

APPENDIX C – ACTIVE INBOX EMAIL RESPONSES

Consultee	Category	Strand	You said	Key Points & Themes	Our Response
Exeter Trees UK	Community Group	Parks & Open Spaces	<p>I am interested to learn more of the future plans for our parks and green spaces. I already have several concerns around the future of our existing green spaces such as Bull Meadow park. If you are aware about this park - part of it will be sold to accommodate a new development (more flats) and 5 trees and many shrubs will go along with it.</p>	<p>Retain and enhance existing green spaces</p>	
			<p>We should be looking at buying more land for green spaces and parks and not selling it for profit at the loss of public benefit.</p>	<p>Provide more land for green spaces & parks</p>	
			<p>Trees play a vital role - anywhere - but we certainly need to ensure we are looking after our trees and planting new ones when mature ones are felled.</p> <p>Please keep me posted about the live consultation.</p>	<p>Preserve, maintain and plant new trees</p>	
Exeter Green Party (1)	Political Party	Built Leisure	<p>As the prospective Green Party candidates for Wonford, we are naturally interested in the proposals for the Wonford area, set out in the Council's draft Built Facilities, Playing Fields, Pitches, play areas parks and open spaces report.</p> <p>The detail of what is being proposed is perhaps inevitably rather sketchy and there are some things missing and /or unclear which hinder understanding the reality of what is being proposed. We therefore have a number of questions regarding what is being proposed which we hope you can answer in a timely way, ie to allow us to make our responses within the consultation period deadline.</p> <p>1. The proposal for a new Wonford centre means removing the existing Community Centre/Phoenix. This is naturally of concern, given the real shortage of meeting spaces for local people in the Wonford area. This leads us to ask:</p> <p>a. Can you explain what, if anything, will be offered to Wonford residents, to make up for this loss?</p> <p>b. Can you confirm whether Exeter City Council will be prepared to offer a Community Asset Transfer of some land, to enable the community to build a new community centre or similar building?</p> <p>c. The Report states (p13) that the new centre 'could' include : "Flexible community spaces linking indoor and outdoor spaces to promote healthy active lifestyles such as community kitchen, gardens and allotments. ". Could you clarify what this means please ie what a „community space“ means, what a 'community kitchen' means, and who you envisage would have ownership /management rights over these 'community' elements of the building?</p> <p>d. Do you mean that 'allotments and gardens' would be provided as part of the new Centre?</p> <p>2. Traffic and car parking. At the meeting of Wonford COGS, James Bogue mentioned that the working assumption at present was that the new centre would have car parking as part of it, as this linked to Sport England's criteria for allocating funding. People at the meeting were very clear that a large increase in people driving through Wonford's residential streets to reach a new „super centre“ was not an attractive option, particularly as there is no access road that is not a basic, residential road, heavily used by pedestrians and cyclists moving around their locality, as well as being on a well used bus, walking and cycling commuter through route, particularly for hospital and County Hall staff. Any such increase in traffic would work directly against not only quality of life ie having pleasant „living streets“, but would increase air pollution and road safety risks for local people. Those driving in would be almost entirely people from outside the area.</p> <p>a. Can you therefore please confirm whether or not a generous sized car park is part of the City Council's plan for this new Centre?</p>	<p>New Health & Wellbeing Hub (Wonford) Replacement for lost community centre facilities</p>	
				<p>New Health & Wellbeing Hub (Wonford) Community Asset Transfer to local communities to develop own facilities</p>	
				<p>New Health & Wellbeing Hub (Wonford) Increased congestion, parking issues and impact on air quality</p>	

APPENDIX C – ACTIVE INBOX EMAIL RESPONSES

Consultee	Category	Strand	You said	Key Points & Themes	Our Response
			<p>3. At the COGS meeting held to discuss the new centre, Dawn Rivers and James Bogue were keen to talk about the „wellness centre“ aspects, citing places like the Bromley by Bow centre. When asked, they confirmed that centres such as Bromley by Bow are run by charities or other not for profits with well established track records regarding their community, values driven stance. James Bogue further commented on the potential conflict between a traditional profit-driven company running such a centre, and the community, wellbeing aspects that people in the room were interested in. It is certainly hard to imagine a straight „down the line“ profit driven organisation having much truck with activities that don’t generate income.</p> <p>Can you clarify what the City Council is planning to do regarding the ownership and management of any new centre at Wonford? Who will it belong to, what kind of organisation will be considered to run it, (assuming that the council won’t be running it), and will the same company be chosen to run as will run the other two new centres?</p> <p>4. The Council’s decision making process on this Strategy. The council’s „consultation calendar“ says that the public will see “findings” in July 2019, but there is no further information about the decision-making timescale for the council, nor what these „findings“ refer to. Please can you clarify the Council’s decision-making timetable for this draft Report ie which committee(s) the final report will go, and what will be shared with the public in July?</p> <p>5. The report implies that the ambition for the new centres depends on receiving external funding from Sport England and other sources. We understand from meetings you held with some Wonford residents in recent months, that the City Council is proposing to put in a bid for these new facilities to Sport England in June or July 2019. Could please clarify/confirm the timetable for Exeter City Council’s submission of a funding bid to Sport England, towards the new proposed centres</p> <p>6. Alternatives to proposals in the draft Report. The draft Report, and Sport England’s prospectus for councils seeking funding for new built facilities, make much of the need to secure local buy in. Can you please clarify:</p> <p>a. Any plans to understand what people in Wonford think of the proposal to build a new Centre? (One consultation meeting was held at a Wonford COGS meeting, but we are assuming that this cannot represent the whole local consultation process)</p> <p>b. What alternative vision for sports facilities are being considered if Sport England funding is not forthcoming?</p> <p>c. If local people show that they do not want the new Centre, (for example, because of the implications of loss of community space and increased traffic in the area), will the City Council amend the proposed approach for Wonford?</p>	<p>New Health & Wellbeing Hub (Wonford) Ownership & management</p> <p>Consultation process and Council’s decision making policy</p> <p>Sport England Funding Timetable</p> <p>Alternatives to proposals in the draft Report.</p> <p>Future community consultation</p>	
<p>Exeter Green Party (2)</p>	<p>Political Party</p>	<p>Built Facilities</p>	<p>Dear Ms Yelland, We sent you a letter (8th April) asking for answers to some clarification questions arising from the draft Built Facilities, Playing Fields, Parks and Open Spaces draft Strategy. You replied, (April 10th): “Our policy is not to respond to further questions and requests for detail at this early stage of the consultation process but to gather all the feedback received and respond to common themes and issues in a final report back at the end of the process which will be placed on the Council website”</p> <p>Following a further request for a response to his own clarification questions, you replied by email to Cllr Musgrave, (April 10th) with answers to the questions in our letter, (we were not copied in) who forwarded them on to us. Thank you for replying, albeit not to us.</p> <p>We have three further questions arising from your email to us and the one sent to Cllr Musgrave.</p>		

