

## Question 23 - Promoting accessibility by walking and cycling

Chapter 11 of the Issues and Options report sets out the issues for promoting sustainable transport. Question 23 sought views on how important you think it is that new development is sited so that it is within walking distance of services and facilities.

**Option 1** - Focus new development as small clusters of growth in locations within easy walking or cycling distance of existing services and facilities

**Option 2** - new development on a small number of growth areas where the large scale development will support the delivery of new accessible services and facilities

**Option 3** - A combination of 1 and 2

**Option 4** - Do not require facilities and services to be within walking distance of new development but require them to be available within the settlement

**Option 5** - None of the above

| Ref No            | Respondent                                    | Q23     | Question 23 Comment   |
|-------------------|---|---------|---|
| FS-Case-297785613 | Kim Sankey<br>Angel<br>Architecture<br>Ltd    | option3 | There are not enough safe cycling and walking areas, and where there are these are not lit. Perhaps a combination of cycle lanes on roads and bound gravel paths would enable walkers and cyclists to exist alongside each other without conflict.  |
| FS-Case-297949549 | Martin<br>Thurgood                            | option3 | BUT the key issue is the development of walking/cycling routes between existing settlements. The policy objective will ne be achieved by simply limiting positive changes to new developments.  |
| FS-Case-299861217 | Heath Nickels<br>Exmouth<br>Wildlife Group    | option3 | <p>This question goes back to a fundamental INITIAL policy decision for this Local Plan (i.e) using the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) to define the Future Housing Needs (Obj. 3 ) and thus developing a spatial strategy: Distribution of development (Chap. 13)</p> <p>Thus, "...new development can be designed to promote walking, cycling and public transport by incorporating attractive and easy to use routes within sites" has to reflect the distribution of development resulting from the HELAA and so Option 3 seems to summarise best the scenario</p> |
| FS-Case-300714787 | Blank - No<br>Name                            | option5 | <p>All are not optimal. Option 2 is the worst.</p> <p>It feels as if I am being led to support what is already being preferred...hope I am wrong.</p> <p>Walking/cycling is important. However there are never enough facilities e.g. doctor surgeries and dentists, libraries, community centres, advice etc. Large developments will always create traffic. Long distance cycle lanes and priority measures are needed.</p>   |
| FS-Case-300872971 | Ian Wasson                                    | option3 | Walking is important but this must be supported by footpaths on roads, so it is NOT necessary to walk on roads in and out of towns with no footpath. Exmouth Rd Budleigh is a good example, but resolved by removing the area west of Links Rd from the BUAB to open countryside.   |
| FS-Case-301179421 | Mark<br>HUMPHRIES                             | option1 | no development where there is not an existing public transport infrastructure that can cope with the additional development. Too much development is in inappropriate locations with poor roads/narrow lanes not suitable for the existing developments   |
| FS-Case-301424628 | ERIC BOWMAN                                   | option1 | <p>THIS IS A NO BRAINER.....</p> <p>I WOULD LIKE TO SEE ALL SORTS OF CYCLING MACHINES BEING UTILISED EG POWER ASSISTED 3 WHEELERS TO CARRY PASSENGERS - COULD E A CLEAN OPTION BUSINESS OPPORTUNITY.</p> <p>WALKING WITH REST AREAS / CAFES - AGAIN ANOTHER BUSINESS OPPORTUNITY</p>  |
| FS-Case-302912562 | Paul Gamble                                   | option4 | <p>Small developments where access by foot and cycle to recognised services/facilities in rural villages should be supported e.g. a minimum of four of the following recognised services: School, Village hall, Public transport, Pub, Shop/post office, Doctors surgery, Place of worship, Sports fields.</p> <p>Priority could be given to villages that have access to public transport within the suggested approx 800m comfortable walking distance, which has routes to larger towns and cities to access larger facilities and services.</p>   |
| FS-Case-302971165 | Richard<br>Thurlow Sid<br>Vale<br>Association | option3 | Accessibility by foot or cycle is important   |

| Ref No            | Respondent               | Q23     | Question 23 Comment  |
|-------------------|--------------------------|---------|--|
| FS-Case-305076755 | Jeff Powley              | option1 | Why combine walking and cycling, it has become very dangerous to walk in many areas due to the preference given to cyclists and this is discouraging walking - the Exe estuary trail being an example of this and the routing of the cycle lane along the seafront in Exmouth. Cycling and walking needs to be completely separated in this local plan.  |
| FS-Case-305122809 | Mike Green               | option3 | If you want our need a new town or city it should be based on a cluster of cells or villages that have a green belt between them - give people a sense of place and feeling of belonging   |
| FS-Case-306256851 | Simon Rennie             |         | no comment see objective 10 section 12 questions   |
| FS-Case-306274820 | Olivia Cooper            | option5 | I'd support a mix of option 1 and 2, but this isn't always possible or realistic and can divert money into ridiculous cycling pathways (as has been seen in Exeter) where the money could have been better spent on supporting local businesses and public transport. In a rural area car use will always be essential, so encourage more environmentally friendly vehicle options rather than insisting everyone walk or cycle within towns.  |
| FS-Case-306915743 | Catherine Kingham        | option3 | Walking and cycling amongst people living in villages and small towns has increased dramatically during the past year, due to people discovering the joys of not always having to take a car! One good thing brought about due to the Pandemic. I think that we should be encouraging people to cycle/walk locally, increasing their wellbeing and good health, purchasing their food locally (say, from farm shops etc.) and live more sustainably.   |
| FS-Case-307126895 | Daren Richards           | option5 | It is not practical to try and reduce transport Evey one needs transport to go from a to b so trying to reduce transport would not work as I'm sure you drove to work today like everyone else does  |
| FS-Case-307482014 | G. Millard               | option3 | There does'nt appear to be any 'linked up' planning . . . e.g. Existing services & facilities cannot seem to cope with any influx of new developments. Further development should only be started AFTER services have been provided and have sufficient capacity . . . not 'promises' that they will be provided at a later date.  |
| FS-Case-307683611 | Dan Lakeman              | option5 | Don't build  |
| FS-Case-307991316 | Susan Cooper             | option5 | Options 1 and 2 where it relates to the West End and Cranbrook, existing towns and to the creation of New Towns and 'garden' village(s). This should not include villages in the AONB.<br><br>Walking and cycling is extremely important but villages will never have the level of facilities/bus services required to prevent frequent car journeys. People travel on a regular basis and very frequently to workplaces, banks, cash points, post offices, chemists, libraries, medical facilities, vets for larger food shops and fresh food providers (even when they have a small community shop), to access a wider range of shops to get items small community shops cannot provide.<br>Only towns and newly built settlements are of a size likely to have these facilities. The level of growth needed in a small settlement of less than a 1500 people would be so large it would be environmentally unacceptable particularly in the AONB. In fact development in these settlements would generate even more car journeys. |
| FS-Case-308052405 | Derek Fish               | option3 | Ensure a sensible balance between the two options and not allow a predominance of option two to result.  |
| FS-Case-308071816 | Gillian Cameron-Webb n/r | option1 | I might have selected option 2 but it depends where the large scale of development is located. My overall desire would be to keep villages as villages so Option 2 would not be desirable in those locations but would be desirable in large developments like Cranbrook. Those sort of large developments should be self sustaining, they must have their facilities and services built into them rather than creating dormitory towns where residents have to travel to outside facilities.  |
| FS-Case-308072238 | Robert Cooper            | option1 | I was a cyclist and a runner for most of my active life. I also used to teach Bikeability when I lived in Surrey. Since moving to East Devon I would not venture on the roads on a bike as I do not yet have a death wish. The roads are far too dangerous. There is no provision for cycling on the roads. I have witnessed some council meetings when councillors have ridiculed the thought of consideration towards cyclists. The councillors were old, overweight and probably could not get on a bike if they wanted   |

