

Park and ride: The existing park and ride should not be removed and replaced. The proposed new P&R would affect the valley park and is therefore an unsustainable proposal. The P&R proposal needs to be considered in light of other P&R being made for this area of Exeter and the need for an additional P&R is not demonstrated as part of a sustainable traffic plan.

Sustainability: On the website you make claims to build sustainable housing – this should be more specific such as all houses will reach Code 6 and have appropriate renewable technology. Will you connect homes to the new district heating system which will be coming from the incinerator? This must be explored. Homes should also be of a proper size – based on the Parker-Boris standards with access to green spaces and gardens, giving priority to people not cars.

Natural assets: The vision talks about celebrating the site's natural assets – therefore the ridge along Markham land and the westerly edges of the site should be protected on the Teignbridge side as this forms one of the hills that can be viewed from the city – key features. The Alphington development brief sets this out as a key issue. A clear green space including new woodland and fields should separate the developments and new woodland incorporated into the development. The site on the other side of Markham Lane should only be developed in keeping with the development brief set out in the Alphington Development brief agreed between the Council and local residents.

Creating community: The whole site should be developed as the 'Matford Village' with a clear village centre – rather than an urban extension to Exeter. The proposal has no focus – either to Exeter or Exminster – exacerbated by the plonking of a P&R in the middle of the development, which makes it feel like houses are based around a transport system that's taking people through or away from it (the A379 and P&R). With that many houses and a new community a centre and focus is needed to help bring people together. Like wise the shopping area and the school are oddly located – on the edge of the development.

Education: The schools are in a strange location. There needs to be clear agreement between DCC, ECC and the new Local Learning Trust on both the location of the schools and its integration into the school offer in Exeter and also in Teignbridge. The school position is unsuitable for pupils in Alphington.

Traffic: The notion that children can cross the A379 via pedestrian crossings twice a day is unsuitable. The A379 needs 1. Lower speed limit, 2. Reengineering to ensure slower speeds and 3. Needs bridges and underpasses to ensure safe passage for children and cyclists etc. The proposals require the downgrading of the A379. This must not lead to more traffic using Chudleigh Road through Alphington which suffers from pollution in Church Road (an AQMA monitoring point) and traffic damage to houses already along Church Road). Traffic through Alphington is already a significant problem – on which local people have campaigned for many years. The traffic issues need to be addressed before this development takes place (including 20mph limit and road reengineering). Buses need to ensure alternative traffic routes into Exeter other than through Alphington. Also early provision of a bus route and buses (as happened in Cranbrook) should be made to ensure that residents have early viable alternatives to driving. Dedicated cycle routes need to be created and joined up to existing routes into and across the city as well as across the development. The development should incorporate low car housing and car pools such as through Exeter Co-cars) and home zones to reduce car impact on the development. There are no proposals on the website which address these areas.

Community facilities: There needs to be clear proposal for community facilities including meeting rooms, and primary care facilities. Church, place of worship and playgrounds and allotments. Careful discussions need to take place with both Alphington and Exminster residents about what's available in existing locations, what additional resources would be needed in the new residential areas or enhancements to existing facilities if not.

Community consultation: Finally an exhibition and a one month timeframe for 'consultation' is not adequate or appropriate. Alphington residents have worked for months with the Council and land owners on preparing a brief for the developments in Alphington to be SPG. Exminster residents likewise have worked hard to prepare a community plan. You should not ride roughshod over the proposed development's neighbours. We, and they, will have to live for generations with the consequences of rushed through plans which build houses but don't create a real sense of place or community or provide the resources they need. Proper and full community engagement is required (in

Alphington and Exminster particularly) in order to really work through the constraints and opportunities for the site.

In the Bovis outline plans, infrastructure planning did not correspond with the Master plan map re school provision (putting a primary school or an all through school on the south side of the A379 with 3/4 pedestrian crossings across the A379 for all the children in E.C.C. dev and T.D.C. dev on the north side crossing this major route road twice a day to access schooling.)

Some of the CIL allocation must be allocated to Exeter to enable investment in Alphington infrastructure to cope with this increase in pressure on traffic, education, community and other resources.

The affordable and social homes must be built to a high standard and the affordable housing remain affordable in perpetuity. A Community Land Trust/ co-housing model should be actively considered – with part of this site made an exception site to enable this to happen.