possible.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**5e. Do you agree or disagree with each of the objectives for transport?**

	Agree	Disagree	Don't know / unsure
4.e.1. An integrated, coordinated transport system enabling people to move easily within Cranbrook and to its neighbours and beyond.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.e.2. Have as many public transport routes and services as possible and make walking and cycling around the town as easy as possible.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.e.3. Reduce car use by making public transport, walking and cycling attractive alternatives.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.e.4. Be ready for future developments in transport technology.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**5f. Do you agree or disagree with each of the objectives for landscape and biodiversity?**

	Agree	Disagree	Don't know / unsure
4.f.1. Cranbrook has high quality accessible natural green spaces.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.f.2. Green spaces and landscape features within and around Cranbrook are linked and have a variety of functions making sure that they are as valuable as possible to the community and wildlife.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.f.3. Buildings and open spaces include nesting boxes and other features to create wildlife habitats that the community can also enjoy.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.f.4. Features such as ponds and ditches are used to collect storm water and designed so that they help to create attractive streets and open spaces.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**5g. Do you agree or disagree with each of the objectives for design and housing?**

	Agree	Disagree	Don't know / unsure
4.g.1. Buildings and spaces are well designed to make an attractive, thriving town.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.g.2. A wide range of homes are available to rent, buy and build.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.g.3. Streets are social spaces, connecting people, not just places.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.g.4. Spaces and buildings are designed to encourage people to talk to one another, allow people to trade goods and services and can easily be changed to meet the changing needs of the community.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.g.5. Spaces and buildings are designed to prevent crime and anti-social behaviour without the need for visible security.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**5h. Do you agree or disagree with each of the objectives for delivery and flexibility?**

	Agree	Disagree	Don't know / unsure
4.h.1. Cranbrook's delivery will be supported by a clear policy framework in the Local Plan, Cranbrook DPD and Neighbourhood Plans that provide clarity and certainty to developers, communities and other stakeholders.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.h.2. Development at Cranbrook recognises the need for change over time and allows flexibility of use and provides opportunity and space for the emerging needs of the community.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.h.3. Cranbrook will develop as a sustainable new town, phased to ensure the community's needs can be met both during development and long into the future.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**6. If you disagree with any of the 36 objectives listed in question 5, please tell us how you would improve them:**  
 Each objective has a code from 4.a.1. to 4.h.3., please refer to these codes where appropriate so we know which one you are talking about.  
 For example, this could include describing how you would change each of the objectives you disagree with, or telling us of any you would remove and explaining why you would remove them.

**7. Would you add in any extra objectives?**

Yes  
 No - move onto question 8

If yes, please write the objectives you would add in below:

**Issues - health and wellbeing pages 38 to 42**

Health and wellbeing is an issue that runs throughout the document, and is an issue that comes up in many of the different chapters. The questions in this section are about airport noise as it's an issue that is not covered in other chapters.

**8. Airport noise is an issue that affects the future expansion of Cranbrook. Research has found that living in areas where noise is above a certain level is harmful to people's health and wellbeing. The World Health Organisation has recommended a noise limit which, if we were to follow this, would restrict the areas available for development in Cranbrook. Should we follow the noise limits recommended by the World Health Organisation?**

- Yes  No

If yes, please tell us why:

If no, please tell us what alternative noise limits you would apply and why?

**9. Please tell us about any suggestions you have for how the negative impact of noise from the airport can be reduced to acceptable levels both within Cranbrook, both in buildings and outdoor spaces?**

**10. Please tell us about any other comments you have on the health and wellbeing section:**  
For example, this could include anything you think should be added in, changed or removed.

**Issues - culture, community and sport pages 43 to 45**

**11. Which option would you prefer for sports in Cranbrook, all of which would provide the same number of pitches for a wide range of sports:**  
Please choose one option

- Small number of large sports hubs each with shared facilities such as club houses, changing rooms and other spaces for socialising.
- Large number of small sports hubs spread throughout Cranbrook, some wouldn't have facilities such as changing rooms, club houses or other spaces for socialising.
- One very large sports hub with shared facilities such as changing rooms, club houses and other spaces for socialising.

Please explain your reasons for your answer to question 11:

**12. Please tell us about any other comments you have on the culture community and sport section:**  
For example, this could include anything you think should be added in, changed or removed.

**Issues - economy and enterprise pages 46 to 48**

**13. Do you think that houses and other buildings and spaces in Cranbrook should be designed so they can meet a variety of different uses in the future, including homes becoming businesses and businesses becoming homes?**

- Yes  No

Please explain your reasons for your answer to question 13:

**14. Do you agree or disagree with the following statement: "To enable businesses to start up and grow as and when they are needed in Cranbrook a variety of spaces and buildings should be made available when and where they are needed."**

- Agree  Disagree

Please explain your reasons for your answer to question 14:

**15. Please tell us about any suggestions you have for how a variety of spaces and buildings for businesses could be made available in Cranbrook where and when they are needed:**

**16. Do you think Cranbrook needs the following in the future?**

	Yes	No	Don't know / unsure
More main, high street chain shops	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
More local independent shops	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
More bars, cafes and restaurants	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Banks and building societies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
More estate agents	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
More libraries	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
More community meeting rooms	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Leisure centres	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
More small business units for start up businesses	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Large business units	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Garages for car repairs and servicing, and workshops	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please tell us about anything else you think Cranbrook needs more of, or any of in the future:

**17. The Local Plan states that 18 hectares of land is needed in Cranbrook for employment uses such as offices, industrial spaces, workshops, shops throughout the town. In total this will be an area 27 times the size of Exeter City's football pitch at St James' Park.**

There are different ways this could happen, which option would you prefer:

- A small number of large areas of employment land.
- A large number of small sites for employment spread throughout Cranbrook.
- Areas of employment land in the town centre and neighbourhood centres created as Cranbrook grows.
- Other - please write in box below

Please explain your reasons for your answer to question 17:

**18. Please tell us about any other comments you have on the economy and enterprise section:**  
For example, this could include anything you think should be added in, changed or removed.

**Issues - energy and climate change pages 49 to 50**

**19. Do you agree or disagree with this statement: "More should be done to make sure that Cranbrook uses less energy and make sure the energy it does use comes from natural resources such as sun, wind and water rather than fossil fuels."**

- Agree
- Disagree

Please explain your reasons for your answer to question 19:

**20. Do you think it's important to improve or include the following in Cranbrook?**

	Yes	No	Don't know / unsure
Designing layouts of groups of buildings, including homes to make them as energy efficient as possible.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Designing individual buildings to make them as energy efficient as possible.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Constructing homes from materials and methods that are more environmentally friendly.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Improve the insulation of buildings in Cranbrook so they are more energy efficient.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Encouraging more use of solar panels on roofs in Cranbrook to create electricity and hot water.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Encouraging use of wind turbines in Cranbrook to create electricity and hot water.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Encouraging use of green roofs to deliver a wide range of benefits including reducing flood risks, improving biodiversity, keeping Cranbrook cooler in summer and improving the energy efficiency of buildings.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Encouraging use of air and ground source heat pumps in Cranbrook to create heat by taking energy from the air or the earth.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Encouraging more use of technology, such as smart meters that allow you to monitor how much electricity you are using.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Install grey water recycling systems that collect the water you've used in your sinks, dishwashers, showers and baths, and then clean it up and plumb it straight back into your toilet, washing machine and outside tap.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please tell us about anything else you think is important to improve or include in new buildings in Cranbrook to help make the town more energy efficient:

**21. Please tell us about any other comments you have on the energy and climate change section:**  
For example, this could include anything you think should be added in, changed or removed.

