

Feedback report on consultation on the draft East Devon Local Plan (Regulation 18) that was consulted on from 7 November 2022 to 15 January 2023



PDF 4 of 10

Chapter 6 (Part B) – Strategy for development at Local Centres

Pages 213-247

July 2023

Policy 25 - Development at Local Centres

Policy 25 of the local plan provides for and allocates land for development at local centres.

General issues (not relating to individual settlements)

- Too much development is identified for all five Local Centres, albeit Lympstone may be suitable to accommodate more given its train station.
- Agree with modest development to increase population and support local centres but think more development should be identified to support local amenities.
- The smaller Local Centres of Broadclyst, Lympstone, Woodbury have too much growth, a disproportionate amount, in addition to a new settlement in the area.
- The larger centres of Budleigh, Colyton and Woodbury should have more houses, jobs and services allocated to them.
- The East Devon AONB team state that Budleigh Salterton is fully within and Woodbury is very close to the East Devon AONB and proposals at these locations should be accompanied by an LVIA or landscape appraisal to consider the effects of the proposals on the AONB.
- National Highways anticipate the strategic road network can accommodate the level of growth proposed at other Main Centres, Local Centres and Service Villages, but expect a high-level transport assessment for the entire Local Plan to provide evidence.
- Devon County Council comment that secondary and SEND contributions arising from development proposed near to the new community (e.g. Woodbury) will need to be invested in the new community.
- Sid Vale Association - The policy has to be justified by showing that there will be a demand for 2.4 Hectares of Employment Land in Sidmouth, Sidford and Sidbury as otherwise there is the risk the land could be used for residential purposes by default. Our local market experience and knowledge is that there is no demand for more Employment Land in the Sid Valley.
- The Avenues Residents Association advise - Supporting existing villages may lead to the destruction of such communities because of the need for an iterative process to allow them to flourish and grow. Lack of development may hinder their future. Such an approach leads to greater development in towns and thus a movement of village populations to towns where facilities are available. It is important to enhance village services to allow them to survive. Development of towns may cost villages in the future.

Broadclyst - General issues

- Devon County Council (DCC) are concerned about the ability to support the proposed level of development due to impact upon primary and secondary school provision in Broadclyst.
- Fail to see the similarities between Broadclyst (one shop) and other settlements in this policy.
- Broadclyst Parish Council -
 - One of the biggest concerns of residents is that increasing the size of the village by 15% will put intolerable pressure on already struggling local services. It is felt that development on this scale, far from enhancing the vitality of the local community, is likely to be detrimental. Without remedial action, a swell in population will be especially difficult for the local primary and secondary schools (all full), and the GP surgery (at capacity).
 - We would like EDDC to establish a protected Green Belt around any potential new development to prevent more urban creep. It is worrying for residents to see so much urban expansion around our village, and it is felt that if this is not done, it misses an opportunity to allow Broadclyst to retain its special and unique character, without which it is destined to become a suburb of either Cranbrook or Greater Exeter in the decades to come.
 - If the Planning Authority is mindful to include sites 12 and 29 in its Local Plan, proposals should be drawn up for effective mitigation of the impact of additional traffic movements on Crannaford Lane. Multiple additional roads identified with specific adverse impact from potential development.
- The proposed amount of development will swamp the existing settlement due to load on local services and transport links.
- The village is served by narrow, often winding lanes with poor visibility. There are occasional passing places. Pavements in the centre of the village and surrounding lanes are patchy and inadequate and there is no designated provision for cyclists.
- Concern expressed over pedestrian and cyclist safety.
- Concern expressed over school traffic with congestion and further safety concerns.
- Concern over facilities and infrastructure being at capacity including surface water and sewage management, doctors, schools, road network, education provision, transport.
- The suggested area for development is frequently waterlogged in wet weather and a footpath crossing the fields is often unusable. The lanes alongside this land flood regularly during the winter to the point of being impassable by foot or by car. The floods are not transient and can be slow to drain over days or weeks. Run off water from a large housing development would exacerbate this problem.
- The housing developments in Cranbrook and Westclyst should be sufficient to prevent further building in areas with unsuitable roads and pavements.
- The proposed development of concentrated modern housing would engulf the historical setting of the village, whose character would be damaged and lost for ever.

