Detail comments - EBPC

East Budleigh Comment	ONPSG Response
Summary and Chapter 6	
* Policy ONP6...Review the language of commitments such as 'No new development will be permitted...' (also 2.7) and 'Development will only be permitted...' in the light of EDDC have the ultimate decision. PCs can only make recommendations to support (or not) a Planning Application. Similarly 4.7 *re* Ladrum Bay: 'any Planning Application would not be acceptable...' maybe better as 'would be strongly resisted'?	Policy has been amended.
* Policy ONP7...The EBBPC would support proposals aiming to link pathways that connect the parishes.	Noted.
Main Document	
* 2.4...It would be useful to indicate the % return from the adult questionnaire.	Noted.
* 2.7...Maybe worth emphasising that solar panels/turbines would need to conform to the major principal in avoiding unsightly appendages (Appendix E 9.2). Ground heat pump system is an alternative, mentioned in PO1 and Appendix D so could be mentioned here.	Noted.
* 3.1...In order to balance the pros/cons of having Ladrum Bay site in the parish, it may be worth mentioning LB management have been supportive of projects in the village (i.e. bring forward comment in 4.7?).	Already mentioned.
* 4.2.1...The proposed North Star development is an important issue for the parish (certainly the most important in terms of residential development), in that it would provide (in its present form) 10 affordable houses. The NP finishes the discussion with the comment that EDDC consider that the development has started. Since the approval date was November 2015 it would be desirable to get clarification as to what has happened in the intervening period i.e. is the development going ahead or not? Written confirmation from EDDC would be helpful?	We will contact the developer to seek clarification.
* 4.4.6...Reference is made to the LORP without a succinct explanation of the project which would be appreciated by the reader. If it goes ahead this would be a major project within the parish, not least significantly affecting South Farm Road.	We will add wording to recognise the potential impact on residents and businesses at South Farm.
* Page 27... 6...'4H'	Corrected.
* 4.4.4...Flooding problems are identified but it is surprising that no plans are put forward (a) to mitigate the extent of flooding and (b) to have/improve a flood warning system for potentially affected parishioners.	This is a joint responsibility between OPC and the Environment Agency.
* Page 38...% increases in traffic need recalculating or maybe better to report as ca 2.5 fold and ca 3 fold increase. Also the two traffic surveys (also Page 40) do not make much sense if the reader does not know the locations of the surveys. A map in the Appendix showing these locations would be helpful.	ONP amended.
* 4.8...(Lack of) returns from a recent questionnaire in EB regarding an improved bus service showed parishioners had little appetite to have an improved bus service in the evening (also Appendix E1).	Noted.
* Appendix E1...EBBPC also raised the possibility of converting the old railway track into a cycle way but CDE dismissed the proposal as impractical.	Noted.
* Appendix E3.3...Maybe an Action for OPC to encourage spare garage space to be let out to other residents e.g. PC to act as hub for connections.	Noted.
* Appendix E6.2...clearly the Church is important in the village (39 active participants; bell ringing etc.) hence it is surprising that no reference is made to the Church in the main text and how the Raleigh Mission Community may evolve (maybe Rev. Martin could contribute?).	Noted.
Similarly, the School is a key feature in the village yet there is virtually no mention of it and its activities in the main text. Surprisingly future plans to collaborate with other schools (Link Trust) is not detailed (maybe the School could contribute some paragraphs).	Children's views acquired via a specific questionnaire in 2017.
* Appendix E6.3...Throughout the doc. the desirability of forming a youth group or constructing a skate park is mentioned. However there is no 'Plan' put forward as to how one, other or both might be achieved e.g. PC to seek funding from xxxx.	This is defined in the plan as a Community Action, to be set up as a separate project under OPC auspices.
* Appendix E...Employment status table...The table is confusing e.g. what are the differences between the categories 'Employed outside parish' (4persons), 'Full time employed outside parish' (1) and 'Full time outside parish' (3)?	With hindsight we agree, but this is how the questionnaire was phrased.
* Pages 107-134...It is likely most readers would consider these 27 pages (ca 15% of the whole doc.) as excessive. For sure the detail obscures the main points that the Plan wishes to put forward. It would be helpful to restrict to 10 pages max.	Appendices will be hived off as a separate document for those who need to refer to the detail.
* Appendix J...List of Sites...there seems to be unnecessary duplication in 'name' and 'location'.	This is how the listing is presented on the Historic England website.
General	
* The Policies are collected together in Chapter 6. It may be better also to put each Policy into the relevant section in Chapter 4 e.g. Policy ONP6 at the end of 4.7.	We prefer our layout.
* 'Plans' are put forward in the Appendices; it be worth considering putting these 'Plans' into the main text.	Unclear what plans are being referred to here?
* The ONP has 'Aims' and 'Policies' but no 'Actions' to enact the Policies and to move towards achieving the Aims e.g. OPC to investigate getting better mobile and/or broadband coverage?	NPs are reactive in that they are used in responding to development proposals.
* The NP will need an 'Equalities Impact Statement'.	Thank you for the tip - we are so far unaware of any need for this.