**Issues - transport pages 51 to 53**

**22.** If road traffic around Cranbrook continues to rise at its current rate there will be a capacity issue which will lead to more traffic queues. Reducing the level of car use is therefore crucial. Do you think it's important to improve or include the following in Cranbrook to reduce the level of car use?

	Yes	No	Don't know / unsure
a) Putting the places people need to live, work and have fun near to each other.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Having good quality, safe, attractive walking and cycling routes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Making sure public transport systems are integrated. For example making sure they work together by having buses that arrive at the train station in time for the trains.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Having more frequent trains.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Having more frequent buses.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Having more of a variety of bus routes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Using modern technology to encourage more people to use public transport. For example real time information about when public transport will arrive, being able to check on your phone whether public transport is running to time, being able to buy public transport tickets by using a mobile phone app.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Dedicated bus lanes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Encouraging the use of electric cars by providing charging points.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j) Encouraging the use of car clubs where members share the ownership of some cars instead of each having your own car.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k) Encouraging people to car share, giving others a lift when you are going to the same place or taking lifts with others.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
l) Build more roads.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please tell us about anything else you think is important to improve or include in Cranbrook to reduce the level of car use:

**23.** Please tell us which three of the list in question 22 you think are MOST important to improve or include in Cranbrook, and for each one please tell us why you think it's one of the three most important:

Please refer to the letters assigned to each option in question 22 so we know which one you are talking about. Don't worry about putting them in order.

1:

2:

3:



**24.** Do you think there will be a need for a second railway station in Cranbrook in the future as the east of the town develops and more people live there?

- Yes  No

Please explain your reasons for your answer to question 24:

**25.** If a second railway station is provided at Cranbrook where do you think it should be: Please see map on pages 36 and 37 showing the two options

- Option 1  
 Option 2

Please explain your reasons for your answer to question 25:

**26.** Please tell us about any other comments you have on the transport section: For example, this could include anything you think should be added in, changed or removed.

**Issues - landscape and biodiversity pages 54 to 57**

Cranbrook has land rising in the north east and in the south west sloping land faces the village of Rockbeare, please see pages 56 and 57. If homes were built on these areas they could be very visible both from within Cranbrook itself and surrounding areas.

**27.** Do you think homes should be built on the land that rises to the north east of Cranbrook?

- Yes  No

Please explain your reasons for your answer to question 27:

**28.** Do you think homes should be built on the sloping land to the south west? This development would be visible from the village of Rockbeare.

- Yes  No

Please explain your reasons for your answer to question 28:

**29.** As the document explains, well designed Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) deliver a wide range of benefits including reducing flood risk, making places more attractive, increasing biodiversity and keeping Cranbrook cooler in the summer.  
Do you agree or disagree with this statement: "The buildings, roads and open spaces in Cranbrook should be designed to work together to provide Sustainable Drainage Systems in a fully joined up way across all parts of the town."

Agree  Disagree

Please explain your reasons for your answer to question 29:

**30.** High voltage power cables go across Cranbrook's eastern expansion area. What do you think should be done about these power cables in Cranbrook?  
Please choose one option.

- They should be put underground, this would be expensive.  
 They should be diverted so they don't run through the town.  
 They should be left where they are and the space between them used as public open spaces.

**31.** Please tell us about any other comments you have on the landscape and biodiversity section: For example, this could include anything you think should be added in, changed or removed.

**Issues - design and mix of use pages 58 to 64**

**32.** To provide homes for everyone different types of houses and apartments are needed throughout Cranbrook. This provides people with an equal chance to live where it is most suitable to them.  
Would you like to see the following types of housing in Cranbrook in the future?

	Yes	No	Don't know / unsure
Discounted starter homes for first time buyers.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Family homes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Apartments / flats.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Self build and custom build homes - homes people build themselves and homes built by a developer to the specifications of the person who is going to live in it.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Care homes, residential homes or nursing homes for elderly or disabled people where residents each have a room but most other facilities are shared and there is a higher level of care.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accommodation for elderly or disabled people consisting of private independent units with some shared facilities and a warden.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Homes designed for older people, such as retirement apartments.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bungalows.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Housing to meet specific needs, for example wheelchair accessible housing.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please tell us about any other types of housing you think Cranbrook will need in the future?

**33.** Do you agree or disagree with this statement: "Average housing densities (the number of homes built in a certain area) across Cranbrook should increase above current levels, this would enable the benefits outlined in the document such as a more accessible, sustainable and visually interesting town."  
See page 58 to 61 for more information about densities.

Agree  Disagree

Please explain your reasons for your answer to question 33:

**34.** Do you think Cranbrook should provide a wide range of different designs of home including some designed specifically for Cranbrook?

Yes  No

Please explain your reasons for your answer to question 34:

**35.** Up until now London Road has served as a convenient southern boundary to the development and therefore serves as a bypass. London Road could instead be used to encourage people to visit Cranbrook town centre. Which option would you prefer?  
Please see page 63 for a map showing London Road.

- Continue to use London Road as a bypass.  
 London Road becomes a gateway to the town, encouraging more people to visit Cranbrook and its town centre.

Please explain your reasons for your answer to question 35:

**36.** In the future, should some limited development be allowed south of London Road to the eastern end of Cranbrook?  
Please see page 63 for a map showing London Road.

Yes  No

Please explain your reasons for your answer to question 36:

**37.** There is a suggestion that some development could occur north of the railway line at Lodge Trading Estate. Would you support this suggestion?  
Please see pages 36 and 37 for a map showing Lodge Trading Estate.

- Yes  No

Please explain your reasons for your answer to question 37:

**38.** Please tell us about any other suggestions for areas of land that you think should be developed as part of Cranbrook?

**39.** The Local Plan requires up to 30 Gypsy and Traveller pitches be provided within Cranbrook. Do you think these should be provided on:

Please choose one option

- A large number of small sites for single families or small groups of families. These small sites would be spread throughout Cranbrook.  
 Three or four medium sized sites to accommodate up to five or six families on each site. These sites would be spread around Cranbrook.  
 One or two large sites to accommodate up to 15 families on each site.

Please explain your reasons for your answer to question 39:

**40.** Please tell us about any other comments you have on the design and mix of use section:  
For example, this could include anything you think should be added in, changed or removed.

#### Issues - delivery and flexibility pages 65 to 67

**41.** Do you think there should be temporary spaces in Cranbrook where facilities including shops, bars, restaurants, community meeting spaces can be provided in the short term before a full town centre is economically possible?

- Yes  No

Please explain your answer to question 41:

Self build homes are homes people build themselves. Custom build homes are built by a developer to the specifications of the person who is going to live in it. On average, one in every ten homes in the UK is a self build or custom home. The Government is trying to increase the proportion of homes that are self build and custom build, something the Local Plan supports.

**42.** How many self or custom build homes do you think space should be provided for in Cranbrook?

- Less than the national average of one in every ten homes.  
 One in every ten homes, the national average.  
 More than the national average of one in every ten homes.

**43.** Would you be interested in joining the Self Build Register? This is a register for people that want to build their own homes and / or are interested in having a home built to their specifications by a developer.

If you tick yes, you are giving your permission for us to contact you to send you a link so you can join the Self Build Register.

- Yes  No

**44.** Please tell us about any other comments you have on the delivery and flexibility section:  
For example, this could include anything you think should be added in, changed or removed.

#### Next steps - pages 68 to 80

In the next steps section, we have included some illustrations of different scenarios that could happen in Cranbrook. There are four scenarios shown and the document sets out the impact of each one in the text with the diagram.