APPENDIX C – ACTIVE INBOX EMAIL RESPONSES

Consultee	Category	Strand	You said	Key Points & Themes	Our Response
			<p>Question 1 With regard to your reply about having a policy to not respond to questions about detail (and by assumption, clarification of anything), please can you explain:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When and how that policy was agreed? • Where it is set out in writing? <p>Question 2 In our letter of 8th April, we asked you : “The proposal for a new Wonford centre means removing the existing Community Centre/Phoenix. This is naturally of concern, given the real shortage of meeting spaces for local people in the Wonford area. This leads us to ask:</p> <p>a. Can you explain what, if anything, will be offered to Wonford residents, to make up for this loss?</p> <p>In your reply to this question (in email to Cllr Musgrave), you say : “1a. The stated intention is for flexible community spaces so there would not be a deficit” Your reply is hard to understand because in your reply to Cllr Musgrave, with regard to our querying what the phrases “flexible community space, community kitchen” actually meant, you were not able to explain, saying “1 c No discussion have taken place on this issue as yet as it is too soon in the process.” So it seems you are saying that:</p> <p>a) A flourishing and growing independently run community centre, run on a not for profit for basis, will be removed</p> <p>b) The Council does not yet know who will be running the new leisure centre ie on what basis –for profit, not for profit – and your own staff told a meeting of Wonford residents that this would be a significant factor in the nature of the facility and how far community-led activities would take place in it.</p> <p>c) The Council say that there will be “flexible community spaces” and “community kitchen” provided in the new leisure centre, but cannot provide any explanation at all as to what this really means – neither the extent or nature of the provision, or the terms on which it or they will be provided</p> <p>d) Despite these huge uncertainties, the Council states that there will be ‘no deficit’ to the community.</p> <p>We believe that this is a very worrying position for the Council to take as it is patently not the case that you are able to guarantee ‘no deficit’ to the community at this time. Closing down Wonford Community and Learning Centre represents the major loss of a community asset and this is particularly ironic given your numerous statements about being committed to the Asset Based Community Development approach. We therefore believe that the idea of going ahead with closing the Centre, without any concomitant offer to replace this asset amounts to the Council entirely failing to comply with either the Sport England pilot approach of being community-led, or the Council’s own official Asset Based Community Development approach.</p> <p>We therefore put this further question (question 2) to you: Can you provide any rationale or evidence supporting your statement that there will be no ‘deficit’ in terms of community asset /community-run space and facilities, if a new Leisure Centre is built on the site of the current buildings?</p> <p>Question 3 We asked you what the City Council is planning to do regarding the future management of the new Centres, and you have replied “No discussions about this have taken place as it is too soon in the process”. However, it has now been brought to our attention that the minutes of Leisure Centre and Bus Station programme board meeting, October 30th 2018 state:</p>		

