

Date	Name	Comments	Response/Action
02/05/18	Highways England	We are therefore satisfied that the proposed plan policies are unlikely to result in development which will impact on the SRN and we therefore have no specific comments to make. However, in general terms we welcome your objectives to improve footpaths, bus services and connectivity with Feniton station and thereby reduce reliance on the private car.	N/A
08/05/18	South West Water	Plan noted. No comments.	N/A
15/05/18	National Grid	[The identified high voltage] overhead powerline does not interact with any of the proposed development sites.	N/A
25/05/18	Environment Agency	We welcome the inclusion of a local green space policy (PNP6). Paragraph 3.45 acknowledges the recreational, amenity and wildlife benefits provided by green infrastructure. It should also be noted that these areas and networks also provide benefits in terms of flood risk management and protecting water quality. It would be good if the plan acknowledged this. We also welcome the plan's commitment to encourage environmentally friendly technologies. However, other than this the plan contains no objectives or policies relating to the natural environment. It should be noted that some parts of the parish, including parts of Payhembury village are at risk of flooding both from rivers and surface waters. In addition the watercourses in the parish are presently only considered to meet Moderate Ecological Status. The failing elements relate to phosphate and macrophytes/phytobenthos, both of which indicate high nutrient levels in the water which are derived agriculture but also foul drainage discharges. Nonetheless, we recognise that the policies contained within the adopted East Devon Local Plan may be sufficient to address these issue within the Payhembury parish.	Wording amended to acknowledge these points
06/06/18	Natural England	Welcome the Payhembury Neighbourhood Plan and we have no comments to make.	N/A
08/06/18	East Devon District Council (See attached file for full feedback)	P3.13 reference to the Lymptone NP setting a precedent for the reintroduction of BUAB's is not strong justification for the same approach at Payhembury. Lymptone was included as a 'Strategy 27' settlement at the time due to offering a range of accessible services and facilities. This justification for a BUAB does not apply to Payhembury.	The Lymptone NP is not the only piece of evidence to justify marking a boundary. Paragraph reworded to address the comment.
EDDC cont.		P3.15 District, rather than County Council	Correct as suggested
EDDC cont.		P3.18 We would still be more comfortable if the [central farm buildings] were excluded. 3.18 does not accurately reflect the range of points discussed on the visit.	Boundary redrawn to exclude the farm barns and yard. However, we believe the site has the potential for the small scale development intended by PNP1 and would hope the development could proceed under the EDDC exception policy for sites adjacent to a village boundary, using the safeguards on scale and retaining employment within that.
EDDC cont.		P3.16/P3.24 We suggest a red line around Payhembury, demarcated "Payhembury Settlement Boundary" and the hamlets shown in blue are called "Hamlet Boundaries" or similar. Also, we would prefer the text to be reordered so that the Hamlet Boundaries and supporting text appear after PNP1 but before PNP2, so that they can be clearly read in context.	Reworded and text reordered as suggested.
EDDC cont.		P3.23 The BUAB criteria outlined in para.3.15 has not been applied consistently in identifying the Hamlet boundaries. None of the hamlets contain facilities and as such we do not consider that justification is provided as to how development in the identified hamlets will promote the objectives of sustainable development.	Hamlet boundaries redrawn to just include houses and domestic gardens. Given the strict criteria on PNP2, we believe there will be very few developments associated with the policy and so expansion of the
EDDC cont.		P3.27 We suggest inclusion of a table detailing ranges as per the table included in the Nationally Described Space Standards to establish acceptable floor space for 1, 2 and 3 bedroom homes to support Policy PNP1.	Table added as suggested.

EDDC cont.	PNP1 There is no reference in this Policy to the existing employment buildings in the centre of the village. If they were marketed for a year in line with PNP4 and then redeveloped (for 30-40 houses?) there would be a very significant impact on the character of the village. Furthermore, this Plan was screened on the basis that only a very small number of infill plots were likely, a large development would have resulted in a need for HRA and SEA. The current plan structure and absence of specific policy relating to the central farm and employment areas may require a rescreening of the plan for HRA and SEA.	See response to P3.18. This central farm yard/barns has been excluded from the settlement boundary.
EDDC cont.	PNP2 We suggest the removal of the named hamlets outside of Payhembury Village for those reasons outlined in comment 5 [plus further changes to wording of the policy].	Removal of the hamlets would effectively remove this policy as the village is surrounded by land owned by a single land owner and plots of this type are highly unlikely to arise. Regarding the final point on onward sale, we query why viability of the legal obligation is questionable. Reworded to make this simpler and focus on onward sale to be affordable. Other rewording as suggested.
EDDC cont. EDDC cont.	PNP3 (R&D) should be written in full We do not feel that this provides enough protection to the existing employment uses in the centre of Payhembury Village, particularly the farm.	Expanded as suggested This comment is no longer relevant following exclusion of the farm building from the boundary.
EDDC cont.	P3.41 Mentions 'small-scale' but not defined or repeated in the policy.	'Small-scale' removed for consistency with the policy
EDDC cont.	General SHLAA - [correct to reference Villages Plan]	SHLAA references changes to Villages Plan as suggested.

No response was received from the following statutory consultees:

Broadhembury PC  
Awliscombe PC  
Buckerell PC  
Feniton PC  
Talatton PC  
Clyst Hydon PC  
Plymtree PC  
Voneus  
BT  
EE  
Three  
Western Power  
Devon County Council  
Coal Authority  
Homes and Communities Agency  
English Heritage  
Network Rail  
Marine Management Agency  
NHS  
Southwest Water  
Historic England

Date	Name	Comments	Response/Action
29/04/18	Parishioner	I think the plan is great. I particularly like the focus on affordable family housing, parking restrictions, renewables, improved pathways and protecting the playground.	N/A
30/05/18	Parishioner	The Colestocks settlement boundary includes the paddock/field attached to the Granary, part of Colestocks Farm conversion. This was agricultural field prior to the conversion and has remained so designated. I feel the boundary should be the edge of the garden area.	Boundaries to all the hamlets redrawn to only include houses and domestic gardens
06/06/18	Parishioner/Small business	Suggestion to the neighbourhood plan is on advice given at a meeting this morning with a planning officer. POLICY PNP2 - Single plot exceptions schemes for locally-tied affordable self-build homes will be supported on sites .... , Upton (Fig 7), <b>and renovations or extension to existing unused buildings outside of the settlements</b> , where each of the supporting policy criteria are met... . This offers an alternative to Qb permitted development, which tends to be developer led and thus outside the reach of many locals in need.	We don't believe the proposed amendment will have any impact. People meeting the criteria in PNP2 could already use existing buildings under PDQ applications.