| Ref No            | Respondent  | Q23     | Question 23 Comment   |
|-------------------|---|---------|---|
|                   |   |         | to. Devon could be a mecca for cycling with the right approach sadly cycling and walking is simply not promoted or encouraged.  |
| FS-Case-308168070 | Norman Reeder   | option4 | Encouraging access by foot/cycle may be appropriate to the younger generations, however some areas (e.g. Sidmouth) have a very high concentration of elderly people for whom a car is essential as many are infirm or unable to walk more than a short distance   |
| FS-Case-308177703 | Judith Ferrier  | option5 | I am very much in favour of walking or public transport but NOT of increased cycling until either dedicated cycling lanes are built which MUST be used, or cyclists are taught to use the road properly, obey the rules of the road and MUST take out insurance and be penalised for not obeying - basically all this to ensure that they are not a danger to themselves or car users   |
| FS-Case-308210121 | Cariad Eccleston  | option3 | I'm not able to drive, so I rely on public transport to get me places. When public transport doesn't go where I need to be -- for a job interview, for example -- then I miss opportunities. Walking and cycling access is essential to me!   |
| FS-Case-308256653 | Della Cannings  | option3 | Not just about walking and cycling but also for wheelchair usage  |
| FS-Case-308288718 | Emily Davis   | option3 | People have not been using busses because they were told specifically not too. That isn't an indication of what's wanted, though. If I could get the bus to Sidmouth once an hour then i would go regularly. I have used the bus to Exeter less and less prior to COVID as the prices were increasing far too much.   |
| FS-Case-308324058 | Jack Slim   | option2 | See my remarks about the large scale housing developments on the periphery of Ottery St Mary above, Basic Service and facilities should be within the settlement.   |
| FS-Case-308326362 | Peter Eastwood N/A  | option3 | Better thought and consideration should be given where cycling and walkers at present have to co-exist. For e.g. the present arrangements for cyclists and walkers on the Exmouth sea front is unsatisfactory. Cyclists do not give way to pedestrians, as they should and often do not observe the 'No cycling' signs. Cyclists should be on the road and pedestrians on the pavements.<br>The sea front should be a one way system, cutting down the air pollution, noise and unsociability not to mention safety issues.   |
| FS-Case-308433805 | Kerry Carr  | option3 | Please also consider new cycle paths between towns& villages & the funding to support these. It has long been discussed having a route between Ottery & Sidmouth, that would be great. It would be fab to see a safe cycle network of cycle paths linking up East Devon.  |
| FS-Case-308520714 | Peter Brain   | option3 | As a recreational cyclist I appreciate the effort already put into existing trails and designated quieter roads. I support both 1 and 2.  |
| FS-Case-308527556 | Kevin Staddon   | option5 | See Q5  |
| FS-Case-308638086 | Robin Barker  | option2 | Option 2 is the closest - we want far better public transport and cycle routes. EG 3 trains an hour from Whimple to Exeter (not 1 every 2 hours). Circular walks. A safe cycle route from West Hill to Ottery - and so much more  |
| FS-Case-308655667 | Jan Gannaway<br>Exmouth<br>Wildlife Group<br>+ Active Travel<br>Exmouth | option3 | Where possible residential areas should be designed as low-traffic neighbourhoods so that all through traffic is discouraged. Evidence shows that LTN's in Waltham Forest resulted in significantly increased walking and cycling, use of local services and facilities and also resulted in 6% fewer cars registered and less crime. Electric cars, while useful in reducing air pollution, do not solve the problems of congestion or of pollution of rivers and marine environments from tyre and brake wear so we must work toward reducing the need for road travel. |
| FS-Case-308685349 | Carol Wheeler<br>Company<br>Name<br>(optional)                          | option4 | If someone is older, disabled or carer, or a parent, they need to take car to carry shopping, even if not a great distance because it is too heavy.   |
| FS-Case-308930499 | Lisa Bowman<br>Exmouth Town<br>Council                                  | option3 | One size does not fit all. Remote villages will have different options in respect of sustainable transport compared to urban areas.   |
| FS-Case-308982711 | Amy Roberts<br>Bell Cornwell  | option4 | Please see attached sheet.  |
| FS-Case-309216926 | Ivor Sims   | option5 | Stop wasting other peoples money. People want to use their cars - let them. Little bits of unconnected cycleways will never be joined up so what's the point.   |