- The rural setting of Broadclyst offers the local community and visitors the pleasure and health benefits of walking and cycling in the beautiful countryside. These activities were essential for physical and mental well-being of residents during the recent pandemic. The development proposed would impact on the health and wellbeing of local residents and visitors.
- The BUA boundary for Broadclyst in the Broadclyst Neighbourhood Development Plan and the adopted EDLP does not include the preferred sites LP_Brc1_09, LP_Brc1_29 and LP_Brc1_12, but the proposed EDLP seems to have redrawn the boundary (now referred to as a Settlement Boundary) to include these sites. There is no justification to this redrawing and I feel it is misleading and intended to deceive so as to provide justification for development on these 3 preferred sites in accordance with paragraph 3.75 of the proposed EDLP. The original BUA boundary for Broadclyst should be retained when considering development.
- The figure of 175 houses for Broadclyst is totally contrary to the Broadclyst Neighbourhood Development Plan which suggested only 44 houses. There is no justification provided in the proposed EDLP as to why this figure of 44 is no longer relevant.
- The area supports a wide range of birds, insects and wildlife which would inevitably be diminished by the transformation of the village to an urban environment. The preservation and protection of wildlife habitats is essential in the long term for the survival of the planet as acknowledged by Michael Gove in the new measures for the Levelling up and Regeneration Bill (Dec 2022)
- The proposed area of development would involve the loss of rich agricultural land.
- A housing development would lead to the permanent loss of valuable green spaces.

LP_Brc1_09 - Land at Heathfield (south-east of Woodbury View), Broadclyst - Preferred Allocation

- DCC note this has been previously considered by them as the LLFA and is proposed to be allocated in the Neighbourhood Plan.
- Broadclyst Parish Council – Brc109 received majority support for development from the community in every round of consultation and is in the final draft as a site for 15 homes. It is considered proportional and natural extension to the village, and although any development brings pressure on infrastructure, it was felt that the allocation of an additional maximum of 15 homes was not significant.
- A number of representations objected to the development, with concern over safety, overcrowding, infrastructure issues, flooding, congestion, dangerous roads, increased school run traffic, loss of green space, residents from other towns and villages already using Broadclyst facilities (schools and doctors' surgeries).

- A number of representations expressed concern over the loss of agricultural land, suggested as at odds with government guidance.
- This is a beautiful and desirable area. Development of this area would only provide homes for wealthier people, would add increased load to the already overstretched infrastructure, ruin the countryside, attract residents from outside the local area and would not provide affordable housing. It should NEVER be considered for development!
- There would be a big ecological and environmental impact on the area and would result in a loss of a lot of green space and habitats which are currently home to lots of different wildlife, including bats, birds, butterflies and insects. The proposed site itself is an area of farmland with mature trees and hedgerows, supporting rich wildlife. The loss of habitat would be devastating.
- The BUA boundary for Broadclyst in the Broadclyst Neighbourhood Development Plan and the adopted EDLP does not include the preferred sites LP_Brcl_09, LP_Brcl_29 and LP_Brcl_12, but the proposed EDLP seems to have redrawn the boundary (now referred to as a Settlement Boundary) to include these sites. There is no justification to this redrawing and I feel it is misleading and intended to deceive so as to provide justification for development on these 3 preferred sites in accordance with paragraph 3.75 of the proposed EDLP. The original BUA boundary for Broadclyst should be retained when considering development.
- A number of representations in support of the allocation.
- Of the three developments proposed for the area, this one seems the least offensive. That being said, it would be okay if this was the only site proposed, that which it isn't. If developments like these are taking place, the impact on local facilities (employment, GPs, schools, buses, social areas) needs to be seriously considered, it seems to have been just brushed aside.
- I feel that this site is of a size and in a situation which is acceptable to the character of the village. The access is reasonable and the number of dwellings should not place an inordinate strain on local resources.