**45.** Which one do you think would be the best scenario for Cranbrook?

- Scenario 1  
 Scenario 2  
 Scenario 3  
 Scenario 4

Please explain your answer to question 45:

**Any other comments**

46. Please tell us any other comments you have about the document:

**Thank you for completing this questionnaire.**

**Please send it back to us in the pre-paid envelope provided by 25 July 2016 or bring it to the Cranbrook Team's office, upstairs in the Younghayes Community Centre, Younghayes Road, Cranbrook (in normal office hours).**

There are several stages to the Cranbrook Development Plan. If you have left your contact details on this questionnaire we'll keep in touch with you throughout the process.

At the end of the six-week consultation period, all of the responses will be analysed. We will compile the results of the consultation in a report which will be made available on our website. Out of all the potential options under the different key issues, decisions will be made on which are the most relevant or appropriate bearing in mind the feedback received. We will then consult widely on these "preferred options", including draft policies. After that, the decision will have to be made as to the final policy position.

## Appendix 6 – Issues and Options respondents

122 completed questionnaires were received mainly from individuals but also from the following people representing organisation:

Name	Representing:
Angie Hurren	Broadclyst Parish Council
Paul Mills	BT Global Services
Lynne Askew	Clyst Honiton Parish Council
Andy Hallam	Devon & Somerset Fire & Rescue Service
Ben Fairweather	Devon Partnership NHS Trust
Ed Moffatt	Diocese of Exeter (and Churches Together in Devon)
Mark Simpson	E.ON
Dr Margaret Hall	East Devon & Exeter branch of CPRE (Campaign to Protect Rural England)
Charlotte Hanson	EDVSA
Barbara Reynolds	England Hockey
Suzanne Hales	Exeter College
Lythan Nevard	Exeter Diocese, Church of England in partnership with the Methodist and United Reformed Church
Andrew Payne	Greggs
Mr R Taylor	Persimmon Homes South West
Alison Hayes	the essential pharmacy ltd
Ross Anthony	Theatres Trust
Waddeton Park Ltd - c/o agent	Waddeton Park Ltd
Justin Milward	Woodland Trust

In addition a number of representations were received in the form of direct correspondence (emails/letters) comprising 9 from individuals together the following listed organisations:

Name	Representing:
David Lock Associates	East Devon New Community Partners

Hilary Winter	Devon Countryside Access Forum
Richard Seal	Rigby Group (Exeter and Devon Airport Limited)
Jillings Heynes Planning	Higher and Little Cobdens
A J Bird	Lodge Trading Estate
Michael Calder	National trust
Corine Dyke	Natural England
P Stockall	Bilfinger GVA on behalf of Skypark Development Partnership LLP
Richard Bailey	PCL Planning on behalf of Waddenton Park Ltd
	Public Health Active Transport
Chris Edge	Co-op
Lytham Nevard	Cornerstone Church
	Cranbrook Town Council
Harvey Gardner	Devon and Cornwall Police
Joe Keech	Devon County Council
John Clarke	Devon Gardens trust
Marcus Salmon	Environment Agency
John Rigby	Exeter and East Devon Low Carbon Task Force
Sally Parish	Highways England
Ross Simonds	Historic England
Robert Deanwood	National Grid
Barbara Morgan	Network Rail
Philip Shelton	Rail Futures
	Rockbeare Parish Council
Stephen Fitt	RSPB
Martyn Dunn	South West Water
Gary Parsons	Sport England
Andrew Shepherd	Savills on behalf of Rockbeare Estate
David Ashworth	Strutt and Parker on behalf of Treasbeare Farm
G McCormack- Hole	Devon Senior Voice
Richard Bartlett	Exeter Airport Consultative Committee

## Appendix 7 – Preferred Approach summary of issues, actions and updates

Summary of main issues raised in consultation responses to the Cranbrook Plan Preferred Approach, with actions as presented to Strategic Planning Committee 20 March 2018, updated as of February 2019 to record the work that has been undertaken.

Topic	Issue	Response	Action	Outcome/update
Bluehayes	Access to the site is problematic and there is insufficient evidence to demonstrate that an access onto Station Road in the location shown is achievable due to the proximity to the existing roundabout to the east.	Officers have had multiple meetings with the Consortium and DCC Officers and there is presently no junction solution which has been tabled that achieves a suitable arrangement. There is a balance to be struck between place making and the provision of an access which provides good quality pedestrian and cycle provision for crossing, as well as keeping vehicular traffic free flowing along London Road.	Explore the potential for a realigned access to the site around the Station Road junction.  Continue an active dialogue with DCC and East Devon New Community partners to seek to achieve a practical solution to junction access.	Allocate land to the south west of Station Road (adjacent to Coachfield House) to facilitate a direct route into Bluehayes expansion area which would coordinate with potential junction into Treasbeare.  Maintain discussions with DCC and EDNCP to design an alternative access to the east of Station Road.
	Additional land put forward for development at the Hungry Fox Estate (north of current allocation, south of	Land is currently underutilised, being mostly agricultural or in domestic use. The access to the site from the current Hungry Fox	Investigate potential alternative access arrangements or improvement of existing access and flooding	Allocate

Topic	Issue	Response	Action	Outcome/update
	the railway line and east of Station Road)	Estate road has inadequate visibility to accommodate the development of the land. Some concerns over flooding implications.	implications. Allocate if these findings are favourable.	
	Concern over relationship with properties at Broadclyst Station, who are keen to retain a separate identity. Desires for a green buffer expressed.	The current masterplan indicates the retention of existing hedgerows along much of Station Road and the allocation of allotments opposite a number of existing properties at Broadclyst Station. This provides some separation of development from Broadclyst Station. Residential development is proposed adjacent to properties at Railway Terrace along its eastern boundary.	Some consideration could be given as to how development would adjoin the properties at Railway Terrace to minimise impact, however this is likely to be a matter of detail which could adequately be determined at the time of a detailed planning application. No action is recommended for increasing the buffer along Station Road.	Provide two separate built up area boundaries for Cranbrook and Station Road communities to help maintain identity.  No specific buffer between the two is necessary noting the allocation in existing location plan. Retained GI may assist with a modest separation in some areas.
	East Devon New Community partners (Cranbrook Development Consortium) advocate the removal of the hedge to the west of the primary route through the area as it is of little value and compromises the layout of development.	At the time of writing, the quality of the hedgerow has not been specifically assessed by Officers. Comments regarding the impact of retention upon the layout of development are understood.	Review quality of hedgerow and consideration of layout. Final decision on retention to be made following this.	Hedgerow is considered to be of limited quality and not an overriding constraint to development. If removed need to ensure suitable mitigation.