| Ref No            | Respondent                                       | Q23     | Question 23 Comment  |
|-------------------|--|---------|--|
| FS-Case-309254127 | J Nickels  | option3 | Promote walking, cycling and public transport by incorporating attractive and easy to use routes within sites, as part of the application.   |
| FS-Case-309293778 | Paul Smith                                       | option3 | Whilst the existence of services and facilities within walking and cycling distance can be desirable, the rise of internet shopping/home delivery service has been embraced by many young busy working families, and members of the older generation with limited mobility.<br>Routes for walking and cycling primarily provide safe/beneficial options for leisure, healthcare and well being, and inter connectivity with adjoining communities or modes of transport to places of employment, as alternatives to vehicular transport..  |
| FS-Case-309401093 | Philip Jordan                                    | option3 | I know this is very personal and possibly caused by Corvid, but we have got rid of a car and now do our shopping in the local town by cycling. Also the local council is actively trying to develop cycle paths or 'green' lanes which I think is a excellent idea.  |
| FS-Case-309414876 | Ross Hussey                                      | option3 | I think reduction in car use is a worthwhile objective, even if cars are no longer powered by fossil fuels, because traffic levels and congestion affect quality of life and are worth reducing in their own right. We should avoid repetition of new development which is difficult to access without a car (such as the Liverton Business Park extension in Exmouth).  |
| FS-Case-309425268 | Pamela Dean                                      | option3 | New services to include safe crossing of major roads with traffic calming or pedestrian lights.  |
| FS-Case-309456508 | Ian Birch  | option4 | Given the elderly profile of the East Devon population, I think this objective will be harder to meet than elsewhere - many won't be up for cycling in narrow lanes with no dedicated cycle lane. May be better to focus on improving public transport, particularly more frequent bus services in rural areas. At present they are not usable (1hr frequency is too little).  |
| FS-Case-309478869 | Rosemary Birch                                   | option3 | I like walking and would be happy to walk to facilities for a small shop, or library visit, or doctor surgery. A large weekly shop would be impossible on foot, carrying bags. Likewiae if cycling. I don't cycle as roads are (before Covid19) too busy, windy and hilly. So unless ther are designated cycle paths well away from roads, I would not be encouraged to cycle. But new developments should have accessable, safe pathways into a village or town if they are on the outskirts. We have an example of a small housing development being built on the outskirts of our village. There is no footpath from the entrance to the site to the village for around 150m. Yet we have a school, a pub, a shop and a cafe that residents can walk to. From this site, they walk with their buggies and children into a narrow, quite busy road to then access the village! So I would say making safe provision for walking to existing facilities is essential! |
| FS-Case-309588076 | Carol Jay<br>Transition<br>Exmouth               | option3 | Walking and cycling routes to be combined with Green Corridors for wildlife , and extended into existing centres to replace the presumption that transport = personal cars.<br>This question goes back to a fundamental INITIAL policy decision for this Local Plan (i.e) using the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) to define the Future Housing Needs (Obj. 3 ) and thus developing a spatial strategy: Distribution of development (Chap. 13)<br>Thus, "...new development can be designed to promote walking, cycling and public transport by incorporating attractive and easy to use routes within sites"<br>has to reflect the distribution of development resulting from the HELAA and so Option 3 seems to summarise best the scenario   |
| FS-Case-309614514 | DAVE LEWIS                                       | option3 | We should also be forcing public transport providers to work together to meet transport needs and connect with other services and service providers.   |
| FS-Case-310194190 | WAYNE<br>SUMMERS                                 | option1 | build small developments locally by local need not in big clumps   |
| FS-Case-310214396 | Karan Bennett<br>Bishops Clyst<br>Parish Council | option3 | Planning should encourage multiple different approaches to meet local needs. It is also essential that local services and facilities are upgraded to cope before any development is approved, This includes traffic and the road network improvements.   |
| FS-Case-310327426 | Amy Roberts<br>Bell Cornwell<br>LLP              | option4 | East Devon is a rural district and opportunities to access developments by walking, cycling and public transport are going to be far more limited than in cities and urban areas. Opportunities will also vary across the district. This should not prevent good development sites coming forward. Future development management policies must reflect national planning policy and guidance, which is clear plan-making and policies should take into account that 'opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas' (NPPF para. 103) and 'sites to   |

| Ref No            | Respondent   | Q23     | Question 23 Comment   |
|-------------------|--|---------|---|
|                   |  |         | meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport' (NPPF para. 84).   |
| FS-Case-310675340 | Bec Davey<br>Axmouth<br>Parish Council             | option5 | The walking and cycling provision for the current village is inadequate and should be improved even before any possible future development should be considered.  |
| FS-Case-311300471 | David Gill   | option1 | But you have not provided any cycling lanes so far. Do that first.  |
| FS-Case-311663485 | Gordon Taylor                                      | option3 | Ensure a comprehensive risk assessment is carried out on cycling/walking pathways as most existing pathways are dangerous e.g. no demarkation or speed limits.  |
| FS-Case-311676977 | Rosalind Fox                                       | option3 | Walking, cycling and running are very important ways of keeping healthy, not only physically but mentally whilst driving to work can be very stressful as well as causing pollution so in an ideal world everybody would be able to commute on foot or bicycle. The downside of this is that if there are lots of other people driving or using public transport the traffic fumes may have a negative impact on health.  |
| FS-Case-311693209 | Jeremy<br>Woodward<br>Vision Group<br>for Sidmouth | option3 | <p>The Sid Valley NP asks for shared use paths for pedestrians and cyclists in new housing developments.</p> <p>Any such development should be accompanied by comprehensive plans on how to ensure that walking and cycling are the most common modes of transport.</p> <p>This could mean:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A realisation of low-traffic neighbourhoods – which should be carried out only with sensitive consultation with communities: <a href="https://tinyurl.com/ywvr76re">https://tinyurl.com/ywvr76re</a></li> <li>- The promotion of the 15-minute neighbourhood – because if walking and cycling are to become the norm, then services must be truly accessible: <a href="https://tinyurl.com/uzr675y5">https://tinyurl.com/uzr675y5</a></li> </ul> <p>These policy initiatives could also apply to development in established areas.</p> |
| FS-Case-311868155 | Martin Dowse                                       | option4 | Cycling and walking in rural and urban areas is a case of taking your life into your own hands. In other words dangerous. The roads are too old and narrow for pavements and cycle lanes. Hills are very prevalent. Look at the age demographics of East Devon. You will need monster amounts of cash to provide cycle routes and those that are proposed are never progressed. I for one do not look good in Lycra, have you seen some of the sights? The 23 million pound bridge over the M5 at Redhayes what is the real footfall in its use. You need a smart and efficient and affordable public transport network rather than pandering to the Sweaty Lycra Brigade. They pay no road fund licence, are not insured and can be very rude.   |
| FS-Case-312095051 | Terry Darrant                                      | option5 | Cycling and walking, as a leisure pursuit, have greatly increased in recent years and whilst the minority may wish to walk to the supermarket by far the majority use a motor vehicle to access their local superstore as few relish the idea of carrying heavy shopping over long distances. This is the reality of human behaviour and cannot be ignored with superfluous ideas of an ideal world where the car is redundant to orienteers and cyclists!  |
| FS-Case-312184112 | Linda Lowes<br>N/A                                 | option3 | We have a wealth of narrow country lanes and farm tracks, that are not safe to use because of the number of vehicles, particularly trade vans, that use them as short cuts and drive far too fast. Cars should be kept to main roads so that we can walk and cycle safely.  |
| FS-Case-312235817 | Amy Roberts<br>Bell Cornwell                       | option4 | East Devon is a rural district and opportunities to access developments by walking, cycling and public transport are going to be far more limited than in cities and urban areas. This should not prevent good development sites coming forward. Future development management policies must reflect national planning policy and guidance, which is clear that plan-making should take into account that 'opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas' (NPPF para. 103) and 'sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport' (NPPF para. 84).  |
| FS-Case-312251067 | Neal Jillings<br>Place Land Ltd                    | option3 | no comment  |
| FS-Case-312255566 | Stephen sadler                                     | option1 | Unfortunately, what local residents are finding is that developments created without car parking spaces 'as the new owners will be encouraged to walk and cycle' do not live up to this. The circumstances of the owner may change (no longer work locally  |