APPENDIX C – ACTIVE INBOX EMAIL RESPONSES

Consultee	Category	Strand	You said	Key Points & Themes	Our Response
			<p>"The Director responded to Councillor Mrs Thompson's question in relation to the timeline and OJEU process, and confirmed that the leisure operator would operate the multi sites for a period of 15 years."</p> <p>The minutes set out clearly that the Council's policy is that one private leisure company will operate all of the new sites for a 15 year period and that, by implication, the council have ruled out running the leisure centres in-house. There is no reference in the minutes to any consideration of favouring a not-for-profit operator. This level of minuted agreements rather contradicts your reply to our question ie that 'no discussions have taken place'. On the contrary, it seems that the Council has already taken a clear position.</p> <p>Please can you explain what the current situation is regarding council policy on who will manage and own the proposed three new leisure facilities ie do the minutes of October 2018 still represent the Council's official policy on who will manage the new leisure centres, or has something changed since then?</p>		
<p>Exeter Green Party (3)</p>	<p>Political Party</p>	<p>Physical Activity</p>	<p>Exeter Green Party welcomes the high level goals of both draft strategies, but believes that the proposed delivery mechanisms are inconsistent with and sometimes actively opposing the stated strategic aims.</p> <p>1. Three new 'super centres' versus wider spread of neighbourhood facilities.</p> <p>The strategy proposes three new 'super centres', with the concomitant assumption that people will be travelling miles across the city to access them. But the City Council's own Corporate Strategy theme of 'great neighbourhoods' 1 highlights the need for local facilities that people can access easily on foot, by bike and public transport. We believe that this Strategy should be revised to cover smaller scale localised provision of less expensive sports facilities, particularly modest sports halls. Obviously, expensive and specialised facilities can't be provided across the city, but with imagination and working with communities and existing assets -based on the ABCD approach, much could be done with existing and modest new provision. A Community Asset Transfer Policy in place would also help to facilitate and secure opportunities for local provision of lower level leisure and movement activities such as exercise and dance classes, increased community input to the management and running of facilities and opportunities to access third party investment not open to Councils. The potential to provide space for a fully independent community centre in Wonford, or to hand the existing building over for asset transfer, is just one example of such potential. The Council should grant realistic long term leases to community owned not for private profit enterprises within green spaces, notably community cafes, where local users agree that this would be a good addition to their park. The Strategy also fails to deal with the needs of future residents - people who will be living in the very large new developments on the eastern and western sides of the city, where there are no community facilities at all. The Strategy has to consider providing more localised, smaller facilities for these new communities.</p> <p><small>¹ "balanced and connected neighbourhood that supports wellbeing and reduces social isolation with new communities built around hubs of activity, workspaces, schools, community spaces and local shops". Exeter Corporate Strategy, 2018 - 21</small></p> <p>2. Base provision on need and consulting the public</p> <p>The Strategy appears to be overly driven by a wish to secure funding for new 'mega-centres'. This approach of investing in three large new centres is not based on any public consultation, but on a report from consultants. Where is the evidence that this is what people want? Page 2</p>	<p>More local facilities as opposed to 3 super centres</p> <hr/> <p>Community Asset Transfer to local communities to develop own facilities</p> <hr/> <p>Asset Based Community Development Approach</p> <hr/> <p>Base provision on need and consulting the public</p>	

APPENDIX C – ACTIVE INBOX EMAIL RESPONSES

Consultee	Category	Strand	You said	Key Points & Themes	Our Response
			<p>3. Failure to link to other key strategies and Corporate Plan goals</p> <p>The timescale, level of change and scale of financial investment implied by both documents make them highly significant to Exeter’s people, spaces and environment, in both the medium and long term. As such, it is essential to future proof both of these strategies – and that means they must mesh fully with current and soon to be agreed strategies. In particular, future land use planning policies, (the emergent Greater Exeter Strategic Plan process), future housing and other development, the soon to be finalised Exeter Transport Strategy, the Council’s Climate Change statements, and the City Council’s Air Quality Action Plan are all highly relevant to the proposals in these two draft documents.</p> <p>None of these documents are referenced though. This omission masks serious clashes of corporate goals. For example, if the three proposed new leisure facilities are built with large car parks ie based on the assumption that significant numbers of users will arrive by car, this puts the strategy in direct conflict with the stated goals of both the draft Exeter Transport Strategy (which Exeter City Council has said has its “wholehearted support”² -) the City Council’s Corporate Strategy goal of ‘tackling congestion and accessibility’ and the City’s Air Quality Action Plan goals to reduce air pollution from traffic. If the city is serious about moving to a near future where cars are used less in favour of public transport, walking and cycling, a future with cleaner air and reduced greenhouse gas emissions, then building 3 flagship centres based on people arriving by car is clearly not a viable policy.</p> <p>² https://www.devonnewscentre.info/have-your-say-on-future-transport-plans-for-exeter/ ³ Master Plan for Ludwell and River Valley Parks, 2016. Page 69</p> <p>4. Ownership and management of the new Centres</p> <p>We believe that any new Centres should be owned and run by either the council or a community owned and led organisation with a track record in supporting genuine community-based and community -led activities. This commitment should be part of the revised Strategy as it is fundamental to securing long term management styles and values that will deliver on the ambitious strategy goals. The past decade has shown the serious risks and limitations of handing over management of valuable public assets to companies that only care about their bottom line.</p> <p>5. Selling off of Northbrook pitch and putt</p> <p>We oppose the idea of selling off the Northbrook pitch and putt. The Riverside and Ludwell Valley Masterplan, commissioned and signed off by the City Council in 2016, highlighted the potential of this space for improved walking and cycling links, better use of the space for leisure, in short “a key landing pad for the both the Riverside Park and Ludwell”³. The Council should set a goal of increasing green space available and enhancing existing green space, not selling off irreplaceable sites like this. We note that the impact on the loss of biodiversity has not been stated. Finally, the air pollution on Topsham Road is already at close to illegal levels from Acorn Junction to the Countess Wear roundabout – and that is without the large new development on the Deaf School site, and the proposed development of further housing on behind St Leonard’s school on the Deaf School field. Further housing on this already polluted and congested road, that is difficult for cyclists and pedestrians, flies in the face of the corporate goals of reducing congestion and enabling more active travel.</p> <p>6. River Exe and Canal as leisure and active travel spaces</p>	<p>Failure to link to other key strategies and Corporate Plan goals</p> <hr/> <p>Ownership & Management of new centres</p> <hr/> <p>Oppose closure and sale of Northbrook Golf Course</p> <hr/> <p>No mention of River Exe and the Canal</p> <hr/> <p>Evaluate usage of play areas and consult with local communities</p>	