Topic	Issue	Response	Action	Outcome/update
Treasbeare	East Devon New Community partners assert that the Treasbeare area could accommodate a minimum of 1000 dwellings as opposed to the 800-950 stated in the masterplan.	Overall dwelling allocations, densities and typologies of development will be reviewed as part of the consideration of amendments to the plan.	Review as part of other considerations.	Allocation which allows for a 420 place Primary school and sports hub results in a housing allocation of around 915 dwellings (to be increased if the school is ultimately located in Bluehayes)
	The East Devon New Community partners assert that development on the eastern side of the parcel could go further than has been shown without harmful landscape impacts, particularly if single storey or 1.5 storey buildings are used and landscaping is planted early. This contradicts comments from residents who are concerned about development on this side, particularly the very northern field, adjacent to London Road and in the Green Wedge.	<p>The New Community partners consultation response includes their own proposals for Treasbeare and assessment of impacts. This is worthy of further investigation as any additional developable land that would have an acceptable landscape impact should be considered for development.</p> <p>Work carried out by HDA in relation to landscape impact for the preferred approach document indicates that the northern field in the green wedge would be acceptable for development.</p>	<p>Commission a review of the East Devon New Community partners proposals for Treasbeare submitted with the consultation response to appraise impact of development further to the east.</p> <p>Review proposed allocation in green wedge at Treasbeare for landscape impact but likely to maintain allocation.</p>	<p>Slight eastwards movement of extension of housing from the boundaries set out at the Preferred approach stage but no further scope for extension without landscape harm. Playing pitches can however be accommodated further east and south to facilitate introduction of school without a consequential reduction in housing numbers.</p> <p>Minor revisions to the boundary to facilitate housing in northernmost field, and fringe of adjacent to field to east together with provision for a Gypsy and Traveller site on the lower north and west facing</p>

Topic	Issue	Response	Action	Outcome/update
	<p>Vehicular access to the site as shown on the masterplan is problematic due to the difference in ground levels between the site and London Road at that point. This is compounded by the presence of the district heating main serving current Cranbrook development being located in the raised area.</p>	<p>These access issues are common to both the Bluehayes and Treasbeare areas as the same junction was shown as serving both areas in the masterplan. Land to the west and east of the currently shown junction is close to grade with the London Road and should be explored as potential access points.</p>	<p>Review access arrangements to Treasbeare alongside those of Bluehayes.</p>	<p>slopes of this field. Otherwise maintain boundary.</p> <p>Access as shown at Preferred Approach stage couldn't be achieved. Relocate main junction into the site to the east (existing roundabout with Younghayes Road).</p> <p>Create second access to the west (opposite allocation of land adjacent to Coachfield House in Bluehayes) where land is at grade with the B3174.</p>
	<p>The noise sensitive areas should be shown on a plan to clearly demonstrate the areas where mitigation is required before they can be brought forward. A specific reduction in dB levels shouldn't be given in a policy, rather a statement that it should be reduced to appropriate levels.</p>	<p>Parts of the Treasbeare area are noise sensitive by virtue of the proximity to Exeter Airport and in particular as a result of engine testing activities.</p> <p>Work has begun on the specification for an engine testing pen at the Airport and initial modelling indicates that a pen is capable of mitigating</p>	<p>Amend masterplan to indicate noise sensitive areas.</p> <p>Formulate policy to require noise levels to be reduced to daytime and night time noise levels set out in EDDC Development Management and Environmental Health Joint Airport Noise Study, Updated Noise Impact Assessment, Exeter</p>	<p>Cranbrook Plan includes a noise plan as a separate figure to which Policy applies.</p>

Topic	Issue	Response	Action	Outcome/update
		noise levels to an acceptable level in the Treasbeare area.	International Airport, May 2016”, Part 2 Tables 12 and 13. These will need to be met before development in the relevant areas is brought forward.	
	Questions raised over the location and size of the sports hub and pitches indicated on the masterplan.	The Treasbeare area is not level and the provision of sports facilities in the area will require an element of regrading. Similarly there are a number of pitch size requirements for individual sports which are dependent upon the age of players using the facility and the level it is to be played at.	Review approach to site selection and provision to be made. Consider in light of decisions to be taken regarding the potential for a school to be located in the Treasbeare area (see comments under Education) and a neighbourhood centre.	Pitch sizes reviewed; Arrangement and location of pitches moved to the east and reconfigured to accommodate provision of Primary school.
Cobdens	East Devon New Community partners are concerned that too few dwellings are allocated in this area.	Overall dwelling allocations, densities and typologies of development will be reviewed as part of the consideration of amendments to the plan.	Review as part of other considerations.	Following review, allocation makes provision for 1495 dwellings.
	Undergrounding of pylons has raised concerns with those who have options on the land in question. There is a suggestion that insufficient evidence has	The consultation was supported by an evidential document in relation to the undergrounding of the pylons. Any delay in delivery trajectory could delay the	Review evidence document to ascertain if further work is required to justify proposal for undergrounding. Continue To pursue undergrounding of pylons.	Evidence sets outs that the undergrounding is viable and achievable for the extent shown in the updated plan.

Topic	Issue	Response	Action	Outcome/update
	<p>been provided to conclude that the line can be undergrounded. The procedures involved in undergrounding power lines are likely to delay the delivery trajectory.</p>	<p>delivery of the primary school in this area as it is currently shown being located directly underneath the line proposed for undergrounding. If this were the case, the delivery of education provision in one of the other development areas would need to be available at an early stage of the expansion development. Officers are of the opinion that the undergrounding of the pylons is crucial to the delivery of a coherent and high quality development.</p>	<p>Ensure delivery plan and policies address timing of education delivery.</p>	
	<p>Additional land put forward adjacent to Southbrook Court and to the south of Southbrook House. Small parcels of land under option to East Devon New Community partners aren't currently shown for built development.</p>	<p>The small parcels of land adjacent to Southbrook Court and Southbrook House are in close proximity to one another on opposite sides of Southbrook Lane and at a point where the road has two sharp consecutive corners. The allocation of these parcels would potentially allow for an improved road connection from the currently</p>	<p>Allocate land adjacent to Southbrook Court and south of Southbrook House. Consider EDNCp allocations in light of further decisions regarding pylon undergrounding and SANGS mitigation.</p>	<p>Allocated as previously set out</p>

Topic	Issue	Response	Action	Outcome/update
		<p>consented land into the expansion area at Cobdens but would also provide a more comprehensive and less fragmented development than currently shown. Most of the parcels within EDNCp control that aren't shown for built development are indicated for SANGS delivery.</p>		
<p>Grange</p>	<p>Allocation of land in this area goes against Strategies 8 and 12 of the Local Plan and the promise of keeping development out of the Green Wedge and Neighbourhood Plan Areas. Rockbeare Parish Council and Cranbrook Town Council as well as residents (mostly of Rockbeare) are strongly against the proposed allocation.</p>	<p>Officers are of the opinion that development in this area, due to its limited landscape impact and physical separation from Rockbeare, will not lead to settlement coalescence. The Local Plan commits East Devon District Council to allocating land for an additional 1550 homes over and above the current allocation and this has been considered as being a suitable site. The removal of land to the west of the lane to The Grange Hotel would represent the removal of land in the Green Wedge but</p>	<p>Officers recommend continuing with an allocation in this area. Final land uses and mitigation to be evaluated in light of wider refinement of the Cranbrook Plan.</p>	<p>Allocation of land at the Grange is maintained but the western extent has been limited to the lane which accesses the Grange Hotel. In addition the allocation has extended to the east and wraps around the northern section of Percy Wakley Woods.</p> <p>This approach recognises greater weight being given to the now "made" Neighbourhood Plan; maintains the housing numbers; has no greater landscape impact; and results</p>

Topic	Issue	Response	Action	Outcome/update
		<p>would also detract from the creation of place along London Road and necessitate the inclusion of land elsewhere to make up the shortfall in housing numbers.</p>		<p>in only a limited impact on place making as a result of the eastwards extension.</p>
	<p>Concerns over retaining access to existing properties, particularly those that use Gribble Lane.</p>	<p>Access to existing properties will be need to be retained, ideally using the existing routes or at least, along similar length new routes.</p>	<p>Clarification to be provided on movement strategy in the Grange area and how Gribble Lane is to be treated.</p>	<p>Northern length of Gribble Lane to be downgraded to footway/cycleway but vehicle access to properties maintained realigned road linking with new mixed use area on B3174</p>
	<p>DCC would prefer the indication of a primary vehicular route through the area (as opposed to a secondary movement route) and the inclusion of cycle facilities.</p>	<p>This could be a useful change to the plan to ensure that buses could serve the area and make the delivery of retained access to properties that currently use Gribble Lane easier. Could be done in conjunction with realigning Gribble Lane through the area so that it exits opposite the primary access to Cobdens.</p>	<p>Amend movement strategy and masterplan to reflect DCC recommended changes.</p>	<p>Hierarchy of routes reviewed. Primary route serving Grange to be maintained along the B3174 serving neighbourhood centre. Buses on this road are still accessible for residents as built development depth would be little more than 300m from the main road and so within acceptable walking distance to a bus stop.</p>

