

Comment Form Responses

	A	C	D	E	F	G
1	Response #	Date	Main or Summary	Page / Paragraph	Comment	ONPSG Response
2	1	17-Jun	S	PO.6	East Budleigh has parking and a toilet. We have neither! We should have a public toilet and parking for vehicles. If parking was the parish could benefit.	Agrees with statements in the NP. Otterton used to have a public toilet but these were sold some years ago.
3	1	17-Jun	S	PO.5	Please do resist the expansion of Ladram Bay.	Agrees with statements in the NP.
4	1	17-Jun			Many thanks to who ever wrote this. Many hours have been put into its content.	Thanks for the recognition!
5	2	14-Jun	M	33	Very important to maintain the "Local green Spaces" and prevent infill.	Agrees with statements in the NP. Infill development - will include a statement on infill in the next plan version.
6	2	14-Jun	M	34	Ensure <u>no</u> development on flood plains other than agricultural use.	Aligns with suggested practices in the Landscape Character Assessment.
7	2	14-Jun	M	39	Important to retain bus service. Twice in last 15 years closure as been prevented.	Agrees with statements in the NP.
8	2	14-Jun	M	42	Must insist on 20 mph through the village and extend 30 mph to boundary at Sleaf Cottage or preferably to Brick Cross.	20mph proposals under way. This is still being pursued by Claire Wright on behalf of Otterton residents. Extension to Brick Cross would be outside our remit - not in Otterton Parish (it's in E. Budleigh).
9	2	14-Jun	M	46	Restrict any "infill" development.	Will include a statement on infill in the next plan version.
10	2	14-Jun	M		Would be nice if it were possible to stop the Sidmouth "rat run". Also to reduce trail bikes tearing up the local paths!	It's a public road, so restrictions not easily possible. We suggest the Parish Council ask DCC Highways to help with better signage for width restrictions, chevrons for example. We will suggest as a Community Action that a focus group be formed to find out if Sat Nav companies could not show the route for larger vehicles, or the local Tourist Information not recommend the route as an attraction.

Comment Form Responses

	A	C	D	E	F	G
1	Response #	Date	Main or Summary	Page / Paragraph	Comment	ONPSG Response
11	3	18-Jun		PO.1	Development desperately needed 2 bedroom bungalows so us older generation can leave a bigger house for young people. But don't want to leave the village where they were born.	Runs counter to NP statements where such development would only be supported IF a requirement were placed on the Parish from EDDC. Focus group could establish how much of a need there really is for downsizing and living within the village.
12	3	18-Jun		PO.2	Car Park desperately needed.	Agrees with statements in the NP.
13	3	18-Jun		PO.5	I agree with.	Agrees with statements in the NP.
14	3	18-Jun		PO.6	Speed of traffic. Also speed of traffic Behind Hayes when Main Road blocked (with playing field)	Agrees with statements in the NP.
15	4	(not given)			The community would benefit from more, smaller homes suited to the elderly, to allow them to move from larger houses in Otterton so enabling them to remain in Otterton where their friends/relatives are.	View differs from majority opinion from questionnaires - but aligns with support for such development IF a requirement were placed on the Parish from EDDC.
16	4	(not given)			No point wanting gas in the village, that should have happened 25 years ago. The future in a few years' time is hydrogen or accept electric power only.	This is unlikely to happen within the time horizon of this plan - i.e. 2031. However, comment aligns with NP statements on support for renewable power introduction.
17	4	(not given)			Incorporate extra parking with any housing development - underground if necessary (like in France) and ensure buildings are heated by ground source.	Agrees with statements in the NP. Underground parking probably unlikely given the geology of the area. Good idea but outside NP remit.
18	4	(not given)			Generate electric power locally (minimising transmission losses from central power stations or turbines offshore) - rear of the village hall roof faces south and is not readily visible i.e. unsightly - to fix solar panels. Could rent out the electricity supply to say the community shop & Houstern Farm etc - rather than selling back to the grid at rather low rates.	Unclear how such a scheme could be mounted, but worth adding to list of Community Actions.
19	4	(not given)			Generate power from the River Otter flow perhaps near the weir. Water power is more powerful & consistent than wind and solar.	Will add to list of Community Actions for investigation.

Comment Form Responses

	A	C	D	E	F	G
1	Response #	Date	Main or Summary	Page / Paragraph	Comment	ONPSG Response
20	4	(not given)			Why aren't buses encouraged to go electric for improved running costs & lower local emissions? And why is there not an app so that bus users can see the location of buses & when they are likely to arrive at the bus stop.	Electric buses can be roughly 70% higher in cost than diesel ones. Although a recent scheme in one US state shows promise in terms of reducing up-front costs through battery leasing, it is embryonic and not subsidised in the way it is in China, and there is no such move in the UK. Suggest ask bus company re app query. This is, however, a matter for the bus company - no impact on NP.
21	4	(not given)			Not so sure parking is going to be such an issue in the future. Why own your own car when you can call a robot-driven vehicle (appropriate to your needs egg van, small car, large car, motorhome at that time) to your house and it takes you where you require. We have already seen a dramatic decrease in the purchase of new diesel cars, it is surprising how quickly new technologies can be accepted once the infrastructure (e.g. charging points, a/r of robot cars) is in place.	Adoption of such models will be slow until the technologies required have moved forward (safety, performance, power grids, etc). Deployments will happen first in larger population centres, and will take many years to reach rural communities like ours - probably well beyond the time horizon of our plan. In the meantime, we have a parking problem that will only be exacerbated when the benefits of the Lower Otter Restoration Project (LORP) for visitors result in higher volumes visiting. Our original questionnaire responses clearly indicate a need to resolve parking now.
22	5	05-Jul			I have lived in Otterton for 30 years and enjoyed the beautiful environment and friendliness of the village I am delighted with your survey and applaud your hard work and look forward to developements.	Thank you. No impact on NP.
23	5	05-Jul			With no transport I am dependant on the bus service and the local shop is a blessing. I note under the "word cloud" an increased service was mentioned. Our hourly service in both directions is splendid, but underused. If people are not encouraged this service Stage-couch will be forced to cut this service.	The NP Appendix F looks at the bus service and its usage. It's unlikely the service would be better used unless its frequency were to be increased - otherwise it's an inconvenient method of getting around. No further impact on NP.

Comment Form Responses

	A	C	D	E	F	G
1	Response #	Date	Main or Summary	Page / Paragraph	Comment	ONPSG Response
24	5	05-Jul			Otterton is a pretty village and people work hard to keep it bright and tidy. My big grumble is build where the garage used to be. I believe it is owned by Carters. It really is an eyesore and just needs weeding and painting to bring it up to the standard of the rest of the village.	We agree that there are areas that are less tidy. Many home owners and lets are responsible for keeping their own fronts tidy. The Parish Council will try to encourage owners to keep properties looking smart. No further impact on NP.
25	5	05-Jul			I don't walk the cliffs anymore but was horrified to hear a rumour that planning permission has been applied for, for a dwelling near the cliffs.	Not part of the NP remit and this application has now been approved. NP does support possible diversification of rural businesses (Policy ONP5).
26	6	04-Jul	M	PO.5	Ladram Bay must be stopped from any further expansion and no more retrospective planning given.	Draft NP proposes a policy to inhibit further development outside the existing park boundary. Retrospective applications are not within the scope of NP coverage.
27	6	04-Jul	M	PO.5 PO.6	Traffic to Ladram Bay is disgusting. New and replacement caravans on low loaders are disgusting. Cannot say how Ladram Bay makes me furious every time I think about it - what a change has taken place since I was a child here - disgusting that it has been allowed to get like this - <<remainder of comment removed>>	The proposed policy ONP5 covers ongoing LBHP development. No further impact on NP.
28	6	04-Jul	M		Preservation of World Heritage Site is "out of the window" when it comes to Ladram Bay. EDDC make the excuse that it brings money into the area - we can do without the money and have our lovely village and countryside back.	Presumably referring to LBHP's application for a viewing deck, which is under consideration at EDDC. No impact on NP.
29	6	04-Jul	M		One day another person will be killed on the village roads - it happened around 2004-5 and will happen again!	The death in 2006 is a matter of record. The assertion is debatable. Claire Wright still continues to work on behalf of the Parishioners to have a 20mph speed limit throughout the village. No further impact on NP.
30	6	04-Jul	M		20mph speed limit is a bit of a waste of time - most hours of the you are lucky if you can get up to a speed of 5 mph!!!	Clearly not the case. The parishioners have frequently registered their opinion in wanting a 20mph limit. There continues to be speeding traffic through the village. No further impact on NP.