| Ref No            | Respondent                                   | Q23     | Question 23 Comment   |
|-------------------|--|---------|---|
|                   |  |         | after a job change) and we also find that the school run is still alive and includes parents from new housing developments even though they maybe under a mile to the school. Also if you want to encourage walking and cycling then in existing towns there will need to be improved roads (how are cyclists supposed to avoid all the pot holes) or cycle paths and pavements need to be made wider and cleaner (dog mess is on most high streets)  |
| FS-Case-312317917 | Steven Walton                                | option1 | Providing new developments are within the current major urban areas and do not become spread throughout the area  |
| FS-Case-312449388 | George Williams<br>Greenslade<br>Taylor Hunt | option1 | As covered earlier in this consultation response, there are a myriad of benefits of allowing smaller-scale development. As such, we object strongly to option 2. Sites within around 800 metres of village amenities should be considered, for the most part, as being walkable. Such sites should form the basis for the district's housing delivery. Accordingly, support should be given to option 1. The land at Woodbury offers a genuinely sustainable development option for the council, within easy walking distance of an array of services and amenities in the village. Furthermore, there is a local school and some employment opportunities within walking distance.   |
| FS-Case-312482944 | Peter Bowler<br>NA                           | option5 | Distances in the countryside are too great to promote other than recreational local walking and cycling. Cycling on these busy small roads is extremely dangerous and should not be promoted.   |
| FS-Case-312788353 | Rosemary Walker                              | option3 | Living in a rural area is difficult without a car. People need to be encouraged to buy electric cars. Cycling is dangerous in East Devon as there are few cycle paths and the main roads are busy.  |
| FS-Case-312793696 | Margaret Hall<br>West Hill Parish<br>Council | option3 | All types of disabled access should also be considered.   |
| FS-Case-312834131 | Robert Dunn                                  | option3 | Although most are able bodied enough to walk or cycle to a service or facility, not all can. But the default, most convenient and clearest route should be by these sustainable methods. As not all development will be possible with Option 1 I'm happy in principle with Option 2 as well, but the services and facilities need to be in place at the start, not the end. In the example of Cranbrook, the station was years late, so (pre COVID) many were in the habit of commuting by car; the town centre is still being discussed, and the other shops and facilities only opened many years after the first occupants moved in. These should be opened and available much earlier, linked in advance to the number of occupied properties.  |
| FS-Case-313155665 | Catherine Dandridge                          | option3 | Given nature of small villages in East Devon a combination of options 1 & 2 seem most realistic & achievable. It is essential to consider footpaths from housing estates that are able to accommodate both walkers & cyclists to ensure safe use thus encourage greater use.  |
| FS-Case-313233811 | Phil Golder                                  | option1 | Access via walking and cycling is definitely a concern. Not only should it be considered with regard to new developments, but facilities should also be improved in and around existing developments  |
| FS-Case-313343575 | Joanna Burkey                                | option1 | I think it is important that we reduce our need for the motor car and transport fuelled by fossil fuels as a whole, therefore it makes sense that all new developments where possible are built where people can either walk or cycle to facilities. If you build a lot of houses somewhere where the majority have to jump in the car to go anywhere, then the local road system gets completely clogged. The East Devon road infrastructure is not designed for high levels of traffic as the majority of roads are narrow and in a lot of areas single track. The road closure in Ottery St Mary this week highlighted this problem as the traffic from Kings School was using the narrow lanes around Taleford, Fairmile resulting in huge snarl ups. If we continue to build in areas where the traffic has to use these lanes, it is going to get unbearable. My 2 sons cycle from Feniton to Kings, I only started to allow this when they started 6th form as I think the roads between Feniton and Ottery are dangerous. |
| FS-Case-313428092 | John Cooper                                  | option5 | Options 1 and 2 where it relates to the West End and Cranbrook, existing towns and to the creation of New Towns and 'garden' village(s). This should not include villages in the AONB.  |

| Ref No            | Respondent  | Q23     | Question 23 Comment   |
|-------------------|---|---------|---|
|                   |   |         | Walking and cycling is extremely important but villages will never have the level of facilities/bus services required to prevent frequent car journeys.   |
|                   |   |         | Only towns and newly built settlements are of a size likely to have these facilities. The level of growth needed in a small settlement of less than a 1500 people would be so large it would be environmentally unacceptable particularly in the AONB. In fact development in these settlements would generate even more car journeys   |
| FS-Case-313468624 | Caroline Dartnall   | option3 | there needs to be a holistic view with all new developments to reduce car use, it will not be eradicated but if more people can walk/cycle this benefits everyone.  |
| FS-Case-313498279 | John Manser<br>CSG Councillor<br>(not views of the Council) | option3 | Access to facilitates should not be dependent on car use, however powered.  |
| FS-Case-313521454 | JOHN BROOKS   | option5 | My opinion is that if there is a genuine move to zero emission vehicles as there seems to be, I don't see a problem with maintaining car based access alongside walking and cycling. It seems to me to be often one or the other.   |
| FS-Case-313521692 | Louise Dean   | option3 | People need to stop using cars and walk ...if facilities shops and leisure were all in walking distance then more people would walk<br>It is a mis conception that everyone drives which can lead to residents feeling cut off or using on line deliveries rather than supporting local services within walking distance  |
| FS-Case-313542858 | Judith Heathcock  | option1 | Accessiility by walking and cycling are important but NOT TO SERVICE NEW DEVELOPMENTS!  |
| FS-Case-313560398 | Elaine Tant   | option3 | If we are going to encourage cycling we need dedicated cycle routes, not pavements with shared use which are dangerous.   |
| FS-Case-313613307 | Madeleine Blu   | option5 | The cycling and pedestrian pathways must be kept separate; the seafront is an example of the constant collision between the two. There should be pavements and cycle tracts everywhere that humans are. Some humans are fit and could cycle or walk to Exeter or further and back again. Others are elderly, frail or handicapped in some way, they could be pregnant or need wheelchairs. Wheelchairs, prams and push chairs have to be accommodated along with buses. Where it is not possible to put in cycle and pedestrian pathways large car parks should be available at train, airport and bus stations; Evergreen trees should be planted in them. We need places to walk the dog and places for cats. Cats are always being killed by cars. We need to protect children from cars. Cars are changing and moving to electric and they appear smaller. Medical experts recommend walking half an hour a day but not through car fumes! Walk or cycle near sea air and green spaces. |
| FS-Case-313672954 | Brian Ward  | option1 | Where facilities are provided for walking and cycling, they should be segregated.   |
| FS-Case-313678330 | june glennie  | option1 | combine exercise with shopping etc  |
| FS-Case-313694058 | Joseph Williams   | option3 | This is a critical concern. Reduced car dependence gives fewer cars on the road, fewer parked cars littering our neighbourhoods, more space for nature, lower carbon emissions, better mental and physical health, and so on.   |
| FS-Case-313698487 | Craig Daley   | option2 | As per previous response, I think that we should be working towards linking towns together through footpaths and cycle paths away from major traffic routes. This would put us in a world beating position, and open up so many areas to tourism and new spend  |
| FS-Case-313710620 | Jacqueline Cox  | option3 | prioritise policies that limit commuting  |
| FS-Case-313712377 | Susan Mackie  | option5 | think of the area attractive to those of a certain age. roads too dangerous to walk or cycle on i for example cannot get to a bus stop despite being 2 miles from Axminster 'too dangerous for bus to stop'.....to dangerous for me to get to a bus stop!!!!  |
| FS-Case-313718525 | Robert Maynard  | option2 | The Plan should promote Sustainable Transport by:<br>a) Reducing the need to travel, especially by private dwellings<br>b) Promoting the use of alternatives to car travel such as public transport, walking  |