Topic	Issue	Response	Action	Outcome/update
	Additional land put forward to the south and east.	Not recommended that land to the south is allocated for built development due to landscape impacts. Land to east could be considered but only if the land between it and the current proposed allocation is also included.	Explore land availability and constraints. Make final decision on land allocation in light of findings and consideration of other wider allocation decisions at Cranbrook.	Allocated additional land to the east as intervening land was also available.
	Suggestion that the land could be allocated to come forward for development only after the other three allocated areas are developed.	This would delay development in the Grange area but would not preclude it. Would need to be an evidential reason for delaying development in the area, which to date, is not clear.	Unlikely to be a preference for phasing development in the Grange area to come forward only after other three areas.	Phasing policy premised on infrastructure delivery rather than specific area. No hierarchy to require delay of Grange development.
	DCC advise that archaeological potential needs to be investigated before publication draft of DPD finalised due to proximity to a Roman Road and the lack of previous archaeological investigations on the land.	Necessary element of evidence gathering.	Discuss with DCC, land owners. Ensure investigations carried out and any relevant outcomes are fed into policy production.	Land owners/developers instigated suitable investigation. Additional land north of Percy Wakley Woods not included within the assessment but DCC advised that they were happy for allocation based on the local results from adjacent fields.
Education	Land adjacent to Cranbrook Education Campus has been included in the Consortium's residential	In order to allocate land, it must be available. The Consortium advise that the land isn't available for the use	Remove proposed allocation. Allocate additional land within one of the larger allocations for an	Removed as proposed

Topic	Issue	Response	Action	Outcome/update
	land budget following previous changes to the current S106 agreement. It therefore isn't available for education development.	proposed and therefore, it will fail this test.	additional 210 primary pupil places. Final decision on location to be taken in light of points below.	
	DCC say locations of schools (primary) shown are acceptable provided they remain within 500m of neighbourhood centres. Consortium suggest having a school in Treasbeare, either in lieu of, or in addition to that at Bluehayes. This would foster a community feel and allow for shared use and co-location of facilities alongside the proposed sports hub.	There is merit in the locating of schools in each of Bluehayes and Treasbeare; both will necessitate movements across London Road should there be a school in only one of the two areas. A school in Bluehayes will give it a focal point. A school in Treasbeare allows for co-location of facilities and a potential community hub of activity alongside the sports provision, however DCC advise that this would need to be fully understood from the outset to ensure expectations and aspirations to be managed. DCC advise that the location of schools should be based on where the majority of housing is provided.	Discuss further with DCC to finalise locations and sizes of primary schools.	Based on criteria and place making agenda, allocation for 630 place Primary and SEN school in Cobdens areas.  Masterplan identifies 420 Primary in Treasbeare but provision for this to switch to Bluehayes depending upon final phasing of development.  210 place Primary not acceptable to DCC – land, construction and future maintenance/running costs disproportionately high.

Topic	Issue	Response	Action	Outcome/update
Gypsies and Travellers	Concern over proximity of sites to existing settled community. Concern over size of sites, with respondents suggesting that 30 pitches is disproportionate to the settled population in the area. Separate concern also expressed that the two sites identified (in Bluehayes and Cobdens) would not be large enough to provide space for adequate pitches with amenity buildings, grazing land for horses etc.	Gypsy and Traveller site provision was one of the most contentious elements of the plan during the consultation. East Devon District Council's SPD on site design and layout states that no more than 15 pitches should be provided on a single site and this would be adhered to through the Cranbrook Plan. The A30 corridor is a traditionally used route for the Gypsy and Traveller community and the provision of pitches at Cranbrook is appropriate in terms of location and has been adopted in the Local Plan.	Seek to identify sites of up to 10 pitches each in order to address concerns regarding site size. Likely to seek to allocate not more than 20 pitches in total.	Allocation of two sites (5 and 10 pitches respectively) which address identified need – 1. Land to the west of Bodley Bridge (10) 2. Land to the north of Parsons Lane (5) Both with good access to B3174 (and traditional travelling routes) but also with good access to services offered by the town. Care with site layout and landscaping will be needed with site 2 as a result of topography
	Concern over the availability of the site in Bluehayes.	Officers are concerned about the availability of the land identified in Bluehayes for a Gypsy and Traveller site and the likelihood of a site being delivered on the land, which is in private ownership and the owners intentions are unclear.	Remove proposed Gypsy and Traveller site from the land in Bluehayes and allocate on another parcel of land within the plan area.	Revised locations found (see above)

Topic	Issue	Response	Action	Outcome/update
	<p>Response from the Gypsy and Traveller community suggests that transit pitches should not be provided.</p>	<p>Many residents and those who attended the consultation events were concerned regarding the provision of transit pitches and the problems which can arise from those in transit arriving on a site without authorisation (e.g. use of Cranbrook Station car park). The removal of transit pitches from the proposal would potentially address some of these perceived impacts of pitch provision.</p>	<p>Allocate land for permanent pitch provision only.</p>	<p>No transit pitches provided to accord with the representation received.</p>
	<p>Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) identifies that the need for pitches is in the short-term. As Cranbrook expansion is not going to be delivered in the short-term, it is not a suitable location for pitch delivery.</p>	<p>The GTAA identified a need for 37 permanent pitches up until 2034, of which 22 are needed by 2019. Since the study was undertaken, 6 permanent pitches have been granted planning permission, taking the need to 31 permanent pitches, of which 16 are required by 2019. There is therefore a need for 15 pitches after 2019, plus the shortfall of any which</p>	<p>A need for permanent Gypsy and Traveller pitch provision exists across the plan period, including during the timescale within which the expansion of Cranbrook is expected to be delivered. Ensure sites have capacity to accommodate identified need.</p>	<p>Plan period for delivery all identified pitches extends to 2031 which is within the period of GTAA assessment.</p> <p>IDP references the potential for early delivery but does not make this a requirement as a result of the identified timescales.</p>

Topic	Issue	Response	Action	Outcome/update
	<p>Anecdotal evidence that lenders are reluctant to lend for mortgages in locations in proximity to Gypsy and Traveller sites. In light of this, East Devon New Community partners suggest an off-site financial contribution and no specific allocations of land.</p>	<p>have not been provided by 2019.</p> <p>It is understood that concerns which exist regarding lending are largely in relation to the unknown impacts of planned but not yet delivered development as opposed to sites which are adjacent to existing Gypsy and Traveller provision. The making of an off-site financial contribution would not make direct provision of pitches to meet the identified need and may not lead to delivery within the required timeframe to accommodate the need due to the difficulties in finding suitable and available sites.</p>	<p>Continue with policy formulation which allocates land for Gypsy and Traveller pitch provision at Cranbrook. Investigate timings for delivery and how this may impact upon lending concerns.</p>	<p>Suggestion within the IDP that early delivery would be encouraged. This approach would help remove uncertainty and the perceived risk for developers</p>
<p>Health and Wellbeing</p>	<p>Concern has been raised (inc. from the Healthy New Towns Executive group) regarding the social, health and wellbeing needs of the growing community and how these will be met in the expansion areas,</p>	<p>At present the affordable housing rate for the expansion areas of Cranbrook is set at 25%, as per Strategy 34 of the Local Plan. Cranbrook development to date has delivered 30% affordable housing (20%</p>	<p>It is Officer's opinion that the needs of the growing community need to be looked at holistically. Depending upon the results of the viability testing, this could include a lowering of the current requirement for</p>	<p>Affordable housing requirement has been reduced to 15% to facilitate a balance the delivery of a mix of housing and required infrastructure. Testing has shown this mix to be viable.</p>