Comment Form Responses

	A	C	D	E	F	G
1	Response #	Date	Main or Summary	Page / Paragraph	Comment	ONPSG Response
31	7	24-Jun	M	p5 Section 1	Perhaps also mention that it is a World Heritage Site at the start. Whilst we applaud your emphasis on this page in terms of the overall aim of "supporting and encouraging the reduction of pollution, global warming and our carbon footprint..." we would like to see even more detail in the report of exactly how this will be done.	WHS: will include. The policies in the NP provide details of how we might start on this route. But much more will depend on future initiatives at a national level that will probably not have much impact before the end of our time horizon (2031).
32	7	24-Jun	M	p17, 4.1.1	It seems to be worded as a bad thing, that we are not allocated any development. Perhaps change the wording so that this is shown to be a wonderful thing that very few towns and villages have, allowing us to maintain the fantastic environment that we have and wish to hold on to.	The paragraph referred to is just a statement of fact and is included as such. Hopefully, when reading all the NP, the feeling of appreciation for our beautiful environment does come across.
33	7	24-Jun	M	Section 4.2.2 p18	This whole section seems misleading. As you rightly suggest, identify in 2.2 on p61, "the vast majority of respondents specified strongly that they wanted no more building" in Otterton. Also, in 9.6.1 p88, the vast majority wanted Otterton to "stay the same". Whilst you touch on this in section 4.2.3, it comes after future development. We feel that the strong message of the village wanting no more development should come first, and be front and centre. The section also says "should any building be required", which means that respondents were answering from that perspective, rather than "do you want any building?" As such, what is said in Section 2.1 p60 is incorrect and misleading. In 4.2.2, 70% of respondents are shown to want affordable housing, which is wrong and contradicts and pages 19, 61 and 88.	The key to this section is in the first sentence: "Should any future housing be allocated or thought necessary...". We are trying to safeguard any future proposals that a developer may put forward.

Comment Form Responses

	A	C	D	E	F	G
1	Response #	Date	Main or Summary	Page / Paragraph	Comment	ONPSG Response
34	7	24-Jun	M	Section 4.2.2 p18	The section also makes an assumption about what is meant by "affordable housing". Our experience is that in ticking this box, people meant "housing that local people can afford", rather than the common definition of affordable housing used in development now, including social rented housing - low rent, secure housing, shared ownership - housing that you buy or rent part of, and intermediate rent homes - 80% market rate housing. (https://blog.shelter.org.uk/2015/08/what-is-affordable-housing)	We agree on this point and will make the terms and wording clearer.
35	7	24-Jun	M	Section 6.1 p46	We would like stronger wording here, similar to the excellent statement in 6.6 on p50 (?). This should emphasise (as coming from the vast majority of Otterton residents, as evidenced from the questionnaire) at the start that we should not want any new developments, and that the North Star development is already above any requirements, and going on with something like "development will only be permitted if ...". On p46, and throughout, we dislike the term "development proposals". We would prefer the term improvement, so proposals would only be supported if they can be shown to represent a considerable improvement to Otterton Parish, its residents, plants, animals and the natural environment.	We disagree on the assertion that the North Star development is above requirements - this is not proven, although the Housing Needs Survey of 2012 that informed this application is now out of date. We disagree with the remainder of this comment. The NP is about guiding future development and as such needs to be referred to in those terms.
36	7	24-Jun	M	Section 6.6 p50	We support Policy ONP6 in this section, which does accurately represent the wishes of the Parish to control the development of Ladram Bay.	Agrees with statements in the NP.

Comment Form Responses

	A	C	D	E	F	G
1	Response #	Date	Main or Summary	Page / Paragraph	Comment	ONPSG Response
37	7	24-Jun	M	p57 point 4	We would like to see a statement on the report that aligns with the UK Government's commitment to reduce carbon emissions to almost zero by 2050. Also specific on how we plan to do this put into 'Community Actions' on this page, but substantially expand this and include planting more trees and hedgerows in the Parish (again in line with the government strategy for reducing carbon emissions). This is partly touched on in Appendix C, p56, part 5, but needs to be strengthened and broadened.	The Parish Council has recorded in their minutes their encouragement to plant more trees in gardens. They are also working towards a Climate Emergency target. East Devon is an area that has one of the most populated areas of trees helping to absorb the carbon in the atmosphere.
38	7	24-Jun	M	Appendix E and D	We like the Community Actions in Appendix D, but are not clear why Appendix E, p59 is separated from these. This appears to devalue all those things in Appendix E. We would suggest combining them all into Appendix D.	Appendix D contains elements that had significant support in the village. Appendix E contains actions that were suggested only by one or very few responses. However, we will make this more clear in the heading of the Appendix.
39	7	24-Jun	M	Appendix A	Whilst we recognise that there has been a huge amount of work put into producing Appendix A, we feel that there is too much, which is unlikely to be read and could perhaps be summarised into one or two pages.	The appendices will be hived off into a separate document for submission, and form part of the body of evidence supporting the NP (of which the Policies are the key element, to be referenced by anyone determining a planning proposal affecting the area). It is very important to have all the evidence available as gathered from the Questionnaires.
40	7	24-Jun	M	Pages 155 to 170, Section 2.2	We really love this section, which we feel offers a very powerful and detailed picture of what is so unique and amazing about Otterton, and so important to protect for future generations. It is a shame that it is left to Appendix L; we feel that it should be another of those things where a main summary is front and centre, and emphasised more in the main report. The tremendous detail in Appendix L could then be referred to.	The Biodiversity Assessment is introduced in Section 4.4.5 (p34/35) of the main document and gives a good overview of the report. The concluding " Key Principles to protect wildlife and geology in Neighbourhood Plans" (3. p170) will now also be included in the main Policy ONP 4 -protecting and enhancing the natural environment.
41	8	09-Jul	M	Section 3.4 p64	<No comment provided>	<No response possible>