| Ref No            | Respondent                               | Q23     | Question 23 Comment  |
|-------------------|--|---------|--|
|                   |  |         | and cycling<br>c) Guide new development to locations that can be served by a choice of transport modes<br>d) Avoid the dispersal of new development provision - in order to reduce the need to travel and maximise accessibility to facilities and services  |
| FS-Case-313771026 | John Connolly                            | option3 | Major new towns such as Cranbrook can design sustainable transport into their infrastructure. Locally this is much more difficult. For example almost any new development in Exmouth is on the town outskirts which are significant higher elevation than the town centre. Walking and cycling from Dinan Way to the train station is likely to appeal to very few as a daily routine - it is an hour walk (downhill - more coming home) and massively uphill return for cycling. Most residents of these new developments will simply drive.  |
| FS-Case-313780058 | Megan Lowe                               | option1 | Improve walking and cycling routes between settlements?  |
| FS-Case-313812606 | Richard Bates                            |         | Cycling along the A376 is highly risky because the local authorities are apparently in denial of the need to improve this road   |
| FS-Case-313840169 | Alan Hughes                              | option3 | It should be recognised that with the demographics of certain areas, e.g. Exmouth car travel is necessary because residents are unable to walk or use public transport because of a disability   |
| FS-Case-313846023 | Paul Garnham                             | option1 | For any large developments, the local infrastructure (including public transport) should be considered *before* any housing is approved and the services & facilities should be built at the same time as the housing. At the moment, the policy seems to be to build as many houses as possible first and only worry about local infrastructure afterwards.   |
| FS-Case-313857211 | Linda Johnson                            | option4 | Walking and cycling are preferable transport options however in rural areas unfortunately cycling is not seen as safe by many in our narrow country lanes and the hilly nature of the landscape is a challenge, this should not be a limiting factor in small scale village development. Again, these kind of questions have different answers for considering the difference between large developments close to Exeter and those in smaller towns and villages.  |
| FS-Case-313969913 | colin rundle                             | option3 | Charging points for electric bikes will be required on arterial cycle routes in the future.  |
| FS-Case-313997024 | Richard Holman                           | option4 | If cycling and walking can be encompassed that is a bonus but if not developments should not be disregarded or viewed badly because of it.   |
| FS-Case-314122774 | Roger Rowe<br>n/a                        | option3 | Co-ordinate walking and cycling plans with the EDDC Clyst Valley plan which is very detailed in this regard. Current access to Exeter from East Devon - walking and cycling - is currently very patchy. it could be massively improved as I have pointed out in my response to the Clyst Valley plan.  |
| FS-Case-314133727 | Ian Jewson<br>Walsingham<br>Planning Ltd | option5 | It is important that a range of scenarios are considered as part of the new local plan. New development proposals will have the opportunity to establish new access links and enhance existing routes.   |
| FS-Case-314221267 | Brian Lowing                             | option5 | Restore public transport which has been eroded over recent decades.  |
| FS-Case-314526176 | Terry Sneller<br>Dorset Council          |         | Access to facilities and services is an important factor when deciding where development should be focused. Focusing development on locations that have good access to facilities helps to reduce reliance on car travel which in turn minimises air pollution, congestion in these centres and reduces greenhouse gas emissions. Promotion of cycling and walking then enables healthy lifestyles through ease of access to active travel modes.<br>When considering suitable locations for development, it is important that settlements such as Lyme Regis, outside of the plan area are considered as these can often have a range of services and facilities that enable easy access to areas within the plan area. |
| FS-Case-314568421 | JILL SHELDON                             | option1 | In addition, and possibly even more importantly, it would be desirable to positively discourage use of cars. The question is though, just how do you do this? The revelation that many journeys are less than 2 miles is truly shocking. This also causes dangerous air pollution. It was very noticeable during the first COVID lockdown just how much fresher and cleaner the air had become.  |