APPENDIX C – ACTIVE INBOX EMAIL RESPONSES

Consultee	Category	Strand	You said	Key Points & Themes	Our Response
			<p>None of the draft documents even reference the River Exe / Canal, yet both are important for both leisure activities (water-based and walking and cycling in the River Valley Park) and active travel – the River Valley Park is a key commuter routes for cyclists. Page 3 It would be helpful if the strategy were to show how the canal and river contribute to the active goals.</p> <p>7. Play areas</p> <p>We accept that the current provision of parks has developed in too random a way, driven by what is easy for developers to offer under Section 106 money. However, before any play areas are shut down there should be a study of the level of usage and proper consultation of the community. Just because there are play areas near one another doesn't mean that they're not both valued or used by many and /or different groups in the community.</p> <p>We are concerned that the creation of so called 'destination' parks means that parents are less likely to let their children go those places alone, and/or or will take to driving them further away to a 'destination park'. This will of course act against the physical activity strategy as well as the Council's corporate goals of reducing traffic and improving air quality.</p> <p>As Exeter grows in size and density more neighbourhood green spaces and informal ways of using them are needed ie places accessible easily on foot and by bike, for play, dog walking and biodiversity. The Council should consider creating 'pocket parks' as another way of increasing locally available mini-green space. This could be combined with the promise of bringing in filtered permeability in residential streets - a couple of trees and a bench in a quiet street all add to quality of life.</p> <p>8. Parks and open spaces</p> <p>A parks and open spaces strategy must have a strong biodiversity policy integrated within it. This policy must in turn be fully integrated with the new Trees Strategy that the City Council is currently developing.</p> <p>The strategy should also include positive and clear statements about encouraging community and not for profit groups to take up activities that benefit local green space and its users, including a Community Asset Transfer policy, and the Council committing to ongoing dialogue with green space groups.</p> <p>The Strategy should include a commitment to seeking to continually reduce the use of pesticides and herbicides, and prohibit the widespread use of glyphosate. by both changed management regimes and changed use of products and methods for weed and pest control.</p> <p>Opportunities for using parks and open spaces to develop skills and learning and social enterprise, through volunteering, apprenticeships and paid posts -perhaps working with a third part community enterprise should be explored. There are plenty of examples around the country of such initiatives. The Council should also include the insurance of volunteers helping with the maintenance and enhancement of parks and open spaces on their corporate insurance as other councils do.</p>	<p>Destination parks will increase driving and reduce physical activity</p> <p>Provide more pocket parks or local mini green space</p> <p>Strong biodiversity policy and clear link to new Tree Strategy</p> <p>Reduce use of pesticides & herbicides in parks & open spaces</p> <p>Use spaces to develop skills, learning & social enterprise</p>	
<p>Exeter Green Space Network</p>	<p>Community Group</p>	<p>Parks & Open Spaces</p>	<p>Strongly opposed to any further selling off of green space within the city and the consultation draft report's proposal to sell off the Northbrook pitch and putt, which has great value not just as a leisure facility but as a valuable link – for wildlife, and for walkers and cyclists –between Riverside Valley Park and Ludwell Valley Park.</p> <p>A parks and open spaces strategy should commit to enhancing and increasing Exeter's green spaces,</p>	<p>Oppose closure and sale of Northbrook Golf Course</p>	

APPENDIX C – ACTIVE INBOX EMAIL RESPONSES

Consultee	Category	Strand	You said	Key Points & Themes	Our Response
			<p>whether owned by the Council or others.</p> <p>A revised parks and open spaces strategy must include clear policies aiming for less use of pesticides and herbicides in public parks and open spaces. Including constructive and positive ways to change management regimes, such that few chemicals are used and more habitat is created by leaving more areas untouched or cut less often.</p> <p>A parks and open spaces strategy must acknowledge the importance of multiple uses for these spaces, i.e. quiet enjoyment, strolling, playing, dog walking, as well as structured physical activities and sports. This means actively managing the potential conflicts between these uses through signage and other methods.</p> <p>Parks and open spaces must be underpinned by a strong biodiversity policy, so that all planting and management regimes comply with that policy. Must also be explicitly and clearly linked to the in-development new Tree Strategy for the Council.</p> <p>Exeter City Council has made clear that it wants to take an Asset Based Community Development approach to parks and open spaces, as well as physical activities. This means not selling off public assets, being prepared to work constructively with not-for-profit organisations that seek to undertake activities in parks and open spaces that are congruent with everyone’s use and enjoyment of them. In particular, not for profit food-related offers would be very welcome and would add real amenity and community value to our parks and open spaces.</p>	<p>Retain and enhance existing green spaces</p> <p>Recognise importance of green spaces for wildlife</p> <p>Reduce use of pesticides & herbicides in parks & open spaces</p> <p>Importance of using parks and open spaces for multiple uses</p> <p>Strong biodiversity policy and clear link to new Tree Strategy</p> <p>Retain public assets and work with not for profit organisations or community groups to adopt an Asset Based Community Development approach</p>	
Ludwell Life	Community Group	Northbrook	<p>Completely opposed to the proposed sell-off of the green space that is currently the Northbrook pitch and putt site. The River Valley and Ludwell Masterplan, signed off the City Council in 2016, highlighted this space as having great potential for walking and cycling routes, leisure activities and forming a much better known and signed link between the two valley parks. There is no rationale given for selling this site other than raising money.</p> <p>Appreciate that the management regime for Ludwell Valley Park is now in the hands of Devon Wildlife Trust, but in relation to Wonford playing fields, a parks and open spaces strategy must contain a clear position on reducing the use of pesticides and herbicides, seeking to completely phase out the use of glyphosate in particular.</p> <p>Would like to see a biodiversity and trees policy within a new parks and open spaces strategy, to avoid the mistakes of the past - planting non-native species where native species give a better result for wildlife and so on.</p> <p>The Northbrook stream's water quality is classified as 'poor' by the Environment Agency. We understand that water quality falls across many agencies, including the Environment Agency, South West Water, and Devon County Council. However, the City Council does have its role to play, so we would like to see a commitment to actively working with these agencies to find the causes of pollution and taking action to stop the pollution.</p>	<p>Oppose closure and sale of Northbrook Golf Course</p> <p>Retain and enhance existing green spaces</p> <p>Reduce use of pesticides & herbicides in parks & open spaces</p> <p>Strong biodiversity policy and clear link to new Tree Strategy</p> <p>Work with appropriate agencies to improve water quality at Northbrook</p>	
Save the Clifton Hill Green Space	Community Group	Parks & Open Spaces	<p>In the section ‘Parks and Priority Actions’, please make reference to the inherent value of Green space, not just as a resource to be exploited by humans for their own activities, but as a valuable natural reserve for biodiverse fauna and flora. This natural attribute is a crucial consideration when determining the future of all Green Spaces.</p>	<p>Retain and enhance existing green spaces</p>	