Comment Form Responses

	A	C	D	E	F	G
1	Response #	Date	Main or Summary	Page / Paragraph	Comment	ONPSG Response
42	8	09-Jul	M	Section 3.5 p65	<No comment provided>	<No response possible>
43	O.1	18-Jul	M	4.8.2 p57 & 42	Car Park Option to resolve the parking issues in Fore Street. How would parking for residents be allowed? Permits. Yellow lines . Tradesmens vehicles access for business at properties.	Parking options can be discussed by Otterton Parish Council in conjunction with the Highways Department.
44	O.1	18-Jul	M	Ladram Bay p37 to 39	Agree with the statement to require restrictions to traffic to and from Ladram Bay. Directly linked to it's continuing growth and the nature of the place changing it's priorities	Agrees with NP
45	O.2	19-Jul	S	Transport and Traffic	It is particularly compromising when you try and cross over the road by the bus stop and extra difficult with children. The visibility is terrible because so many cars (and large SUVs) park over the white lines on the small section of the brook between the pub and the green. In order to ensure clear visibility this area should really be marked with double yellow lines. I have three small children and I am usually half way in the road before I can see if there is any traffic. It is really quite dangerous and it should be remembered that it is a crossing point for the local school children. Something needs to be done to aid pedestrian crossing.	Supportive of traffic calming and safety measures proposed to OPC but not yet taken forward.
46	O.2	19-Jul	S	Community Facilities and Leisure	Increase facilities and activities for the families and young people in the Village. There isn't currently much to accommodate/interest young people, and despite the comments about Ladram as a family we find it amazing to have access to their leisure facilities. Perhaps think about intergenerational ways of working to involve everyone in the community (e.g. the film club could run a kids club - or there might be people in the Village that could teach music (affordably) to some of the children. The Village hall is an excellent resource and it would be great to see it used this way.	The Neighbourhood Plan proposes a number of 'Community Actions', (See Appendix D & E) some strongly supported and others less so. This plan only lists the outcomes from the study; setting up of individual initiatives following this is not in the scope of this plan, but it is hoped that people from the community could take on some of the suggested projects. We understand the Film Club is hoping to provide something for children.

Comment Form Responses

	A	C	D	E	F	G
1	Response #	Date	Main or Summary	Page / Paragraph	Comment	ONPSG Response
47	O.2	19-Jul	S	The Natural Environment	Think about ways as a Village that we can support the natural environment through the reduction of PLASTIC usage. Work with the Community Shop to support this mission (perhaps through bulk buying schemes for example or a veg box scheme). Work with business in the Village on plastic reduction (not just recycling actual reduction). Given that we live in a coastal area this should really be at the forefront of any vision to support the natural environment.	Otterton Community Shop is limited in space, storage and facilities to go beyond what it already provides (see OCS response). The shop is now part of a charity plastic sweet/crisp wrapper recycling scheme. The self service milk machine using glass bottles to recycle, is also now in place. Perhaps we need a 'champion' to evangelise this subject - We will add this as a Community Action.
48	O.3	19-Jul	S		The following observations are submitted by Councillor Kelvin Dent, Chair of Sidmouth Town Council's Planning Committee. Otterton Draft Neighbourhood Plan was submitted to Sidmouth Town Council's Planning Committee on 10th July. The Plan is concise, well written, the policies appear to be appropriate and we support them. The Community Actions are also appropriate and worthy although there appear to be no time lines at present. We support the Draft Neighbourhood Plan.	Transferred to Statutory Consultees sheet
49	9	14-Jul		4 Economy, Business, Employment	Farming is very important in keeping the beauty and diversity of the area. Much of the work is done by large contractors with very big equipment but done very quickly. So nuisance is kept to the minimum. Conflict with the residents mainly is caused by poorly parked vehicles as the roads are plenty wide enough for vehicles to pass through. More off-street parking areas need to be in place to keep main street and Ladram Road less cluttered.	Agreed poor parking contributes to congestion. But it's not just residents, it's visitors too. More co-ordination needed on large vehicle movements - buses, lorries, lodge deliveries, farm vehicles. Claire Wright has already looked into the possibility of a Residents Parking Scheme, but we don't qualify.
50	9	14-Jul			Some small housing developments are needed to allow the elderly to downsize and be close to families, which is good for their wellbeing. And the young to have their own homes and stay in the area.	These two categories are mentioned explicitly in the draft plan. However, this is subject to the main focus which is on inhibiting further development in line with Conservation Area and AONB considerations.

Comment Form Responses

	A	C	D	E	F	G
1	Response #	Date	Main or Summary	Page / Paragraph	Comment	ONPSG Response
51	9	14-Jul			More parking areas needed. As Cars will never get less. Its just the convenience. A good percentage are people coming to visit Otterton Mill, Kings Arms and Ladram, which we must encourage - which makes the place so lovely and alive. Most villages and towns have transport and traffic issues, which drive people away but its not like that here, people want to come.	Agrees with statements in the NP.
52	9	14-Jul			Ladram Bay Holiday Park create a lot of jobs and facilities for the people of Otterton and surrounding area. It shouldn't be knocked as these holiday makers spend a lot of money in the East Devon economy. A lot of congestion in the main street isn't helped by vehicles taking a short cut from Sidmouth and Budleigh and not even going to Ladram as their satnavs direct them that way. Movements in and out of site are only hindered by inappropriate parking and the volume of walkers parking up and leaving their cars to go off and enjoy the lovely coastal walks. So more parking areas need to be implemented.	The report specifically lists areas where LBHP has helped the village, and describes some of its characteristics including about providing jobs and facilities for local people. Congestion is already mentioned in the draft plan - and several responses here mention the 'rat run' between here and Sidmouth. As stated in the plan, parking in the village is recognised as a problem and residents have expressed an desire for car parking.
53	10	15-Jul			Thanks to the Steering Group for putting together this plan.	Thanks for the recognition!

Comment Form Responses

	A	C	D	E	F	G
1	Response #	Date	Main or Summary	Page / Paragraph	Comment	ONPSG Response
54	10	15-Jul		PO.1, PO.3	<p>What makes Otterton such a beautiful village? At first glance the historic thatched cottages on the high street which are well kept by the people who live there.</p> <p>The surrounding green fields and green spaces between the houses where horses and sheep as well as the odd pheasant graze.</p> <p>A true definition of a rural village which are now sadly on the decline!</p> <p>I moved from Budleigh two years ago because I didn't want to live in a town or on a housing estate - I wanted to be in harmony with nature and enjoy the welcoming 'community atmosphere' of this beautiful village.</p> <p>I'm lucky enough to live in Hayes Close and it worries me that you regard the green spaces in the village as potential sites on which to build with the exception of just a few. Hayes Close has also been suggested as building site!</p> <p>I agree local people need affordable houses in which to live, but why are there so many cottages being bought as second homes? The already allocated site at the end of the village would be good for local people to have affordable houses but how can you guarantee that they will not be snapped up for holiday homes which would eventually turn Otterton into a holiday village!</p>	<p>There are no sites mentioned in the draft plan, other than the one at 'North Star' with existing planning permission. We just reported on where questionnaire responders suggested future development (ONLY if forced on us) might go, but we are not endorsing these.</p> <p>People buy second homes because it's a free market for buyers and sellers and there's no current law to inhibit this for existing properties.</p> <p>We should focus attention on the development under way at North Star. Perhaps the developer would be willing to include a restrictive covenant on the cheaper homes, so that a sale in the future could only be to prospective purchasers with a proven local birth/residence etc link to the village.</p>
55	10	15-Jul		PO.5	Ladram Bay Holiday Park - should not be allowed to become a bigger development or further expansion which would threaten the village atmosphere and turn Otterton into a holiday village.	Agrees with statements in the NP.
56	10	15-Jul		PO.6	Traffic - Speed limit through the village. Also in Behind Hayes lane where motocross bikes speed through.	Agrees with statements in the NP.
57	10	15-Jul		PO.7	Encourage and increase activities for all ages residents to join.	Agrees with statements in the NP.