| Ref No            | Respondent   | Q23     | Question 23 Comment  |
|-------------------|--|---------|--|
| FS-Case-314607825 | Mary Brooks  | option5 | If there is a genuine move to zero emission vehicles as there seems to be, I don't see a problem with maintaining car based access alongside walking and cycling.  |
| FS-Case-314622730 | Timothy Legg   | option1 | Just ensure that car use is minimised. Need two trains an hour Honiton to Exeter etc.  |
| FS-Case-314731257 | Fiona Lawson   | option5 | I think more cycle paths. Every new road should have one.<br>New cycle paths between Ottery at Mary and Sidmouth. Sidbury and sidford. Kilmington and Seaton. Off road paths built to encourage people to cycle away from traffic.   |
| FS-Case-314758581 | Peter Ball<br>Kilmington<br>Parish Council                 |         | Option 6 A mix of all of the above as different groups of residents (mobile affluent retired & reasonable income families; Elderly & low income without personal transport; tourist visitors; etc.) all have different requirements. Also different styles of developments (villages/towns) have varying requirements.<br>Electric Vehicles are quieter so pedestrians don't hear them coming. Speed limits within BUABs need to be reduced to 20mph or accident rates will likely increase and cyclists and pedestrians will not want to walk on roads.   |
| FS-Case-314782794 | Nicola Daniel  | option1 | Options 2,3,and 4 are unsustainable.   |
| FS-Case-314832307 | Anthony Carthy<br>James Carthy<br>and Company<br>Limited   | option5 | Emphasis should be on providing services and development usually brings additional services with it.   |
| FS-Case-314852216 | Jenny Ashmore  | option1 | But to be very sensitive to not building on any AONB areas, flood plains, and where there is an impact of the natural world to the detriment of the area.  |
| FS-Case-314877392 | Susan Mills  | option4 | Increase the walking distance to facilities from 800 meters to 2000 meters which would tie into the health and wellbeing policy.   |
| FS-Case-314894688 | John Colby   | option3 | Specially designated environmental areas should be protected   |
| FS-Case-314937410 | Eleonore Pang  | option4 | Definitely not options 4 and 5.  |
| FS-Case-315126013 | George<br>Williams<br>Greenslade<br>Taylor Hunt            | option1 | As covered earlier in this consultation response, there are a myriad of benefits of allowing smaller-scale development. As such, we object strongly to option 2. Sites within around 800 metres of village amenities should be considered, for the most part, as being walkable. Such sites should form the basis for the district's housing delivery. Accordingly, support should be given to option 1. The land at West Hill offers a genuinely sustainable development option for the council, within easy walking distance of an array of services and amenities in the village. Furthermore, there is a local school and some employment opportunities within walking distance. |
| FS-Case-315148483 | Sara Arthur  | option3 | If new developments cannot be sited within walking/cycling distance of existing services and facilities, then services etc should be provided within the development.  |
| FS-Case-315184341 | Richard Pratt  | option3 | For all the encouragement provided for walking and cycling, there are too many other factors affecting a person's decision as to whether they do so: fitness levels, time availability, distance to travel, children to drop off at school, weather conditions. This suggests that car use will still be prevalent wherever development takes place, so is this a realistic measure to determine site allocation? It should be factored in for local connectivity but you can't dictate where a person will work, or wish to shop or use other facilities.   |
| FS-Case-315216760 | Elizabeth<br>Campbell                                      | option3 | Local accessibility is essential. During lockdowns - particularly the 1st - people used cars much less and accessed local shops more. Public transport did suffer but probably because people were not going anywhere.<br>However, considerable amount of development is required in terms of building many more cycleways. As an example, the Estuary trail is so well used it becomes hazardous at times with so many cyclists and pedestrians competing for the space. If there is a genuine desire to increase cycling then more provision is required on the road network to separate cyclists from cars/lorries/vans/buses.  |
| FS-Case-315275424 | Rob Phillips<br>Broadhembury<br>Neighbourhood<br>Community | option5 | We have selected option 5 – this is not because we do not think access to services and facilities is not important. Instead, it is because: (1) We recognise that some people wish to live in a rural setting for their own wellbeing, or for the support of family or others they have a close connection with who reside in those places. (2) A greater recognition that online activity is rising in proportion to travel, and will   |

| Ref No            | Respondent   | Q23     | Question 23 Comment  |
|-------------------|--|---------|--|
|                   | Land Trust<br>(BNCLT)  |         | continue to do so. This, together with the delivery of goods to the door, reduces the extent to which travel is becoming important. (3) The travel that remains will be by ever increasing low carbon means – not just electric cars and bikes, but also by other upcoming means.  |
| FS-Case-315287680 | Jennifer Hiley-Payne N/A   | option3 | A compromise may be the best option  |
| FS-Case-315320410 | Richard Power<br>Diocese of Exeter                                 | option3 | Development should enable the rebuilding or resiting village schools to locations where the children are/live rather than relying on car journeys from centres of population out to local village schools (where they may be very few children).   |
| FS-Case-315449037 | Darren Roberts<br>East Devon District Council,<br>Central Planning | option3 | Mobility hubs can be used for both villages and towns- having space for cycle parking, car charging, bus dropping off and car sharing/ pooling. See <a href="https://como.org.uk/shared-mobility/mobility-hubs/what/">https://como.org.uk/shared-mobility/mobility-hubs/what/</a>  |
| FS-Case-315455012 | Rachel Hughes  | option3 | Electric charge points are essential. And there is a need for public transport - but it has to be sufficiently financed so that it is frequent enough and reliable.  |
| FS-Case-315476876 | Graham Long<br>Upottery Parish Council                             | option4 | Only allowing development where facilities already exist forces those that already have facilities to become growth hubs and prevents any development in parishes like Upottery which are considered unsustainable by the current Local Plan. The new plan must allow people choice to live where facilities and service are not available a walk or cycle ride away. If the current sustainability rules had been in place for the last 1,000 years our three villages of Upottery, Rawridge and Smeatharpe would not exist today, but they are and they must be allowed to develop and not stagnate. (Note: The growth in online home delivery services during the ongoing pandemic challenges the assumption that facilities and services need to be within walking/cycling distance of homes and Amazon's switch to all electric vehicles suggests that small van delivery need not increase carbon emissions)   |
| FS-Case-315516791 | Mary Truell<br>None  | option1 | Walking and cycling facility excellent but in small settlements, already built, eg village shops etc No new small or large settlements are needed outside towns. Building to facilitate any further accommodation must be from conversion or renovation or use of abandoned old build eg offices, shops within towns where easy access is already established.   |
| FS-Case-315539551 | Gary Parsons<br>Sport England                                      | option3 | Sport England encourages good design that should contribute positively to making places better for people, to create environments that make the active choice the easy and attractive choice for people and communities. The creation of healthy places, which promote and enable participation in sport and physical activity, requires the collaborative input of many different partners through many disciplines including planning, design, transport and health, along with developers working with local communities. Active Design is a key guidance document intended to help unify health, design and planning by promoting the right conditions and environments for individuals and communities to lead active and healthy lifestyles.   |
| FS-Case-315542900 | Joanna Boyce   | option1 | Walking and cycling on our roads is not safe.  |
| FS-Case-315550412 | Iain Fairbairn   | option3 | Residential developments should be linked to the provision of employment opportunities, preferably close by. We currently have a shortage, for instance, of high-quality offices/light industrial premises, which should be provided within a minimum radius (say one mile) of new housing.  |
| FS-Case-315622017 | Robert Martin<br>Clyst Honiton Parish Council                      | option5 | It is acknowledged that Cranbrook will be built out with the providing only limited facilities. This should not be repeated or expanded, as villages are already feeling overwhelmed. The whole exercise will have to be viable, but building large swathes of housing with facilities just for those houses (as in Cranbrook) does not improve lives anywhere else, and the increased traffic, pollution and noise has a seriously detrimental effect. Far better to build where the new facilities will provide benefit for current residents as well as those in the new houses.<br>There is a need for walking and cycling facilities whatever the situation is, especially with the expanding use of electric bikes and for healthy lifestyles.<br>The optimum is for facilities and services to be within walking or cycling distance, but still ok if it requires them to be available within or near the settlement involving short distance e-travel.<br>The use of low emission vehicles/electric cars and bikes will be necessary |