APPENDIX C – ACTIVE INBOX EMAIL RESPONSES

Consultee	Category	Strand	You said	Key Points & Themes	Our Response
			<p>Following on from this point, please link explicitly to the importance of preserving and enhancing biodiversity and specifically the highly successful and much appreciated flagship 'Wild Exeter' initiative.</p> <p>Oppose any development that involves buildings on Green Space, exempting tracks, cycle paths and measures to improve accessibility and activity listed in the document.</p> <p>On Page 31, the reference to health and well-being is somewhat vague. Please stress that research has consistently found a link between improved health, wellbeing and time spent in outdoor environments, especially those managed for wildlife.</p>	<p>Strong biodiversity policy and clear link to new Tree Strategy</p> <p>Recognise importance of green spaces for wildlife</p> <p>Links to health & wellbeing</p>	
<p>Exeter Civic Society</p>	<p>Community Group</p>	<p>Built Leisure</p>	<p>The Society is pleased that Exeter City Council is moving towards establishing a sports strategy which is long overdue. The Society is concerned with the built environment, highway issues, and the strategic planning of facilities for those residing in the city, so will reserve comment to these matters rather than sporting activity.</p> <p>There is nothing to disagree with in respect of the draft Physical Activity Strategy and it is hoped that the Council is successful in achieving the aims. We are pleased to note in section 5 that it is intended to increase the number of people actively travelling to work rather than to use their car. It is noted that it is intended to enable 4,250 more commuters to choose active travel to work, but this lacks ambition. Statistics are based on 2011 census data, but with about 7,000 homes built since then, and a further 12,000 proposed in ECC's next strategic plan, the council should be more ambitious in developing opportunities for people to travel to work other than by car, particularly by identifying more cycle routes. It is hoped that ECC will be pro-active in developing these proposals rather than to wait for DCC to find funding for such infrastructure.</p> <p>Built Facilities.</p> <p>The report dated January 2019 and presented to council on 12 February makes many proposals to consolidate facilities at Exeter Arena and Wonford, together with new housing at these sites, presumably to either support social housing or to raise funds to fund new sports facilities. Whilst there may be land available to develop housing in the vicinity of Exeter Arena, we believe that this is not the case at Wonford, and will lead to overdevelopment of the site or the loss of essential green space.</p> <p>There are many suggestions in the Council's report (based on Max Associates Report 'Built Indoor Sports Facilities Strategy', October 2018) but these fail to provide data relating to current demand for such facilities, or any attempt to quantify the number of users now, or in the future once new homes are built in the city. This information should be either developed or published so that councillors, officers, and organisations can make better informed decisions based on need rather than an idea that it would be nice to provide these facilities. It also appears likely to us that these new facilities will be used by those living in urban extensions to Exeter in East Devon and Teignbridge, yet they will not contribute towards such facilities through their Council Tax – we recommend that these councils are asked to contribute towards these facilities.</p> <p>There are proposals from East Devon District Council to include a Sports Village in proposals for the GESP, which could include a competition size swimming pool and other yet to be defined facilities close to the M5. If built, this could have an impact on possible revenues for facilities within Exeter and affect</p>		