Comment Form Responses

	A	C	D	E	F	G
1	Response #	Date	Main or Summary	Page / Paragraph	Comment	ONPSG Response
58	10	15-Jul		ONP2 ONP3 ONP4	Totally agree - 'the village as it is' should be protected.	Agrees with statements in the NP.
59	10	15-Jul			More facilities for the younger age groups in the village. I would be happy to give up an evening if a youth club was organised in the village hall.	Agrees with statements in the NP. Thank you for the offer!
60	11	18-Jul			<p>Re traffic problems in Otterton. Many people in Otterton has made many complaints regarding the traffic through the village, and the problem is normally blamed on Ladram Bay. However there is an easy solution to this problem.</p> <p>There is already signage in place at Ottery Street, Peak Hill and the entrance to Northmostown stating 6ft except for access, which nobody polices. How we see it you blame Ladram Bay for doing nothing wrong when there is clearly many vehicles breaking the law to and fro Sidmouth.</p> <p>Obviously traffic to and from Sidmouth use the village as a shortcut. You also have in mind reducing the speed limit in Otterton which will cause more congestion and problems even more so if the problem of overwide vehicles is not addressed.</p> <p>Obviously this has been mentioned many times before but this time when you look at this issue could you now fix it.</p>	<p>How could such a move be enforced? Police are already overstretched; and I don't think there is any legal scheme that could involve local folk in such action (unlike Speed Watch schemes, where local folk are authorised to act under the control and supervision of the Police).</p> <p>And how many vehicle drivers actually know the width of their vehicle? (Although they should!)</p> <p>We will add a Community Action to be taken on by residents.</p> <p>A 20mph speed limit has been supported by many residents who returned the original Questionnaire.</p>
61	12	18-Jul	M	2.7 p9	Reference to solar panels and respecting Village Design Statement refers to sensitive choice of roofing material. Why bother if solar panels are to cover the roof!! To preserve our picturesque village should only be allowed out of general sight.	Some of the newer solar panel designs are in the form of tiles and in our opinion are <i>not</i> insensitive. Normal panels or such tiles would in any case, not be allowed on thatched properties or many other of our Listed properties.
62	12	18-Jul	M	Appendix J p139	Proposed Local Heritage Assets - Rolle Barton - should this only apply to Nos 1, 2 and 3. The rest of the complex is NEW build.	Agree -this will be amended.

Comment Form Responses

	A	C	D	E	F	G
1	Response #	Date	Main or Summary	Page / Paragraph	Comment	ONPSG Response
63	13	21-Jul		Questionnaire responses cloud	Less parking on main street. The volume of parking in Fore Street actually slows traffic. Houses on the right hand side (coming up from the Mill) open directly on to the road. Reducing parking will speed up traffic and make it more dangerous for residents.	The parking is a 'double-edged sword': whilst it can act as a traffic calming measure by itself, it also contributes to congestion when larger vehicles use the street. Also, parked vehicles opposite all the houses that have doors directly onto the road, mean that moving traffic is pushed closer to the properties. Parked cars also reduces visibility sprints when pedestrians try to cross the road, which is unsafe.
64	13	21-Jul		Ladram Bay	Agree expansion should not be allowed but it is a business and they do contribute a lot to the village. We should work with them and not treat them as the enemy.	We have specifically mentioned in the NP, projects where LBHP have contributed to the village and the fact that they contribute to the local economy and workforce. We are suggesting only that the development remain within the existing park boundaries.
65	14	22-Jul	M		Congratulations to the members of the Group that have compiled this plan. It is very thorough with lots of interesting information.	Thanks for the recognition!
66	14	22-Jul	M	p9	4th para, 3rd line replace 'would' with 'should'. Neighbourhood Plans should be flexibly written so EDDC planners have to take notice of them. There is evidence they are not.	There is also evidence that they <i>are</i> being followed - reference refusal in early July of a proposal to build an infill property in Budleigh. However, the picture is inconsistent - reference Crantock in Cornwall, and a recent approval in Lymptone.
67	14	22-Jul	M	p11	The village needs to provide more facilities for children. It still has a Scout hut and supposedly a leader.	Agrees with statements in the NP.
68	14	22-Jul	M	p29 last para	Several walking groups from Sidmouth regularly use these footpaths too including All Saints Men's Walking Group and the Ladies Walking Group.	No change needed.
69	14	22-Jul	M	4.4.4 p34	Unless you have a reliable 4x4 householders are also cut off from the east as this road floods to a significant depth preventing travel along the coast road.	Added to plan

Comment Form Responses

	A	C	D	E	F	G
1	Response #	Date	Main or Summary	Page / Paragraph	Comment	ONPSG Response
70	14	22-Jul	M	p41 para 4	Many commercial and private vehicles significantly exceeding 6ft in width use the coast route regularly exacerbating traffic movement and making it difficult to pass in the passing places. There are occasional long hold-ups. Needs to be better policed.	See comment on M Selley's submission who asks a similar question.
71	14	22-Jul	M	pp39 & 40	All vehicles have increased in size substantially during the past 5 years while the roads remain the same size/width. It is now difficult to negotiate Fore Street, Bell Street and Ladram Road caused by heavy vehicles which these roads were not designed for. There has been significant loss and waste of mains water in recent years and damage to banks and garden walls.	This is not unique to Otterton. And at present there is no statutory framework for restricting vehicle movements, however unsuitable for larger vehicles.
72	14	22-Jul	M	pp49 & 50	Industrial agriculture, where monocrop forage maize is cut for use in anaerobic digesters and transported to Woodbury in very large trailers causes both noise and delays to traffic in Otterton and the surrounding area is unacceptable. These vehicles travel from 7:30 am to as late as 02:00 am on the following morning causing disruption in the village.	Although aggravating at the time, the farm vehicles may work longer hours due to weather constraints and trying to get crops in to maximize their potential gain. It is usually for a short amount of time within the summer. Unfortunately, it is not within remit of NP to suggest a solution.
73	14	22-Jul	M	pp49 & 50	Digestate was transported from Woodbury to the Otterton area during the week beginning 29 April in huge tankers pulled by large tractors; again starting around 7:30 am and working through until 11:30 pm. It was impossible to overtake these very wide tankers and whenever a large vehicle approached from the opposite direction traffic came to a standstill as they negotiated to pass each other. This caused huge delays in the area and productivity for businesses in East Devon must have fallen significantly. Villagers were kept awake at night by the roar of large tractors travelling through the village. One has to guess at the basis if using such large vehicles and their effect on other road users and residents and the local economy.	More co-ordination needed on large vehicle movements - buses, lorries, chalet deliveries, farm vehicles. This is to some extent outwith the scope of the plan. As a Community Action, a member of the village could form a steering group to look into the matter.

Comment Form Responses

	A	C	D	E	F	G
1	Response #	Date	Main or Summary	Page / Paragraph	Comment	ONPSG Response
74	14	22-Jul	M	pp44-47	While agreeing with all of the Planning Objectives I have little confidence that the EDDC Planning Committee will respect them.	The NP, when 'made' will be a legal document. There have been a number examples reported in our local paper where an application has been refused because it contradicted the requirements of the NP.
75	15	22-Jul	M		<Separate document on Google Drive>	We will amend the plan to accommodate some of the points made.
76	16	23-Jul			Having read the summary we have no points to raise. However, we would like to thank the team who took on this huge job. It is particularly pleasing that the Otterton Village Design Statement 2004 will continue to be used for reference in this new document.	Thanks for the recognition!
77	17	25-Jul		PO.1	Otterton does not have a suitable infrastructure to support more new house building. There is a need to enable 'downsizing' but there are few opportunities other than encouraging conversion of larger existing properties to apartments.	Agrees with statements in the NP.
78	17	25-Jul		PO.2	Any increase in development is bound to increase traffic.	Agreed, but we're not proposing any. We are trying to safeguard the possibility that IF, in the future, more housing is imposed upon us, then at least we have some specifications in place.
79	17	25-Jul		PO.3	There should be much stronger emphasis on conserving the natural environment especially in the context of the global warming crisis. Otterton should be trying to be more proactive, looking at where there could be more tree-planting. Discuss with local landowners e.g. replanting the orchard area between Behind Hayes and Fore St. This could be a community orchard, as has been done in other places.	Agrees with statements in the NP. A Community Action could be for members of the village to form a steering group to develop such a project. Counter comment by Tony Bennett - see below.