LP_Brcl_12 – Land west of Whimble Road, Broadclyst - Preferred Allocation

- The Environment Agency advise that the area of floodzone 2 to the northwest of the site should be secured as green infrastructure and be kept free of built development.
- Historic England- Further to our initial assessment of the proposed sites it would be helpful to see the full HESA of this proposed allocation to enable one to determine whether it can be reasonably demonstrated that it is likely to be able to accord with national policy, guidance and legislation including the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

- DCC seek clarification on the function and approach to the existing 'pond' which is unclear if this forms part of the allocation.
- Object to Brcl_12 as flooding in the area will only be made worse if this site is developed.
- Roads are not suitable for extra traffic from Brcl_12.
- Brcl_12 will ruin the countryside on this rural side of the village.
- Owner of the New Inn pub objects as housing development, rather than countryside, will discourage visitors from visiting the pub and adversely affect the business.
- Loss of grade one agricultural land a concern.
- Loss of biodiversity a concern, including loss of pond on this site.
- Broadclyst Parish Council -
 - In the Clyst Vale Regional Park consultation document there was specific mention of the Winter Gardens site (LP_Brcl_12) as being an important habitat for invertebrates. We therefore would like to see a full environmental and biodiversity impact assessment, commissioned prior to development being agreed, and a proper plan for mitigation if development is allowed to go ahead.
 - Site Brcl 12 was presented for consideration during the Call for Sites as both a housing site and an economic site.
 - Housing: following an external consultant's desk-based analysis on the proposed sites, Broadclyst NP steering group was advised that site 12 was too big to bring forward through a NP and should therefore be removed from the Broadclyst NP.
 - Economic: consultation responses for economic re-development of the buildings were as follows:
 - a. Quantitative: with 61% of votes in favour, this site has the support of the community.
 - b. Qualitative data:
 - i. Good support for employment use and to support small businesses;
 - ii. The loss of agricultural land is not a material consideration;
 - iii. The environmental impact will be assessed by AECOM;
 - iv. Support for regeneration of brown-field site;
 - v. Concerns about access and additional traffic;
 - vi. Consider a condition for no B8 use
 - vii. Village is sustainable location;
 - viii. Development to be subject to noise impact assessment and mitigations if necessary
- Agent for Land Value Alliances (Developer) -
 - We consider that this site is a suitable location for development in light of the everyday facilities available in Broadclyst itself, as well as the sustainable transport links available to access both Exeter and Cranbrook via cycling and public transport.
 - Given the scale of the site (circa 12 hectares), and in order to achieve sufficient density on the land for housing (30dph), we suggest that draft policy 25 should be amended to

increase the number of homes from 136 dwellings to 160 dwellings, which is considered to be a more appropriate level of development. LVA are also flexible in terms of the mix of housing to be provided on site, including (for example) bungalows, if the authority so desires it – as well as self-build and smaller units.

- A high number of representations object to the allocation citing:
 - Adverse impact on the local road and transport network with safety concerns for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists alike.
 - Adverse impact on local facilities infrastructure including doctors and schools.
 - Environmental impact of building on GREEN FIELD sites, with impacts on biodiversity and loss of green space.
 - Increase in light pollution from construction phase and post build out
 - Loss of Grade 1 agricultural land.
 - Adverse impact on flooding and local sewage network.
 - Impact on local heritage.
 - Impact on the character and rural appearance of Broadclyst.

LP_Brcl_18 - Land at Church Lane, Broadclyst - *Rejected Site*

- No comments.

LP_Brcl_22 – Land at Jarvishayes Farm, Broadclyst - *Rejected Site*

- Surprised to see this site rejected after locals had put it forward through the Neighbourhood Plan. It is of a much smaller scale than the sites proposed on the other side of the village, with good access off the B3181, and is unlikely to require such major infrastructure and flood relief changes. Decision to reject is however supported.
- Two further representations questioning the decision to reject, suggesting that the site has much better access to the village services, footpaths, public transport etc. than the other recommended large sites within the village and would be a scale much more in keeping with the village.