| Ref No            | Respondent   | Q23     | Question 23 Comment   |
|-------------------|--|---------|---|
| FS-Case-315678300 | George Williams<br>Greenslade<br>Taylor Hunt                           | option5 | Option 5 is preferable as the Council has not provided an option to support new housing in unison with employment development. Commuting to and from work results in more vehicle movements than to and from the shops for example. Providing mixed use developments means that there are genuine opportunities to live and work in close proximity, significantly cutting down the need to travel via private vehicle. The aforementioned site at Sowton not only offers this opportunity but is also closely related to other key services and benefits from means of sustainable transport.  |
| FS-Case-315678845 | Paul Hayward<br>Newton<br>Poppleford and<br>Harpford Parish<br>Council | option1 | The Parish Council dislikes the way this question was worded. What is "easy" to one resident is certainly "not easy" for another. Very subjective and allows for poor planning decisions if not quantifiable.   |
| FS-Case-315690761 | Naome<br>Glanville   |         | The reality is that any further development in East Devon towns will end up being on the outskirts of the town. If you live on a new development on the edge of Ottery St Mary, it is too far to carry heavy bags of shopping on foot or on a bike from Sainsburys in the centre of town. So pretty much all people going shopping will be using cars. Small country lanes mean that it is not always safe to cycle or walk as visibility is poor. We need better, more frequent public transport. Access to facilities relies not on where new developments are, but money being available to provide new facilities. eg Ottery St Mary GP surgery is already over-subscribed and I'm not aware of any new surgeries being planned. The RD&E is fast becoming the only hospital available - you have to get to it in a car. There are no new bus services in the pipeline. So the above options do not speak to the real situation. E. Devon's facilities and infrastructure are already insufficient, and can't take on more. |
| FS-Case-315697980 | Terrence<br>Blackler   | option3 | Many residents of East Devon are elderly for which cycling and lengthy walking are not options. They will increasingly rely on public or private transport. Policy should not dictate that East Devon residency is not an option for the elderly.   |
| FS-Case-315804855 | Sophie Minter  | option1 | By only building on existing brownfield sites, converting unused retail units, refurbishing upper storeys, adequate numbers of residential homes could be made easily within walking and cycling distance of amenities whilst at the same time supporting high streets and enhancing communities.   |
| FS-Case-315937332 | Fiona Anderson   | option3 | Our small towns and villages particularly along the coast suffer from bad air pollution from tourist cars in the summer and all year round from lorries. In light of the COVID pandemic making people less willing to use public transport and use their cars more, we must encourage people to start using public transport more. That won't be by running a bare bones service with old worn out buses (and worn out drivers!). Charge high parking fees in the hot spots like Sidmouth and have Hopper buses running from out town car parks. Sorry this should be in public transport I suppose!  |
| FS-Case-315939416 | linda aucott   | option1 | Disperse development is more sustainable in the long term and will protect existing communities and make a stronger East Devon community in the long term. Managed pace of growth will enable facilities to adapt on the basis of need.   |
| FS-Case-315947650 | Rosalind Rapley  | option1 | I think development should be within towns and villages on brown sites as much as possible and that people will continue to work from home where they can. So focus should be improvements for pedestrians and cyclists within those areas; better footpaths, better awareness of cyclists and perhaps shared space signage in towns, even giving priority to people rather than vehicles.  |
| FS-Case-315961800 | David & Mrs<br>Wendy Lewis   | option3 | We absolutely believe that accessibility by walking or cycling is a relevant issue.   |
| FS-Case-315963133 | George<br>Koopman  | option3 | As an example of poor planning control, the Hayne Farm development in Honiton(several hundred houses) can only accessed by a one way lane under a narrow railway bridge. How could this be allowed?   |
| FS-Case-315967632 | David Daniel   | option1 | The other options are unsustainable   |
| FS-Case-315972159 | Monica Bell  | option1 | Add in cycle paths from Tipton St John to local towns and villages (off road).  |
| FS-Case-315984133 | Daphne<br>CURRIER  | option3 | Some flexibility of approach will be required to make the most of what is available and possible.   |
| FS-Case-315991192 | Susan Clarke   |         | Just make provision for cars. People will always use cars. Cloud cuckoo land to think a mum of 2 or more will cycle to get the shopping.  |

| Ref No            | Respondent  | Q23     | Question 23 Comment   |
|-------------------|---|---------|---|
| FS-Case-316012231 | Terry Sweeney   | option3 | This is to accord with my preference for relatively small scale development in existing settlements, and the focus on new settlements.  |
| FS-Case-316023654 | lauren allan  |         | I would support a combination of option 2 and 4.<br>The car is here to stay albeit using electricity in the future.<br>The problem in Devon is the combination of walkers, cyclists, cars, lorries and farm vehicles on lanes with passing places.<br><br>Public money for public good may help provide the land needed for separation of the current road users and some extra hedgerow of a size that birds would actually nest in.   |
| FS-Case-316035390 | Daniel Lazar<br>Membury<br>Parish Council                                 | option5 | Mobile shops will reduce car use, and many people are now getting many goods delivered anyway. Going back to the days when a doctor used to set up at the village hall on a weekly or monthly basis would be great. Local schools should be preserved wherever possible.  |
| FS-Case-316036693 | Philip Wragg<br>none  | option3 | The proposed Cycle path and Footpath link between Sidford and Sidbury is long over due.<br>The Paris idea for the '15 minute city' is a great idea of the benefits of post Covid providing all local services within easy reach to minimise the need for car travel.  |
| FS-Case-316053199 | Ben Evans   | option1 | At present you seem to be allowing new developments in areas that are within easy walking or cycling distance of existing services and facilities but the existing infrastructure is so poor and sometimes downright dangerous, that people are not encouraged to use it.   |
| FS-Case-316056741 | Helene Jessop<br>RSPB   |         | The RSPB supports sustainable travel infrastructure provision to encourage and enable more journeys between home and work, local facilities and local greenspaces etc to be by walking or cycling, and public transport in preference to car use. We recommend that proposals for improvements to existing and development of new walking and cycling routes etc are subject to an appropriate level of ecological impact assessment to avoid adverse impacts on important sites for nature and priority species and habitats, and mitigation and compensation measures put in place where impacts cannot be avoided. |
| FS-Case-316091613 | Malcolm<br>Dicken Torbay<br>and South<br>Devon NHS<br>Foundation<br>Trust |         | In the summary Health has been excluded as an example of accessibility difficulties for those who do not own a car.<br>There will be many examples whereby the local population will have better access to a local shop or education facility than to their GP, Minor Injury Unit or local hospital.  |
| FS-Case-316135438 | George<br>Williams<br>Greensalde<br>Taylor Hunt                           | option2 | As covered earlier in this consultation response, there are a myriad of benefits of allowing smaller-scale development. As such, we object strongly to option 2.<br>The land at Down Close offers a genuinely sustainable development option for the Council, within easy walking distance of an array of services and amenities in the village. The Post Office, public house, place of worship, and Primary School and more are within reasonable walking distance of the land at Down Close.   |
| FS-Case-316136353 | Bill Horner<br>Historic<br>Environment<br>Team, Devon<br>County Council   |         | No comments   |
| FS-Case-316158325 | Paul Hayward<br>Personal View<br>only                                     | option3 | Again, something that has to be determined on a site-by-site basis. What is easy walking distance for one resident, is not for another. Always cautious of such blanket statements that inevitably get used to “prove” a policy down the line, much to everyone’s dismay  |
| FS-Case-316159794 | George<br>Williams<br>Greenslade<br>Taylor Hunt                           | option1 | Sites within around 800 metres of village amenities should be considered, for the most part, as being walkable. Such sites should form the basis for the district’s housing delivery. Accordingly, support should be given to option 1.<br>The land at Whimble offers a genuinely sustainable development option for the council, within easy walking distance of an array of services and amenities in the village. Furthermore, there is a local school and some employment opportunities within walking distance.  |
| FS-Case-316166919 | Sheila Dorsett  | option3 | Government are promising new buses!   |