Comment Form Responses

	A	C	D	E	F	G
1	Response #	Date	Main or Summary	Page / Paragraph	Comment	ONPSG Response
80	17	25-Jul		PO.5	We need to reduce the antagonism towards Ladram Bay Holiday Park, and encourage this business to recognise the negative impact their traffic has on those living in Otterton. Ladram could encourage its visitors to support local businesses such as the King's Arms, the Community Shop and the Mill. There is still a need to reduce the impact on local traffic caused by the transport of lodges and caravans - especially on Tuesdays!	Agrees with statements in the NP. The Parish Council have regular meetings with LBHP to try and resolve any issues. Further improved methods of communication with LBHP will be encouraged.
81	17	25-Jul		PO.8	We should continue to pursue the introduction of a 20mph speed limit in Fore St. Local farming businesses should be asked to ensure that traffic involved in crop-gathering reduces its speed through the centre of the village. There are certain weeks when there is a continuous stream of large tractors + trailers speeding through the village from early morning until late at night. The amount of 'on street' parking does cause congestion at times, but it also serves to reduce traffic speed.	Agrees with statements in the NP. Claire Wright is still working on behalf of the residents of Otterton, to introduce the 20mph limit throughout the village. Re farm traffic - see comments above for Malcolm Crabtree. On street parking makes it more unsafe for pedestrians when there is no path, or when they are trying to cross the road. It also pushes moving traffic nearer the houses that have doors straight onto the road.
82	17	25-Jul		PO.7	Although the village hall is quite well used in the evenings, it is seldom used during the day. Perhaps we can learn from other similar communities where a range of activities seem to take place for different age groups. e.g. monthly community coffee mornings; clubs for teenagers;	Will add to 'Community Actions'.
83	17	25-Jul		PO.6	How to encourage local residents to make better use of bus services? Some buses continue to turn at the top of Fore St, rather than the end of Ottery St - this is really dangerous! Safety is a real issue to walkers, especially between the King's Arms and the Green, and the bridge opposite the Mill where there is no pavement. The introduction of the milk machine where there are double yellow lines may introduce an extra hazard with people parking briefly to use the machine?	Safety already highlighted in draft plan.

Comment Form Responses

	A	C	D	E	F	G
1	Response #	Date	Main or Summary	Page / Paragraph	Comment	ONPSG Response
84	17	25-Jul		PO.6	There are real dangers for both pedestrians and drivers trying to exit their properties all along the village hall side of Fore St. Exits are 'blind' and some house entries are directly into the road.	Safety already highlighted in draft plan.
85	17	25-Jul		PO.7	Community Shop - we need to increase local 'ownership' and use of the shop by all age groups; it needs more volunteers; 'use it or 'lose it'; Shop is keen to improve recycling and reduce plastic waste; limited premises makes this very challenging - how can the community help with this?	This is not within the remit of the NP, but it could be part of a 'Community Action' for a group to follow.
86	18	26-Jul			a. Skate Park Although children may want this, the cost is enormous and there is already a skate park at Lime Kiln. I cannot believe a park at Stantaway would be cost effective.	We believe that although the children have said a skate park is wanted, what they would be happy with is just a few ramps and jumps for their boards or scooters for the younger ones. The Parish Council have this under discussion.
87	18	26-Jul			b. Car Park. This is an old chestnut, but it is hard to know where it should be. A park beside the river would destroy the very environment which attracts the visitors. It is very doubtful whether a park at the other end of the village would be used by those visiting the bridge area. Finally who would pay for the cost of buying the land and furnishing a car park?	NP has been updated to cover this. A car park at E end of village would not solve issue of traffic volume on Fore St.
88	18	26-Jul			c. Mobile phones. Over the last few years the Parish Council has repeatedly approved applications to build a new mast. However all the applications are being submitted by middle men, who hope to sell the site to Phone Companies. Sadly it seems that at the present time none of these are prepared to invest in better facilities for our village.	Negotiations under way. No change required in plan.
89	18	26-Jul			d. Orchard. The parish did have an orchard up Chockenhole Lane, but no one was prepared to maintain it. People do not appreciate how much effort is need to prune the trees each year and to trim the grass and cut hedges.	Suggested in draft plan as a Community Action as a number of responders had mentioned this, but obviously has a land use connotation as well.

Comment Form Responses

	A	C	D	E	F	G
1	Response #	Date	Main or Summary	Page / Paragraph	Comment	ONPSG Response
90	18	26-Jul			e. Gas Pipeline. Many years ago Parishioners were offered the opportunity to pay for a pipeline into the village. Only some 20 were prepared to use the gas and the Company (then British Gas) wanted 75 . The problem is that users were asked to pay for a connection from the main pipeline on or close to the main roads, and would also need to install new boilers and appliances. The cost today would be astronomical!	This just shows what came out of the questionnaire responses. Agreed the financial viability makes this a virtual non-starter.
91	18	26-Jul			f. Outdoor Gym Eqpt. The Parish Council actually approved installing some equipment a few years ago, but could not find a site and were somewhat put off because the eqpt on the Green at Budleigh hardly attracted any users.	Now under consideration again by Parish Council.
92	18	26-Jul			g. Benches on paths. This is a contentious issue, because many consider they detract from the natural environment. If any are installed they need regular maintenance. The Council has put a seat up at Stantyway and another by the river bridge. The one by the river is faced by long grass and vegetation as is also the one by Ricketty Bridge. Incidentally the Parish is not responsible for the River path – downstream it is maintained by Highways and upstream belongs to Colaton Raleigh.	It's on the Community Actions List.
93	18	26-Jul			h. Stantaway. Over the years we have had several opportunities for investment on this Field. EDDC offered to provide a Tennis Court, but it was felt this could not be protected from Vandalism. We were also offered an area of hard standing (MUGA) for various games but would have had to construct a surfaced path from the Gate to the area at a cost of over £10k. The Council did not consider this could be justified by potential usage. The Council has however contributed towards construction, maintenance, and improvements to the Pavilion and donated the picnic tables.	Needs setting up as a separate project with a remit to raise its own funding in some way. Nothing further for NP.