Topic	Issue	Response	Action	Outcome/update
	<p>particularly through the delivery of appropriate social and community infrastructure and services.</p>	<p>rented and 10% shared ownership), plus 10% 'Affordable by Design' homes which are sold to persons with a housing need who meet certain eligibility criteria. As part of the planning policy production for the Cranbrook Plan, an exercise into viability testing will be carried out to determine what infrastructure is deliverable to ensure development viability and delivery; this includes a balancing exercise regarding the percentage of affordable housing provided.</p>	<p>25% affordable housing provision in the expansion areas, in order to provide the necessary supporting infrastructure and services for the residents of the town, which may be a wider set of infrastructure and service requirements than one would normally anticipate being provided as part of a new development. This is set against the backdrop of the town being one of 10 Healthy New Towns across the Country and one of 12 Sport England Local Delivery Pilot areas to tackle inactivity and the need to ensure that a balanced and healthy community is formed.</p>	
	<p>Confusion over the strategy for health and wellbeing facilities and the relationship with neighbourhood centres and meanwhile spaces.</p>	<p>It is anticipated that a single main health and wellbeing hub will be delivered in the town centre (in line with work being progressed by the</p>	<p>Clarify strategy for the delivery of health services and facilities and the relationship with</p>	<p>On-going work to facilitate health facilities. Policy provision recognises the importance of these for the growing town but is not</p>

Topic	Issue	Response	Action	Outcome/update
		<p>Healthy New Towns programme) and that other health services could be delivered in satellite locations at the neighbourhood centres. These are likely to be delivered through the utilisation of spaces in other facilities, such as pharmacies or community spaces. It is not envisaged that there will be dedicated branch GP surgeries as this doesn't align with current NHS and CCG business models or the drive toward new models of care.</p>	<p>neighbourhood centres and meanwhile spaces.</p>	<p>prescriptive in the form in which they should be delivered.</p>
<p>Housing mix</p>	<p>The current rate of housing provision (including affordable housing) isn't delivering a balanced community. There are too few new properties in Council Tax bands E and above.</p>	<p>Consideration of the delivery of affordable housing and the creation of a balanced community should be looked at alongside the health and wellbeing implications of housing and infrastructure delivery. The Council Tax base in itself is not a planning matter but is seen as an indicator of housing balance by Cranbrook Town Council.</p>	<p>Pursue a specific policy in relation to the delivery of Self and Custom-build housing at Cranbrook as opposed to relying on existing policy H2 of the Local Plan.</p> <p>Review evidence for a bespoke policy in relation to the range and mix of housing delivered at the</p>	<p>Custom and self-build housing has been provided through Policy CB12 which sets out a minimum requirement of 4%.</p> <p>In addition NDSS has been incorporated into Policy CB17 to further strengthen the amenity value of the housing that is to be delivered in support of the Plans Health agenda.</p>

Topic	Issue	Response	Action	Outcome/update
		<p>The delivery of custom and self-build housing may help to redress the balance of housing provision as it will likely attract a different range of people from those presently moving to Cranbrook. Consideration of the adoption of the Nationally Described Space Standards could be given which would increase the average size of properties and would provide improved living space, potentially having a positive impact upon health and wellbeing. However, these Standards are not applied elsewhere in East Devon and there is the potential that to introduce them would delay delivery at the town and affect viability.</p>	<p>town, rather than relying on policy H1, which may not be strong enough to ensure a mix of housing sizes at a development of this scale.</p>	
<p>Movement</p>	<p>Greater emphasis should be placed on sustainable transport modes and prioritisation.</p>	<p>The movement strategy and masterplan are intended to prioritise sustainable transport modes but it is accepted that this does not</p>	<p>Movement strategy topic paper to be produced to place greater emphasis on sustainable transport and then to be reflected in the</p>	<p>Movement strategy updated. Both this and the Plan recognise the importance of sustainable transport and particularly Active transport -</p>

Topic	Issue	Response	Action	Outcome/update
		come across as well as it should in the documents.	revised masterplan and relevant policies, including a sustainable travel policy to promote car clubs, bike hire etc.	see Policies (for example) CB9 (Public Transport); CB19 (Coordinated sustainable travel) and CB (20) Plug in and ultra-low emission vehicle charging.
	The plan fails to identify how the movement network (including pedestrian and cycle movement) links in with the wider network. It is too Cranbrook centric.	This is required to be resolved so as to show how Cranbrook sits in the wider area and to demonstrate a co-ordinated approach to movement.	Amend movement strategy plan to show wider movement network.	Movement strategy updated
	Masterplan comments on rail infrastructure are unclear. The passing loop is the most important component. A half hourly rail service may be possible without an improved station, with a 2 <sup>nd</sup> platform only being possible if the passing loop passes through the existing station; DCC believe the 2 <sup>nd</sup> platform option to be a sub-optimal solution. Concerns that only development post the delivery of 6500 homes	<p>The delivery of a half-hourly rail service is a key ambition of the plan in order to encourage use of rail travel as an alternative to the private car.</p> <p>Further evidence from DCC is required to justify any financial contribution from development toward delivery of the half hourly service.</p>	<p>Devon County Council to compile evidence of need for additional rail infrastructure to support the Cranbrook Plan evidence base.</p> <p>Remove specific option for 2<sup>nd</sup> platform from proposals.</p> <p>Develop a policy which safeguards land for a second station but allows for other options for the delivery of a half-hourly service to be brought forward and funded</p>	<p>2nd Platform option removed. Land safeguarded for a second station (CB 10)</p> <p>Financial contribution identified to assist in delivering a range of sustainable travel measures including bus services, enhanced rail frequency and 2<sup>nd</sup> rail station.</p>

Topic	Issue	Response	Action	Outcome/update
	relies upon the delivery of a half-hourly rail service.		by Cranbrook delivery. Considerations of delivery funding mechanisms to be further explored and testing as part of viability testing of plan.	
	Suitability and desirability of the old A30, B3174 London Road to be downgraded from its current status and to become an integral part of the town is questioned. Views expressed that it should remain as a bypass to development.	The London Road is a diversionary route to the A30 should it be closed between the M5 and Daisymount roundabout and any plans to downgrade it would need to ensure that this function can be sustained, despite the irregularity of its use for this purpose. Officers at EDDC and DCC consider that if development at Cranbrook is to occur on both sides of London Road then its conditions should be suitable to maximise cyclist and pedestrian movements both along and across the route. Such actions would also help to ensure integration between the developments on both sides of the road, which is	Continue with plans to downgrade the London Road through Cranbrook in consultation with DCC and the local community.  Develop plans to indicate the types of measures that could be brought forward to support publication draft of plan.	Set out in Policy CB25 and 26, changes to the London Road are facilitated whilst recognising the ongoing value of the road as the diversionary route identified.