| Ref No            | Respondent                                   | Q23     | Question 23 Comment  |
|-------------------|--|---------|--|
| FS-Case-316188495 | George Williams<br>Greenslade<br>Taylor Hunt | option1 | Sites within around 800 metres of village amenities should be considered, for the most part, as being walkable. Such sites should form the basis for the district's housing delivery. Accordingly, support should be given to option 1. The land at Offwell, Nr. Honiton offers genuinely sustainable development options for the Council, within easy walking distance of an array of services and amenities in the village. Furthermore, there is a local school and some employment opportunities within walking distance.  |
| FS-Case-316240170 | George Williams<br>Greenslade<br>Taylor Hunt | option1 | Sites within around 800 metres of village amenities should be considered, for the most part, as being walkable. Such sites should form the basis for the district's housing delivery. Accordingly, support should be given to option 1.<br>The land at Chardstock offers genuinely sustainable development options for the Council, within easy walking distance of an array of services and amenities in the village. Furthermore, there is a local school and some employment opportunities within walking distance.   |
| FS-Case-316333576 | Rosalind Leveridge                           | option1 | Walking and cycling are most important, but we should not need high levels of development in order to provide them. Provision should always be part of any new development.  |
| FS-Case-316334732 | K A Pearcey                                  | option4 | Accessibility by walking or cycling may be good for some but should not be exclusive as it may exclude some individuals  |
| FS-Case-324952647 | Lawrence Turner Boyer<br>Planning            | option3 | Please refer to submitted representations.   |
| FS-Case-324964822 | Sarah Jackson                                | option3 | Sadly, in isolation, neither of these are realistic. There is no "one size fits all" here. We must strive to see development that includes safe cycling and walking routes wherever possible, but between areas of habitation often the only routes available are not served by safe roads, footpaths and cycle paths, and in many cases too far to walk or cycle by road. In addition, the provision for public transport links is not a commercially viable option without subsidy. That said, wherever possible we should be requiring developments to deliver such things.<br>In addition, the Sports England guidance may not adequately consider the demographic of East Devon where much of our population are older and less physically able. In addition, we live in a very hilly part of the country with poor road surfacing, dangerous fast country roads and a lack of safe inter-town cycling and walking routes. Therefore, these distances may not be realistic. |
| FS-Case-324977684 | Simon Collier<br>Collier Planning            | option3 | No comments at this stage.   |
| FS-Case-324988465 | Simon Collier<br>Collier Planning            | option3 | No comments at this stage.   |
| FS-Case-324999075 | David Morgan<br>Not Applicable               | option4 | Please refer to submitted representations.   |
| FS-Case-325037488 | Ed Salter LDA<br>Design                      | option3 | Please see attached letter   |
| FS-Case-325041454 | East Devon and Tiverton & Honiton CLPs       | option3 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Ensure there is proper provision of cycle lanes and footpaths into towns and local facilities</li> <li>· We recognise there will always be the need for larger developments (more than 50 houses).</li> <li>· We think that up to 25% of new developments should be built on small sites.</li> </ul>  |
| FS-Case-325070883 | Emma Russell                                 | option3 | If we want people to walk and cycle more we need to provide toilets enroute, water fountains and employers setting up new facilities should be installing showers and drying facilities. If I cycle 10 miles to work in the rain I will need a shower and a place to change and dry off my cycling gear for the way home, As a woman I will need to feel safe on all walking and cycling facilities in both daylight and in the dark, In the summer I will need shade along the route.   |
| FS-Case-325077531 | I.G. Cann<br>Exmouth Civic Society           | option3 | Please see attached submission.  |
| FS-Case-325085151 | Matthew Kendrick Grass<br>Roots Planning     | option1 | See Separate Representations Document  |

| Ref No            | Respondent   | Q23     | Question 23 Comment   |
|-------------------|--|---------|---|
| FS-Case-325107229 | George Williams<br>Greenslade<br>Taylor Hunt                                   | option1 | Please refer to submitted representations.  |
| FS-Case-325124589 | Glynnis Poole<br>LiveWest  | option3 | Please refer to submitted representations.  |
| FS-Case-325156112 | Peter Dobbs  | option3 | Please refer to submitted representations.  |
| FS-Case-325170882 | Dorothy Taylor<br>Exmouth<br>Mental Health<br>St John's Court<br>Carers' Group | option1 | Please refer to submitted representations.  |
| FS-Case-325549089 | Ken Pearson<br>Stockland<br>Parish Council                                     | option3 | Active transport is part of the solution to reduce GHG's and keeping extra facilities close by to populations improves their uptake.  |
| FS-Case-325726521 | Simon Coles<br>Tetra Tech<br>Planning  | option3 | Under 3 above, the focus should be on directing most housing growth to main towns with existing transport connections such as Axminster, rather than relying on the delivery of new transport infrastructure which may impact on development viability and programme. |
| FS-Case-325731054 | Andrew Ardley<br>South Western<br>Railway                                      | option3 | Focus shouldn't just be on walking and cycling to minimize distance traveled - people will still need to travel for employment etc. and its really important this is done by focusing development on sustainable corridors such as railway lines.                     |
| FS-Case-325752618 | Stephen<br>Morgan-Hyland<br>Maddox<br>Planning                                 | option3 | Please see accompanying letter.   |
| FS-Case-325812938 | Nick Matthews<br>Savills   | option2 | See attached.   |
| FS-Case-325829612 | Dan Yeates<br>Savills  | option3 | Please refer to submitted representation.   |
| FS-Case-325831870 | Cem Kosaner<br>Lichfields  | option3 | N/A   |
| FS-Case-325838141 | Dan Yeates<br>Savills  | option3 | Please refer to submitted representations.  |