Comment Form Responses

	A	C	D	E	F	G
1	Response #	Date	Main or Summary	Page / Paragraph	Comment	ONPSG Response
94	O.4	28-Jul	M	4.8.2	I Agree with the document as presented, in particular: 4.8.2 Exploring a site for a visitor car park to reduce traffic congestion. 6.8 Strongly agree with the statements on protecting local green spaces and that any other housing development should be of a small scale.	Agrees with statements in the NP.
95	19	24-Jul		PO.3	Please conserve the quote 'scenic beauty' of the parish for future generations.	Agrees with statements in the NP.
96	19	24-Jul		PO.5	Further expansion would make Ladram less desirable as a holiday camp destination - it would be same as lots of others and ordinary.	Maybe depends on the type of expansion - smarter, higher end lodges that blend with greater landscaping within the present boundary, may be more desirable.
97	20	25-Jul	S	PO.6	Traffic in and through the village has increased enormously every recent years and some form of control is now becoming vital Masood necessary. The volume and speed of traffic must be curbed the safety of all residents and visitors will stop I suggest the following actions for consideration : 1.20 mph limit throughout with image 2.Provide chicane at either end of the village which would force vehicles to reduce speed. 3.Enforce the existing web limit on the road from Ottery Street over Peak Hill to Sidmouth. Existing road signs clearly state a width limit of 6 feet, but this is ignored by large numbers of vans and large vehicles well over 6ft in width. The elimination over these vehicles would greatly reduce traffic through Otterton. Enforcing the existing width limit on the road to Sidmouth could be achieved by erecting posts either side of the road 6 feet apart. Posts could be retractable to provide permitted access for residents along that road.	Agrees with statements in the NP. Problems with traffic have been noted throughout the NP. The Parish Council and Claire Wright on behalf of the residents are pursuing the 20mph speed limit option. Traffic calming measures will also be looked at although road management has to be through the Highways Department.

Comment Form Responses

	A	C	D	E	F	G
1	Response #	Date	Main or Summary	Page / Paragraph	Comment	ONPSG Response
98	20	25-Jul	S	PO.1, PO.2, PO.3	Otterton is a traditional Devon village in an AONB and WHS and many residents often actually dependent on visitors to the area. However, most visitors come because it is a quiet calm a peaceful place in beautiful surroundings. They will not come if it is full of traffic, has poorly designed new buildings and a lack of safe footpaths and walkways. There is a dangerous lack of footpaths in many sections of the main street.	Agrees with statements in the NP. This is exactly what we are trying to avoid. The Parishioners want safety for all and IF housing is insisted upon in the future, new buildings should have all the requirements as described in the NP.
99	21	25-Jul	M	p8	Village consultation was really useful and we appreciate all the hard work that has gone on since to produce this neighbourhood plans. Well done all of you!	Thank you!
100	21	25-Jul	M	p11	Skate park/ramps provision for youngsters should be a priority.	Agrees with statements in the NP. It is already on the Agenda for the Parish Council.
101	21	25-Jul	M	p18	Affordable housing should be a priority. North star site has planning permission but I would be concerned about pedestrian safety from site into the village.	Partially agrees with NP - our proposals only cover what could be built IF we were forced to accept more.
102	21	25-Jul	M	p27	I agree with chief planning guidelines.	Agrees with statements in the NP.
103	21	25-Jul	M	p38	There is huge concern over the amount of heavy and wide traffic in and out of Ladram caravan park. Weight of vehicles is causing damage to road and underground water pipes etc. There is no feasible alternative route in so something has to be done to alleviate the problem ASAP.	Agrees with statements in the NP.
104	21	25-Jul	M	p42	A car park is essential - Bell Street field? Off street and visitors. More larger vehicles wider than 6 foot are using Ottery Street as a rat run.	Agrees with statements in the NP. (See responses in previous comments.)
105	21	25-Jul	M	p46-51	Agree with sustainable development policy ONP.1	Agrees with statements in the NP.
106	21	25-Jul	M	p107	Concern over stress on ancient bridge into Otterton of increased amount of traffic (weight and size) including agricultural vehicles (too large for the area they serve).	This is a matter for DCC Highways.
107	22	26-Jul	S	PO.1	Endorse small scale developments for downsizing to enable residents to remain in the village.	Agrees with statements in plan.
108	22	26-Jul	S	PO.3	To conserve green spaces in centre of the village.	Agrees with statements in the NP. We have made a point about conserving green spaces and have identified them on a map.

Comment Form Responses

	A	C	D	E	F	G
1	Response #	Date	Main or Summary	Page / Paragraph	Comment	ONPSG Response
109	22	26-Jul	S	PO.4	No increase in second homes.	Agrees with statements in the NP, although it is difficult to know if a house purchase is for a second home or not.
110	22	26-Jul	S	PO.5	No expansion of Ladram Bay Holiday Park.	Agrees with statements in the NP.
111	22	26-Jul	S	PO.6	To provide parking prior to entering the village, i.e. the triangular space on left before bridges.	Agrees with statements in the NP. We will explain this more, as many people have made mention of this as it would stop cars coming through the village.
112	23	26-Jul	S	PO.1	Agree. New housing "affordable" only and for locals. We should encourage this within the guidelines NOT discourage. Fully support renewable energy.	Agrees with statements in the NP.
113	23	26-Jul	S	PO.2, PO.3, PO.4	Agree.	Agrees with statements in the NP.
114	23	26-Jul	S	PO.5	Fully agree - Plus campaign for NO RETROSPECTIVE APPROVALS.	Agrees with statements in the NP. Cannot <i>prevent</i> retrospective approvals though, as it is not illegal to apply for it.
115	23	26-Jul	S	PO.6, ONP7	Agree, but 1 Where could extra parking be located within a distance which would be used by visitors. (Nothing wrong with parking in main street. Where else might residents park? Also parked cars reduce speed of through traffic). 2 Who would pay for above and cycle & pathways? 3 Resurrect 20mph application	More on parking will be added to the next version of the plan. 20mph limit is being pursued by Claire Wright on behalf of Otterton residents.
116	23	26-Jul	S	PO.7	Agree. Resurrect proposals to re-order the church for community use.	Agrees with statements in the NP. Latter not part of NP.
117	24	26-Jul	S		This is a well thought out and carefully considered neighbourhood plan which has my full support.	Thanks!
118	24	26-Jul	S	PO.3	Please plant more trees which absorb CO2. I understand that these are readily available for free and will even be planted for you.	Will add as a Community Action.

Comment Form Responses

	A	C	D	E	F	G
1	Response #	Date	Main or Summary	Page / Paragraph	Comment	ONPSG Response
119	24	26-Jul	S	PO.7	The state of the Brook, particularly below the Kings Arms, always needs attention. If this cannot be done by the Council could we not have working parties of volunteers to clear it? Same applies to weeds at the side of Fore St (lower down) and Maunder's Hill (near the school entrance) in particular.	Not part of NP. However, the Parish Council do often remind residents that they are responsible to clear the portion of stream in front of their property. There have also been working parties to clear the stream and other areas in the past.
120	24	26-Jul	S	PO.5	Essential to curb expansion at Ladram Bay, which would only increase traffic - commercial vehicles in particular which cause pollution, wear and tear on bridges and roads and traffic jams.	Agrees with statements in the NP. There are numerous responders that have made the same point.
121	25	26-Jul	S	PO.3	More trees should be planted in the parish. They absorb CO2 and contribute to the fight against climate change. The water riverbanks and footpaths should be more regularly maintained up and down street, and also the Brook along Fore Street, where vegetation growth impedes the flow of water.	Will add as a Community Action.
122	25	26-Jul	S	PO.5	It is hard to see how any future development of Ladram Bay would not have some impact on traffic through the village, or on the AONB.	Agrees with statements in the NP.
123	25	26-Jul	S	PO.6	A public car park, discreetly sited, would help traffic congestion. If this were provided parking along Fore Street could then be more restricted. The 20 mph speed limit already agreed should be implemented ASAP.	Agrees with statements in the NP. Claire Wright is still working on behalf of the residents of Otterton, to introduce the 20mph limit throughout the village.
124	25	26-Jul	S		Generally the draft plan seems very good and has my full support.	Thanks!
125	26	27-Jul	M	pp39, 41, 42, 102	The enforcement of the mandatory 6 foot width limit, at the top of Ottery Street, would go a long way in alleviating the traffic concerns in the village.	The enforcement part is the difficult bit. Otterton PC will talk with the Highways department to see if there is anything that can be done.
126	26	27-Jul	M	6.7, Appendix D	Further development at North Star would be totally inappropriate due to increased traffic in a narrow lane with lack of a footpath.	Agrees with statements in the NP.