Topic	Issue	Response	Action	Outcome/update
	<p>Concerns expressed regarding the impact of development upon traffic levels on Station Road and the ability of the road, the bridge over the railway and the junction onto London Road to cater for that traffic.</p>	<p>essential for place making and community cohesion.</p> <p>Development at Cranbrook will inevitably lead to an increase in traffic movements along Station Road from traffic arising at the town or attracted to its facilities from locations to the north. Development should seek to minimise the impacts of this as far as possible and the preferred approach indicates an alternative access from Cranbrook onto Station Road, although as explained earlier in this document, access arrangements to Bluehayes (the area adjacent to Station Road) are yet to be resolved. Issues relating to the alignment of Station Road either side of the bridge over the railway will not be resolved as a direct result of development at Cranbrook as this is not deemed necessary</p>	<p>Clarify how Cranbrook delivery will seek to minimise traffic problems on Station Road and how it may mitigate some impacts.</p>	<p>The bridge over the railway remains a constraint, but land is allocated west of Coachfield House to facilitate a significantly enhanced junction with the London Road (B3174). An alternative junction is also being explored to the east of the Station Road. With enhanced sustainable/active transport measures in the plan and junctions that reduce the potential for queueing and congestion on Station Road the risk of traffic impacts on Station Road have been minimised.</p>

Topic	Issue	Response	Action	Outcome/update
		to bring forward the development.		
	Network Rail assert that any proposal to keep the Crannaforde Lane level crossing open is likely to necessitate improvements to the crossing, which currently has half-barriers. Solutions include full barriers or a bridge crossing.	The movement strategy currently indicates Crannaforde Lane as being retained as a cycle route. However, further modelling of movement and the positive impact that the route will have upon the vitality and viability of the town centre indicate that it should be kept open for vehicle crossing. The comments of Network Rail are unclear as to the circumstances in which they would expect improvements to be made and the costs of options.	Amend movement strategy and proposals to retain Crannaforde Lane crossing for vehicular movement.  Investigate level crossing improvement options and costs with Network Rail and DCC and feed into viability testing.	Retain Crannaforde Crossing as an open crossing for vehicles. No need for an enhanced barrier provision currently evidenced.
Employment	The delivery of 18.4ha of employment land is an ambitious approach and would result in job creation for 70% of residents without accounting for nearby employment developments.	18.4ha is taken from the Economic Development Strategy and is already contained within Strategy 12 of the Local Plan, which relates to development at Cranbrook. The provision of mixed use areas may reduce this overall quantum	Continue with allocation of 18.4ha of employment land but review way in which is delivered.	4.9ha secured of employment land secured in the Treasbears expansion, remainder of land identified in the town centre and mixed use areas spread across the enlarged town. This provides a diverse offering which is targeted at a different market sector to much

Topic	Issue	Response	Action	Outcome/update
		depending upon how these areas are delivered.		of the existing local offer to facilitate delivery.
	Delivery of employment floor space should be phased in conjunction with longer-term demand.	Strategy 12 of the Local Plan already sets out an expectation of phased delivery of the employment land in conjunction with housing delivery.	Review phasing strategy in Strategy 12 to ensure it is reflective of the needs and demands of the town. Reflect any revisions in a new policy.	Phasing requirements set out in Policy CB7. Flexibility within the policy to allow meaningful discussions with developers and to reflect the future market conditions
	There was confusion as to what was meant by the allocation of mixed-use areas in each of the 4 allocations. How would the uses be distributed within the mixed-use areas and how would a mix of uses be ensured?	Acknowledged that this wasn't as clear as is necessary and the potential knock-on implications upon land values and delivery if this isn't clarified.	Develop topic paper in relation to employment land delivery and to provide clarity on mixed use areas, phasing of employment land delivery and expectations of types of employment space created.	Policies within the plan provide clearer guidance as to the expectation for mixed use areas which have also been rationalised in their extent.
	Residents are concerned at the speed of delivery of commercial activity in the town centre and the implications of further residential development without such delivery.	Outline planning permission for the development of the town centre exists as part of the original consent for the provision of Cranbrook. To date only the Cranberry Farm public house has been built in the town centre although work to facilitate the delivery of commercial activity is underway and a S106	Develop a vision for the town centre and interpret into planning policies which will deliver this vision.	Vision now set out within the Plan together with separate policies that address required uses and basic parameters, together with the scope for delivering residential accommodation.

Topic	Issue	Response	Action	Outcome/update
		<p>obligation exists which requires the provision of 500 sq. m. of retail space by 2000 occupations. This trigger is likely to be hit in less than 12 months. Current policies in the Local Plan and mechanisms in place as part of the outline planning permission for the town are unlikely to provide sufficient detail to steer the delivery of the town centre to maximise its potential as a hub of commercial and social activity.</p>		
	<p>Concerns that a neighbourhood centre in the west and fronting the London Road, as shown in the plan, would have the potential to adversely affect the town centre, by intercepting trips.</p>	<p>The land to the south of London Road shown as a neighbourhood centre is significantly elevated above London Road and has the district heating main running under it. These constraints make the delivery of a neighbourhood centre on both sides of the road unrealistic.</p>	<p>Relocate the neighbourhood centre at Bluehayes into the site as opposed to be entirely focussed on London Road. Precise location to be determined following resolution of access arrangements to the site. Consider a small neighbourhood centre in Treasbeare, located in the area of the sports hub.</p>	<p>Neighbourhood centre removed from Bluehayes; Neighbourhood centre at Treasbeare moved eastwards with policy restrictions in place to limit scale and nature of the offer available.</p>

Topic	Issue	Response	Action	Outcome/update
<p>Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANGS)</p>	<p>Concern regarding indication of over-provision of SANGS and the potential for ransom of this land should developers bring land forward and not have any SANGS mitigation land available to them. Concern has also been expressed regarding the delivery mechanism for SANGS and suggestions made that EDDC should procure and deliver the SANGS and seek financial contributions from development towards delivery costs.</p>	<p>EDDC procurement of land and delivery of SANGS is not recommended due to delivery risks and the fact that East Devon District Council is not legally obliged to deliver and manage SANGS. SANGS should also be delivered close to or as part of significant major developments such as Cranbrook to maximise their effectiveness.</p> <p>Delivery and management by the developers (or by another body contracted by them) is the preferred approach.</p>	<p>Further explore and consider appropriate expectations for delivery and management of SANGS to minimise risk of ransom and secure the long term provision and management of SANGS.</p>	<p>SANGS delivery paper published. This recognises the expectation that except in exceptional circumstances developers will provide their own SANGS. Opportunities for future management have also been explored and are set out within the delivery paper</p>
	<p>East Devon New Community partners are concerned about the land for SANGS indicated in the Cobdens area as it is markedly different from their proposals, which utilise the pylon corridors to deliver the majority of SANGS mitigation in this area.</p>	<p>This largely revolves around the EDDC decision to seek to underground the pylons, which is being further investigated as a result of comments received to the consultation. EDDC's position is that the preferred approach to SANGS provision in Cobdens is a more coherent</p>	<p>Review in light of further work carried out on the matter of undergrounding the overhead pylons and any decisions made following it.</p>	<p>SANGS land has been safeguarded to the south-east, east, and north east, with a separate area to the north west linked by the stream corridor. This makes best of use of the available land, makes SANG provision in areas where housing would have an unacceptable landscape</p>