APPENDIX C – ACTIVE INBOX EMAIL RESPONSES

Consultee	Category	Strand	You said	Key Points & Themes	Our Response
			<p>the justification for the proposals. Any revised report to Council should include the possibility of facilities close to the city.</p> <p>The Council makes it clear in the introduction to these consultation documents that it has no statutory responsibility to provide sporting facilities, and yet there are suggestions for the provision of non-core facilities for gymnastics, boxing and skiing. There is no mention of badminton as a sport, or of water based sports, despite there being very healthy water based clubs based on the river.</p> <p>The report by Max Associates highlighted that Council run facilities are poorly maintained because of a lack of revenue funding, so why develop such facilities while the shortage of revenue funding persists? It is essential that if the council recommend the development of any facilities that this is accompanied by a publicly available business plan that clearly demonstrates how the facilities will be funded and maintained during their lifetime (60 years is normal), including major expenditure such as replacing roofs etc.. And it is essential that the Max Associates Report is updated to consider whether some clubs could relocate to halls owned by privately run organisations that would benefit from revenue from small sports clubs that may rely on cheap rents rather than the high cost of purpose built facilities.</p> <p>The council should focus on that which people need that is uneconomic for the private sector and impossible for clubs to do as it requires a lot of land and capital investment. This situation has been reinforced by the Council (Labour party) reminding us in election leaflets that it is short of revenue funding, so should it be spending any tax-payers money on flagship sporting and leisure built facilities? Would the council be better working with these groups to encourage/ enable the clubs and the private sector to seek funding for such facilities from sport associations and the Lottery? Clubs and the private sector can operate facilities so much better and get participants far more enthused, from local football teams, scouts & guides and the canoe club to David Lloyd and Exeter Golf & Country Club.</p> <p>We believe that the development of additional facilities at Exeter Arena will result in the loss of playing pitches but this is not noted in the report, or how these pitches will be replaced. There are proposals for four new major facilities, a swimming pool, Sports Hall, Gymnastic facilities, and a boxing facility. However, access to this area is not good from the south, particularly if it is expected that competitive events are intended with visiting teams. Vehicular access is from Summer Lane but due to a low railway bridge, coaches and large delivery lorries must access the area via Mount Pleasant Road and then the Beacon Heath area. To improve access, the council should consider a new road access from Exhibition Way for visiting coaches and service vehicles at least. If it is not possible to achieve this, and competitive sports are intended at these facilities, perhaps some would be better located at the Wonford Centre which has good highway access.</p> <p>There are two school sports halls close to the Exeter Arena area at St James and St Luke’s secondary schools as well as many primary schools with school halls, but these are not included in any analysis by Max Associates. The usage of these facilities should be analysed, and It may be better if the Council invest in these facilities rather than build another sports hall which may not be adequately used.</p> <p>For proposals at the Wonford Sports Centre we are concerned by suggestions in the Report, and recommended by Max Associates, for ‘An innovative, new build integrated community health and wellbeing centre to replace the existing Wonford Sports and community centres.’ The sports facilities and community hall at Wonford were purpose built in the mid-1980s so are only about 30 years old, and have many years life left in them. It should be perfectly feasible to adapt and refurbish these facilities to achieve the integrated community and wellbeing centre that is suggested. This will be</p>		

APPENDIX C – ACTIVE INBOX EMAIL RESPONSES

Consultee	Category	Strand	You said	Key Points & Themes	Our Response
			<p>achieved at much less cost than building new. Councillors should be reminded that these buildings are built over contaminated land so construction is not straightforward.</p> <p>The report makes no mention of school sports halls at Isca and St Peter’s secondary schools which are located at each end of the Wonford community. It would be helpful if activity there was included to determine what sporting activities should be included at Wonford.</p> <p>The proposed closure of Northbrook Golf course is a surprise proposal. The report does not demonstrate that this facility is not sufficiently used or financially unviable so we would urge the council to publish such information to support proposals to redevelop the area. With the course being an important green link between Ludwell Valley Park and the River Valley Park it is a very important green space. The Council has highlighted its desire to retain public green spaces within the city, but the possible development of housing on some or the entire site will result in a permanent loss that can never be regained once built on. The River, Canal and Quayside Group within ECS wish particularly to oppose the sale of Northbrook pitch-and-putt golf course. It should be better promoted and administered as a sports facility, or re-purposed as a green space with more varied use and active landscaping. Re-purposing would, for instance, enable it to be developed as a wildlife corridor, with areas of denser, wilder vegetation than at present.</p> <p>It might be possible, within a strategy along these lines to sell a proportion of the current area – we would suggest a third or less, concentrated on the higher ground and nearer Topsham Road for residential development. This green link should be connected to cycle and pedestrian routes over Topsham Road so users face minimal disruption to their enjoyment of the area.</p> <p>Playing Fields and Pitches Needs Assessment.</p> <p>At the time of responding to this consultation the author has not had an opportunity to read Continuum Leisure’s report which we hope includes quantative analysis about the size of population to establish the number of pitches required.</p> <p>It is reassuring to read that the consultant’s assessment of need includes that as a result of planned housing and population growth, although it is noted that this will only extend to proposals to 2026. With the Council about to announce plans for a further 12,000 homes (about 24,000 people) in the city as part of the GESP to be developed to 2014, it would be prudent to also look at needs up to 2040 to ensure sufficient pitches/land is protected for future residents.</p> <p>There is no mention of provision for Tennis or Lawn Bowles, which is odd considering the Council controls such facilities. To ensure that these sports and facilities are considered for development, and any others within council ownership (cycle tracks?); such facilities should be included in the overall sports strategy for the city. This will ensure that these facilities are included within maintenance and investment plans for sports provision, and demonstrate to users that such facilities will be retained (or not).</p> <p>We must point out some possible conflicts with plans for pitches in the vicinity of the canal (Bromhams Farm and Grace Road Fields). In the Council’s current Strategic Plan there are proposals to establish a city centre camp site in this vicinity, and for a ‘marina’ off the canal. Both of these will need access by car / boat, and possibly the use of Grace Road Fields. Proposals in the council’s recently commissioned</p>		