Comment Form Responses

	A	C	D	E	F	G
1	Response #	Date	Main or Summary	Page / Paragraph	Comment	ONPSG Response
127	27	<not given>		PO.6	Are there plans to reduce the type of vehicles using the Lane between Otterton and Sidmouth, where large camper vans using sat nav block the lane.	See previous comments on this subject.
128	27	<not given>			Phone mast this has been on the council agenda for 4 years. I see it as no presence in this plan. Why? In 2019 this should not be at issue to get a signal in Otterton.	Many references in Appendix H . OPC to follow up.
129	28	<not given>			Otterton is a Devon country working village on the coast. With a holiday park that has been there for many years and also employed many local people. It is also a agricultural village. Which bring employment.	We agree with the statements.
130	28	<not given>			The village has always been a rat run to and from Sidmouth, for working people.	We agree.
131	28	<not given>			Put a ticket machine in a car park this field in Bell Street. The revenue from this would pay for someone to keep the village tidy. At the moment it is a disgrace. It would also stop walkers from parking on roads. Make road parking for residents only. Leave Ladram alone that is not the problem.	Disagree - Bell Street would not help with traffic volumes <i>through</i> the village. A car park before entry to the village would help with volumes of traffic through the village. A Community Action group could be set up to help keep Otterton tidy.
132	28	<not given>			The outsiders which have moved here for retirement and bought houses with their eyes and ears closed are the problem. Otterton has never been a retirement village if they don't like it go back to where they came from.	Noted.
133	29	20-Jul		PO.6	To encourage the use of buses connections need to be better with Exeter - e.g. buses connecting at Newton Poppleford better or bus from Exeter continuing from Newton Poppleford too often. At present the journey is just too difficult.	Agrees with statements in the NP although bus companies decide their routes and frequency, partly depending on popularity.
134	29	20-Jul		PO.6	Footpaths are generally good and encourage visitors - however footpath from Otterton to Bicton was so overgrown it was impossible late May / June / early July.	Footpaths are the responsibility of the County Council and the one to Bicton to the west of the river is not in our Parish.
135	29	20-Jul		PO.6	It would help if Otterton wasn't on the through route to Sidmouth - could the road become 'access only' to Otterton and not be used as a 'rat run'?	This would be a matter for the PC and DCC. Looking into traffic issues could be a focus for a community action.

Comment Form Responses

	A	C	D	E	F	G
1	Response #	Date	Main or Summary	Page / Paragraph	Comment	ONPSG Response
136	29	20-Jul		PO.5	Ladram has been there for many years however traffic has increased over the years so reducing this but not allowing any further development is of upmost importance as it just seems to get busier and the road in Otterton cannot support this.	Agrees with statements in the NP.
137	29	20-Jul		PO.5	Ladram have said they will try to reduce the inconvenience of mobile home through the village, however there were 2 (at least) incidents in late spring ?June when mobile homes tried to turn up the Ladram Road and couldn't causing congestion for the cars and bus service - they really need think through the transport of mobile homes.	Agrees with statements in the NP. Improved communication with LBHP is essential and a better way to move the lodges and inform residents is being sought.
138	30	20-Jul		PO.1	Should a % of affordable homes be required on any development? Should this be specific or tested before approval. Should all future development have local resident status for perpetuity - St Ives and others have included this.	This is already the case. Unclear whether 'St Ives model' actually works - causes stress in other parts of local housing market, apparently.
139	30	20-Jul		PO.2	How will increased traffic be measured? What current 'benchmarks' are being used?	We will propose a Community Action to mount a traffic count exercise every two or three years?
140	30	20-Jul		PO.3	Protection of hedgerows often lengths are removed Protection of roadside wildflowers Creation of wildlife friendly banks Control of cutting of lanes etc 'Plantlife' have a campaign	There is a lot about wildlife protection in the reports in the Appendices.
141	30	20-Jul		PO.4	Should it include 'visual impact'?	PO.4 covers a different subject. Policy ONP4 covers this.
142	30	20-Jul		PO.5	A Master Plan for the site with a 5 year renewable term, should be requested by EDDC. This will mitigate piecemeal development that does not need to address traffic, landscape environmental impact. Several objections to the latest retrospective applications suggested this was done. This should be approved by EDDC .	Agree. However, LBHP were asked if they had a 5 year plan and they said that they had not.

Comment Form Responses

	A	C	D	E	F	G
1	Response #	Date	Main or Summary	Page / Paragraph	Comment	ONPSG Response
143	30	20-Jul		PO.6	Traffic plan for LBHP would help the whole village. Better notification of deliveries, particularly Bell Street / Ladram Road.	We need a village information distribution service that works better than the Parish Newsletter. An email opt-in service or joining a designated WhatsApp for mobile phones would be helpful. Project for a Community Action.
144	31	22-Jul		PO.1	Could the wording be tightened up on environmental standards? It currently seems open to interpretation. A percentage increase on emission rates or similar standards defined in building regulations may provide the answer.	A good suggestion, but this is too detailed for an <i>objective</i> .
145	31	22-Jul		PO.2	A number of the planning objectives are too vague. Sustainable development does not seem to be defined and without such definition it will be impossible to enforce the requirement as everyone will have a different view on what it means.	We will include a definition of 'sustainable' aligned to that in the EDDC Local Plan.
146	31	22-Jul		PO.3	Ottertton is a beautiful village but the village green offers a poor first entrance . Consider improvements to this area.	Not relevant to NP - responsibility of OPC.
147	31	22-Jul		PO.5	Ladram Bay is significantly detrimental to the environment. Peace male individual development is a concern. A wide-ranging masterplan should be demanded supported by an Environmental Impact Assessment. Measures should then be instigated to improve traffic management and pedestrian safety amongst others.	Development of LBHP has been piecemeal over the years but it would be the responsibility of EDDC to follow this up more thoroughly. Traffic management is already covered in the NP.
148	31	22-Jul		PO.6	There is no baseline for measurement. How do we know what good looks like and when we have achieved improvements.	Detail of measurement bases will need to be worked through.
149	32	25-Jul		PO.5	Too many <u>large</u> vehicles going to Ladram blocking Main Road.	Agrees with statements in the NP.
150	32	25-Jul		PO.5, PO.6	I would like to see a tidier village brook it is very untidy most of the year and a speed restriction on all traffic would be advantageous	The Parish Council encourage those properties that front on to the brook to keep the edges tidy. There have also been working parties to help. Speed restriction already covered.
151	32	25-Jul			A MOBILE PHONE MAST greatly needed please.	Agrees with statements in the NP. We will add more about this in the main body of the plan as it is mentioned quite often.