Topic	Issue	Response	Action	Outcome/update
		<p>approach than that preferred by the New Community partners, which is fragmented.</p>		<p>impact, and allows for coherent layout with good place making.</p>
<p>Land Budget</p>	<p>The land budget has a very low proportion of developable land in comparison to expectations for developments of this type and scale.</p>	<p>Concerns about the land budget largely relate to the assertion by potential developers of the sites that not enough residential land is proposed for allocation and too much open space and SANGS land is indicated. As discussed elsewhere in this document, issues relating to the precise extent of residential land are to be reviewed in advance of a publication document.</p>	<p>Review the overall land budget in light of other proposed amendments to the plan and the quantum of recreation and SANGS land required for the anticipated dwellings.</p> <p>Sense check through viability testing process.</p>	<p>Budget is reviewed and updated. High proportion of open space and SANGS land still set out but this reflects requirements for the development in meeting its Habitat Mitigation requirements; the modest over provision of SANGS to ensure that the minimum quantum is at least achieved (achievable by all developers) and the topography which restricts the potential for physical development in certain areas.</p>
<p>Flooding and drainage</p>	<p>Environment Agency raise concerns that proposed development and drainage features haven't entirely been kept out of flood zones 2 and 3 and that there are existing situations of surface water flooding that haven't</p>	<p>A small area of the employment land in Treasbeare is located in flood zone 3 and so will need to be removed from the proposals for employment floor space.</p> <p>Drainage basin locations and sizing as shown are only</p>	<p>Review drainage strategy and indications of basins and basin sizes. Include requirements to resolve existing known surface water flooding problems on London Road in the vicinity of the proposed development.</p>	<p>Issues addressed through the updated layout. London Road issue acknowledged within the Policy CB 25 (London Road Improvements)</p>

Topic	Issue	Response	Action	Outcome/update
	<p>been addressed in the preferred approach.</p>	<p>indicative, however some may be over large or in sub-optimal locations when matters such as gradient and flood zones are taken into consideration.</p>	<p>Remove employment allocation where it is in flood zones 2 and 3.</p>	
	<p>Concerns that development, particularly in the Grange area could negatively impact upon existing flooding experienced in and around Rockbeare.</p>	<p>Development would need to demonstrate through a site specific flood risk assessment and drainage strategy that it will not increase the risk or flooding either on or off the site and should take into account known flooding issues in Rockbeare.</p>	<p>Give consideration to whether or not specific policy wording should be included to require flood mitigation measures for Rockbeare to be implemented as a result of development proposals in the Grange area coming forward.</p>	<p>No evidence of specific requirement over that which would come forward through a site wide FRA</p>
<p>Meanwhile spaces</p>	<p>Questions raised about precisely what this designation means - is the temporary use of land allocated for a different permanent use or the setting aside of land for uses to come forward as and when they arise. Some views expressed regarding the need for such a requirement. Concerns</p>	<p>There is a need to have a more responsive method of delivering infrastructure e.g. through the setting aside of land for unprescribed uses to ensure that land is available as and when the need will arise for uses and developments not identified in this current plan.</p>	<p>Provide clarity on expectations for the meanwhile spaces and how this is taken into account in the land budget.</p>	<p>Addressed through each expansion area policy. Specific quantum now removed and instead emphasis placed on making available land within mixed use areas for temporary community and commercial development.</p>

Topic	Issue	Response	Action	Outcome/update
	about how this impacts upon land budgets.			
Delivery	Devon County Council in particular are concerned about the use of CIL for the delivery of infrastructure and particularly around the funding and delivery of education provision.	Officers recognise that under the CIL regime the infrastructure funding gap for Cranbrook is likely to be higher than if infrastructure is secured through the use of S106 agreements. The Government's 2017 Autumn Budget announced plans for a consultation on the removal of S106 pooling thresholds in certain circumstances. However at the time of writing, the consultation has not been published. East Devon District Council continues with a review of its CIL charging schedule alongside the Cranbrook Plan.	Final decisions as to how infrastructure will be delivered will be taken to inform and be informed by the viability testing of the plan. Careful consideration of infrastructure timing and delivery will be addressed and set out in a Cranbrook Delivery Plan to accompany the DPD. This will also appraise priority levels for individual projects, having regard to DCC comments.	<p>Progress running in parallel with plan preparation to take Cranbrook out of the CIL regime and allow infrastructure for the town to be delivered by s106.</p> <p>Viability testing has costed the infrastructure and set out an achievable lists of requirements of facilities.</p> <p>Infrastructure delivery Policy and supporting "live" documents demonstrates how the requirements can be achieved.</p>

## Appendix 8 – Preferred Approach respondents

Representations were received from a range of interested stakeholders and individuals. Full details of the responses can be found on the Councils web page for the [Preferred approach](#)<sup>10</sup>. A summary of the respondents is included below:

Name	Representing:
A and R Street	-
Alan Lascelles	-
Anthony May	-
Arthur Street	
	Aylesbeare Parish Council
Bernard Lane	
Daniel Rogers	Bell Cornwell on behalf of Cranbrook LVA LLP
	Bell Cornwell on behalf of Stuart Partners Ltd
	Broadclyst Parish Council
Cllr E Rylance	
Cllr M Allen	
	Clyst Honiton Parish Council
	Cranbrook Healthy New Town Executive Group
	Cranbrook Town Council
D, J and C Blackett	
David Blackett	
	David Lock Associates on behalf of EDNCP
D Farnworth	
D Cutts	
	DCH Group
	Devon Countryside Access Forum
	Devon County Council

<sup>10</sup> <http://eastdevon.gov.uk/planning/planning-policy/cranbrook-plan/preferred-approach-consultation-responses-2017-18/>

	Devon Senior Voice
	EDDC Summary of Gypsy and Traveller responses
E A Mockford	
E Croft	
E Weatherhead	
	Environment Agency
	Equality and Humans Rights Commission
	FAB link Ltd
	GVA on bealf of St Modwen
H Proctor	
	Highways England
I Bruce	
J Rogers and T Freeze	
J Wollen	
	Jillings Hutton Planning on behalf of Southbrook Court
J Gay and M Brailsford	
L Screen	
M Hughes	
M Roker	
M and L Richards	
M Kingston	
M Horn	
Massey Family	
M Ellingham	
Mrs C Faulkner	
Mr J Glennie	
	National Grid
	National Trust
	Natural England
	Network Rail
	Nigel Jones

P Cuff and s Thomas	
P and L Howe	
P Davies	
P Matthews	
	PCL Planning on behalf of Waddeton Park Ltd
	Persimmon Homes
P Boekman	
P Healey	
P Taylor	
	Regional and City Airports
Revd Lytham Nevard	
R Ayre	Baker Estates Ltd
R and S Beattie	
S Chamberlain	
S Down	
	Somerset County Council
	South West Water
	Sport England
S and E Cutts	
S Lawrence	
S Schlich	
S Marshall	
T Hughes	
	Tetlow King Planning on behalf of Rent Plus UK Ltd
U Hewald	
	University of Exeter Centre for Energy and Environment
	Whimple Parish Council

In addition a further 71 individual responses were also received but who did not consent to their name being published – these too are set out on the website with names and contact details redacted.

Further and when the feedback was presented to the Strategic Planning Committee a 50 signature petition was lodged with the Council. The petition relates to an area of land that was included for

development within the Cranbrook Plan: Preferred Approach consultation. [A copy of the petition](#)<sup>11</sup> can be viewed on the website using the identified link. As with many of the representations submitted during the Cranbrook Plan: Preferred Approach consultation, names, addresses and signatures of those who have signed the petition have been redacted.

---

<sup>11</sup> <http://eastdevon.gov.uk/planning/planning-policy/cranbrook-plan/preferred-approach-consultation-feedback-to-the-cranbrook-plan/>

## **Appendix 9 – Representation form used for proposed submission consultation**

Page to be completed after Pre submission consultation

## **Appendix 10 –Summary of issues raised in proposed submission consultation**

Page to be completed after Pre submission consultation

## **Appendix 11 – Summary list of respondents to proposed submission consultation**

Page to be completed after Pre-submission consultation