APPENDIX C – ACTIVE INBOX EMAIL RESPONSES

Consultee	Category	Strand	You said	Key Points & Themes	Our Response
			<p>canal development plan must also be considered to ensure there are no conflicts of use in this area. Secondly, the Council’s Riverside & Ludwell Valley Parks Masterplan 2016-2026 highlights the Bromhams Farm area as a new outdoor activities hub, as well as a location for a visitor centre. In addition, it proposes that Grace Road Playing Fields are developed as a picnic and camping area, as well as Clapperbrook Lane being a primary access to the Valley Park from the west. We hope that the council will take these conflicting matters into account and amend all proposals accordingly to ensure there are consistent and complimentary masterplans.</p> <p>We would like to comment on three of the proposed actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action 2 highlights the need to plan ahead for adequate provision as a result of proposals within the GESP which we wholeheartedly support. • Action 6 suggests developing existing grass pitches into AWP’s to increase use/activity. However, we would urge the council not to do this because such pitches are expensive to maintain and regularly need rebuilding. The council’s lack of revenue funding to maintain existing facilities is highlighted throughout recent reports. • Action 9 suggests developing masterplans for the two strategic sports hubs which we support. However, we must urge the council to engage in further early consultation with users and communities rather than to produce a fete-a-compli. Whole life maintenance plans should also be developed alongside such masterplans to ensure facilities can be maintained. <p>Community Play Areas.</p> <p>The author is responding without having had the opportunity to read the council’s Review of Play Areas before completing this response.</p> <p>At a time when many in society are concerned about the amount of time children seem to spend indoors using electronic play equipment rather than playing and socialising outside, we do hope that the council will ensure that there is a network of localised play areas for all children. All future plans should include consultation with local families and community leaders before final decisions are made to close or change any local provision.</p> <p>The report highlights that many new play areas are developer driven, but much of this is as a result of the Council’s planning policies requiring play areas to be developed in new housing developments. If the council then adopts these facilities it is odd that through the planning process officers have not negotiated or dictated the appropriate quality and level of play equipment. It is surely possible to ensure that any new developments that come before planning officers are subject to better scrutiny to ensure any new play areas fit in with any agreed strategy.</p> <p>Parks and Greenspaces.</p> <p>Large parks are places where communities can come together for fetes, social activities, a place for relaxation, and often combine and link with play and recreation areas. Parks such as Heavitree Park, St Thomas Park, and Rougemont Gardens are characterised by mature trees and plants with wildlife, and seating suitable for all age groups. Most parks have been established for some time, hence the mature trees that are admired and enjoyed.</p>		

APPENDIX C – ACTIVE INBOX EMAIL RESPONSES

Consultee	Category	Strand	You said	Key Points & Themes	Our Response
			<p>As Exeter has expanded new communities have been provided with a range of green spaces from small parks to open lawned areas, but no new parks have been established that may allow greater community gatherings and enjoyment, as well as the provision of mature trees and planting. Much of the land where this could have been achieved has now been developed either for new homes or employment, and there may not now be any opportunities to establish such a park to support new communities within the city, particularly to the east of the city.</p> <p>The council should now consider how a new park could be developed on the boundary of the city, perhaps working with neighbouring councils where significant new housing is being developed.</p> <p>In paragraph 5.2 it is stated that budgetary pressures in the short and medium term requires the council to consider innovative approaches to developing greenspaces in the future. Whilst it is recognised that austerity measures are having an impact upon the council’s revenue budget, it is crucial that the council should be ambitious and plan for the future, especially for the large projects that require planning policies and strategies, and capital funding.</p> <p>We do not have any comments in respect of sections 6 and 7 of the draft report.</p>		
Kirsty Hill	Local Government	Physical Activity	<p>One area we have highlighted was around the reduction in parks in the Exwick area when this is one of the areas highlighted as a priority. Part of the problem with access on the west of the river is the topography and this needs to be considered as well as density. It is clear the site of the destination park is yet to be decided but with closures in Exwick we would want to see the park placed close to this priority area to support physical activity of people of all ages in the area.</p>	Destination park for Exwick	
			<p>It would also be useful to include a timeframe for which the strategy will be worked on to be able to assess progress towards the outcomes over time, and also to align other strategies and work programmes to.</p>	Clear timeframe for delivery of strategy	
			<p>The King George’s playing field play area is highlighted as expired but it is not clear whether it is this one that is due to close. If it is the park which contains the equipment which is wheelchair accessible then this equipment is not removed and refurbished if required as it is really important that all children are able to access play equipment and there is currently very limited access to play equipment for children who require wheelchairs and inclusive play should be supported to reduce inequalities.</p>	Refurbish and maintain play equipment particularly wheelchair accessible sites	
Exeter TAG Rugby Club	Sports Club/Assoc	Physical Activity	<p>I do feel our club genuinely has something unique and of real value to offer the whole of our community of Exeter however the main issue we are faced with is that of a regular and suitable venue. For the last 14 years we have from September to the start of the athletics season in April used the floodlit grass pitch at the Exeter Athletics Arena after which we lose this facility and switch to the 3G pitch at Exeter University from April to the end of July.</p>	Insufficient all-weather pitches	
			<p>Although I would like to think we have always had a very good relationship over the years with both our venues each does has its own particular drawbacks which I believe has a real negative impact on the expansion of our club. The Arena because it is weather dependant and sessions there are often cancelled at late notice due to the weather. Not being reliant on the weather the 3G pitch at the university is obviously our much preferred venue but we are restricted to its use to the summer months</p>	High venue hire fees	