Comment Form Responses

	A	C	D	E	F	G
1	Response #	Date	Main or Summary	Page / Paragraph	Comment	ONPSG Response
152	33	25-Jul		PO.1	New housing should have a covenant to be lived in or purchased by local people and not allowed to be rented out as holiday lets which are preventing young or older people having access to permanent housing.	See comment above on 'St Ives model'
153	33	25-Jul		PO.2	Agree	Agrees with statements in the NP.
154	33	25-Jul		PO.3	Agree	Agrees with statements in the NP.
155	33	25-Jul		PO.4	Agree	Agrees with statements in the NP.
156	33	25-Jul		PO.5	This is probably impossible to do - Ladram Bay have a right to expect vehicles to access their property as does any other property owner or renter.	Noted. The NP is trying to improve the situation with Traffic Management.
157	33	25-Jul		PO.6	Agree	Agrees with statements in the NP.
158	33	25-Jul		PO.7	Agree	Agrees with statements in the NP.
159	33	25-Jul			The plan is very very good & the people involved in producing it deserve many congratulations.	Thanks!
160	34	26-Jul		PO.5 5.4.6	Thank you for an excellent piece of work. I have nothing to add. As a resident of Fore Street, <u>a</u> ll other aspects of the Plan are subordinate to traffic issues - which are significantly detrimental to our quality of life here. That said, we recognise the difficulties of changing things so long as the interests of Ladram Bay prevail. I am not hopeful/optimistic of any change soon!	Thanks! Agrees with statements in the NP.
161	35	26-Jul	M	p98	Our NP should support any planning application for a mobile Phone mast: this should have a caveat that the Code of Best Practice on Mobile Network Development in England will be adhered to, public safety in respect of non-ionizing radiation emissions will be taken into account, a site specific community consultation will take place and the community kept informed at all levels of development process.	Covered in Appendix H - extended wording in main plan to follow. The Parish Council are still working with others to have a mobile phone mast for the village of Otterton.

Comment Form Responses

	A	C	D	E	F	G
1	Response #	Date	Main or Summary	Page / Paragraph	Comment	ONPSG Response
162	35	26-Jul	S	ONP8	Stantyway recreation field. Site assessments are already underway for location of a mobile Phone mast in this local green space (Otterton PC minutes 13/05/2019) and one can't help ask if all other possibilities have been exhausted before giving up this recreation area to telecommunications development? More transparency please.	Recreation area won't be 'given up'. NP supports mobile signal improvement - detail is for Otterton Parish Council to determine.
163	35	26-Jul	S	ONP7	Traffic and travel around the parish: Increased traffic pressures on Otterton bridge are making it less and less safe for pedestrians, at peak times dangerous - size of vehicles reduces pedestrian space - buses, HGVs, Hiluxs, 4x4s, tractors, vans, caravans, camper vans - People are having to cling to the sides of the bridge to avoid traffic. The only real solution is a pedestrian walkway / footbridge to provide safe access to the river for visitors and locals .	This is a useful observation and we will extend the wording to cover the safety aspect.
164	35	26-Jul	M	p59 #6		No comment to make.
165	35	26-Jul	M	6	Overall aims: support and encourage the reduction of pollution ... Plastic free initiatives e.g. plastic free churchyard.	Agrees with statements in the NP.
166	36	26-Jul			We totally agree with your draft of the neighbourhood plan and thank you all for the huge amount of time and effort you have given to its preparation! Traffic & Travel (Policy ONP7) situation worsens daily!!	Thank you! Traffic is on the minds of many residents.
167	37	28-Jul			It's very comprehensive and informative report providing the inhabitants Otterton with a wonderful opportunity to say how our village should be developed and protected in the years to come. Well done and thank you!	Thank you!

Comment Form Responses

	A	C	D	E	F	G
1	Response #	Date	Main or Summary	Page / Paragraph	Comment	ONPSG Response
168	37	28-Jul		PO.1	Otterton should not see itself as a case apart and if residential housing is required then it should as a priority be affordable, primarily to allow the next generation of local families to continue living within the village should they so choose, and sustainable and built in a manner that is sympathetic to its surroundings. Given that the 'North Star' site that's been approved it is essential that any future development plans are transparent and are capable of robust scrutiny.	The majority of residents in the 2017 questionnaire did not want further housing in the village and as Otterton has been classified as 'unsustainable' in housing terms, then beyond the building of the North Star development, nothing else is required. However, should any future development be imposed, then scrutiny is indeed, essential.
169	37	28-Jul		PO.2, PO.3, ONP1	It is important that the inhabitants of Otterton, residential and commercial, individually and collectively, present and future see themselves as temporary custodians of the village with a responsibility to hand over their 'share' of the village to future generations in a manner that has protected and hopefully enhanced the natural and physical environment. That said protection of the 'status quo' and the NIMBY attitudes that might understandably prevail will need to acknowledge that not all change is bad and due to demographic, social or economic reasons certain changes are required.	PO.2 and PO.3 ONP1 acknowledge that there could be change, but in creating that change, there needs to be certain safeguards that help protect or enhance the very environment that residents have chosen to live in. We agree the general principle.
170	37	28-Jul		PO.4	As it becomes such an important part of their everyday lives, evermore so given working from home will inevitably increase then it is essential that Otterton has first rate Internet access that supports both the individual businesses and the local economy but also allows family and friends to stay in touch whatever time of day and wherever they live.	Agrees with statements in the NP.

Comment Form Responses

	A	C	D	E	F	G
1	Response #	Date	Main or Summary	Page / Paragraph	Comment	ONPSG Response
171	37	28-Jul		PO.5	Ladram Bay. Where does it stop? It's very easy to be totally negative about Ladram Bay from an Otterton inhabitant perspective unless of course you use it, are an employee of it or own a caravan or chalet on the site. Ladram Bay contributes to community initiatives and that should be welcomed however any further development should be resisted as to allow it will simply exacerbate what is already a chronic traffic situation. The fact that scant attention would appear to be paid to planning regulations means that trust has long gone.	Agrees with statements in the NP. Ladram is an important business to the locality and it is not going away. Development does not necessarily mean expansion. Developments that LBHP would like to make, could happen within the boundaries of the site, providing all the conditions for the ONP and local planning documents are met. We are very mindful of all the views that have been expressed.
172	37	28-Jul		PO.6	The authorities should take heed of the considerations of the inhabitants of Otterton in relation to traffic concerns and if there is overwhelming support for traffic calming measures then a further push should be made to introduce a 20 mph limit. Given the existence of a primary school, an elderly population, businesses and residential properties situated immediately next to a busy road being frequented by increasingly large and powerful vehicles the case it seems is compelling and should be pursued.	Agrees with statements in the NP. Claire Wright, in conjunction with Otterton Parish Council, is still pursuing the 20mph limit for the village.
173	38	28-Jul	M & S		Well presented report with lots of information and backup to the proposals for objectives and policies.	Thank you!
174	38	28-Jul		6.2	"Conserve" should not prevent positive changes.	Agreed.
175	38	28-Jul		6.5	Diversification of farming is essential for economic and environmental purposes. This should be encouraged within the need to avoid/prevent detrimental impact.	Agrees with statements in the NP.
176	38	28-Jul			What are the established site boundaries. Needs to be defined to avoid bending the concept.	Agreed. Will try to get map from EDDC.
177	39	28-Jul	M	p33	Why does the proposed coastal protection area not include the land to the north of the playing field to the ????? Of the developed area.	CPA is designated by EDDC. Map has been replaced, as it was not sufficiently specific for this section.
178	39	28-Jul	M	p45	Delete first word of PO.5 and insert ban,	Not possible.
179	39	28-Jul	M	ONP5 p49	No development should be allowed at all on or near the cliff edge.	Covered in EDDC policies - when applied.

Comment Form Responses

	A	C	D	E	F	G
1	Response #	Date	Main or Summary	Page / Paragraph	Comment	ONPSG Response
180	39	28-Jul	M	p57	Phone signal now much improved - no mast required save in church tower if necessary.	Signal is not improved everywhere in village. Parish Council is still exploring a possible site for a phone mast to ensure good even coverage, which is what many residents and businesses have requested.
181	40	<not given>			Have you made an enquiry with the council on how CIL money will be agreed with forum.	OPC Parish Meeting to discuss.