APPENDIX C – ACTIVE INBOX EMAIL RESPONSES

Consultee	Category	Strand	You said	Key Points & Themes	Our Response
			<p>due to the high demand from its students during term time. The high cost of its hire is also a real issue for us.</p> <p>As a club we do feel we have something different and of value that we offer the people of Exeter and would very much like to have a regular venue of a 3G floodlight pitch which we could have use off each Friday evening throughout the year to help us fulfil this. If the proposed 3G community pitch at the University's Topsham Sports Ground goes ahead we would very much hope we could be considered for this.</p>	<p>Secure future playing pitch provision at Topsham Sports Ground</p>	
University of Exeter	Education Sector	Built Leisure	<p>We are fully supportive of the Move More strategy and look forward to working with the Council and other partners to deliver on the outcomes.</p>	<p>Supports Move More Live Better Draft Physical Activity Strategy</p>	
			<p>With regards to the Built facilities strategy, securing the future of playing pitch provision at Topsham Sports Ground which provides high quality rugby, football, cricket and lacrosse facilities and is a key asset for the City, is important. To ensure participation in sport can continue and develop, improvements in Pavilion and changing are needed together with investment in artificial surfaces and critically floodlighting of the site. The support of the City Council in enabling this is critical.</p>	<p>Secure future playing pitch provision at Topsham Sports Ground</p>	
			<p>The University would like to discuss further the St Sidwells Point development and how this can deliver on student needs.</p>	<p>Improvement needed in Pavilion, changing facilities, artificial surfaces and floodlighting</p>	
Sport England	National Bodies	Physical Activity	<p>Sport England are hugely excited and supportive of the suggested approach that Exeter City Council are taking in their new Physical Activity strategy and their plans around the built and natural environment in the city.</p>	<p>Supports Move More Live Better Draft Physical Activity Strategy</p>	
			<p>We are really encouraged that the council recognise the positive and wide ranging impact that population level increases in physical activity can have on the city as a whole. Tackling some of the big strategic challenges that are facing the city by getting more people to move more every day.</p>	<p>Supports Exeter Move More Draft Built Facilities, Playing Fields, Pitches, Play Areas, Parks and Open Spaces Report</p>	
			<p>We're glad that the council have taken an analytic approach to targeting the places and people that are set to benefit the most from their vision. Recognising that there are huge stubborn inequalities that exist in why some people are less physically active than others.</p>	<p>Commends analytical approach and inclusion in the Corporate Strategy and Housing Vision</p>	
			<p>It's also fantastic to see that the role of physical activity has extended into other strategies across the place including the corporate strategy and new housing plan. Taking a long term approach to this is what Sport England are hoping to see from Local Authorities.</p>	<p>Use plain & consistent language</p>	
			<p>Overall we are highly supportive of the plans being consulted on and we look forward to working closely and alongside the city council and other key organisations in the delivery of the vision set out.</p> <p>That said, Sport England do have a few areas that we would like the council to consider when finalising these strategies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would be helpful to be clearer on the relationship between the strategy and the LDP rather than referring to the pilot as an entity – is the pilot the way of working and approach and the priorities within it the strategy priorities. • Could the strategy and it's associated documents use more plain and consistent language? Is the strategy intended to be understood and consumed by the general public? • To use the most up to date data, insight and evidence - Particularly with regards activity levels 	<p>Use most current data, insight & evidence</p>	

APPENDIX C – ACTIVE INBOX EMAIL RESPONSES

Consultee	Category	Strand	You said	Key Points & Themes	Our Response
			<p>within the identified target localities and the information for future active environments plans.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can the council be clearer on how it will work with other key organisations to support the existing and further sporting system in Exeter. Clearly this is a strategy for physical activity in its broadest sense but the approach does feel to move the council away from any Sport provision, I think we'd all accept that an active environment is supportive of both formal and informal sport and physical activity as a spectrum. What role does the Council play in this and who else does this fall to? Are other partners signed up to the emerging strategies in a shared way? • We would welcome the opportunity to join up our local and national expertise in facility and planning work with the emerging plans, ensuring latest methodologies and processes (in an evolving policy environment) are used to finalise the strategic approach across the city. 	<p>Clarify working relationships with other organisations and external bodies</p>	
<p>Exeter Cycling Campaign</p>	<p>Community Group</p>	<p>Physical Activity</p>	<p>13 page document submitted with 11 recommendations and supporting evidence and date=a. Recommendations itemised below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As a result, we would suggest amending the vision to the following: "Our vision is for Exeter to continue to be the most active city in England, and to enable those most at risk of inactivity to become active in everyday life." 2. For ECC to work with Devon County Council (DCC) to roll out the modal filters identified by community members in our Living Streets report. 3. All new housing developments in the District must be served by public transport and connected with paths that give people walking and cycling priority. Provision should be made for secure bicycle storage in all new housing developments. 4. ECC should work with DCC to design and agree a dense network of paths, making the city permeable for people walking and cycling: including children, the disabled and the quarter of car-free households. 5. ECC to publicly support a 20mph speed limit within Exeter and work with DCC to make it happen. 6. ECC to fund a pilot of temporary road closures or no parking/drop off during school start/leave times. 7. ECC should work with DCC to provide segregated cycle routes on the arterial routes within half a mile of any redevelopment. 8. ECC to charge parking at the same rate as public car parks for built leisure facilities. 9. An equivalent amount of covered bicycle parking should be provided at all ECC leisure facilities and sites. 10. ECC should review the annual cost of accessing leisure centre facilities versus investing in cycling infrastructure for people on low incomes in the target LSOAs. 11. ECC to review the cycle path provision covered by the report area to ensure that it is all a minimum of 3 metres wide, or that full segregation is provided. ECC to review all of the access points for cycle paths within the report area so that physical barriers which mean cyclists have to dismount, or are forced into conflict with pedestrians, are removed. 		