LP_Brcl_29 - Land to the east of Town End, Broadclyst - *Preferred Allocation*

- Historic England- Further to our initial assessment of the proposed sites it would be helpful to see the full HESA of this proposed allocation to enable one to determine whether it can be reasonably demonstrated that it is likely to be able to accord with

- national policy, guidance and legislation including the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Particularly with regard to the letting of Lake House
- Object as located on a very narrow road without footpaths.
 - These fields are often covered in surface water which will only be displaced if houses are placed here.
 - The National Trust this policy identifies land to the east of Town End as a preferred allocation for 24 new homes and 0.1 hectares of employment land (allocation reference Brcl_29). They advise - this site is owned by the National Trust as investment land that was donated specifically to fund conservation work on the Killerton Estate. It has always been The National Trust's intention to sell this investment land when an appropriate opportunity arose. For this and adjoining land Brcl_12 the trust advise they would support specific policy requirements, applicable to both sites, to secure high quality development which; respects the local identity of Broadclyst; protects the setting of listed buildings; ensures that sustainable pedestrian and cycle links are provided and wider sustainable links to green infrastructure. They support masterplan production and advise site mapping needs updating.
 - Broadclyst Parish Council -
 - Site Brcl_29 was found by the desk-based assessment to be acceptable for delivery through a NP and progressed through to the first round of public consultation. However, access to the site was a major concern and the site only received support from a total of 31% of consultation respondents, so was withdrawn by the Steering Group and did not progress any further in the draft Neighbourhood Plan.
 - There are concerns that development on this scale could be detrimental to the intrinsic character of the village, particularly the historic Eastern side of Broadclyst, abutting the proposed sites. This part of the village has many listed and thatched buildings. In particular, with reference to site LP_Brcl_29, any development here would have a direct impact on Lake House which is Grade 2 Listed. The land proposed is also on an elevation that could dominate the surrounding environment. If development is allowed to go ahead, we suggest it must be in keeping with the historic setting and adhere strictly to the design codes set out in The Broadclyst Parish Neighbourhood Plan.
 - Loss of grade one agricultural land a concern.
 - Concern that the local highway infrastructure could not cope with the development.
 - Lack of safe pedestrian routes a concern with potential to encourage car usage.
 - A high number of representations object to the allocation citing:
 - Adverse impact on the local road and transport network with safety concerns for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists alike.
 - Adverse impact on local facilities infrastructure including doctors and schools.
 - Environmental impact of building on GREEN FIELD sites, with impacts on biodiversity and loss of green space.
 - Increase in light pollution from construction phase and post build out

- Loss of Grade 1 agricultural land.
- Adverse impact on flooding and local sewage network.
- Impact on local heritage.
- Impact on the character and rural appearance of Broadclyst.

Omission sites a Broadclyst

- None identified.

Budleigh Salterton - General issues

- Budleigh Salterton Parish Council express concern about the proposal for 152 homes because it would put unacceptable strain on the medical resources in the town, which also serve the surrounding villages.
- A respondent comments - This consultation shows planned development on what was described as green wedges in the Budleigh Salterton Neighbourhood plan, a plan that was voted on in a referendum by the people of Budleigh Salterton. It looks like East Devon is not referring to this plan? What am I missing here?
- The proposed growth of Budleigh Salterton means it risks losing its distinctiveness and just becoming a suburb of Exmouth.
- Proposed development at Budleigh is totally out of proportion.
- Wain Homes consider that Budleigh suffers from acute housing need, poor housing affordability and an ageing population. It also points out that the town is washed over by the AONB, such that any new development will be in the AONB.

Nb. Devon County Council's consultation response includes a Transport Site Infrastructure Assessment which comprises a summary of the settlement, a list of facilities, transport modes at the settlement, how each of the potential sites could be accessed and the impact this may have on the local transport network – please see the full DCC response for further detail.

LP_Budl_01 – Land adjacent to Clyst Hayes Farmhouse

- Budleigh Salterton Parish Council oppose any development on this site because it is in the AONB, grade 1 agricultural land, would add to traffic congestion on B3178 and the primary school is over subscribed.
- Budleigh Salterton Parish Council state that one of the reasons the town was included in the AONB was because of the attractive vistas and views afforded of the local countryside in this area.
- Devon County Council query whether green infrastructure should be provided, and development may require a sewer requisition to the watercourse if infiltration is unfeasible.
- A large site outside the town boundary.
- A few respondents consider the site an attractive and important green wedge for the town.
- Gives this part of Budleigh a semi-rural character.
- Some respondents expressed concern about the impact of additional cars on Knowle Road where traffic is already a problem.
- Would undermine attractive character of area.

- Development would add to flooding issues.
- Dark Lane is a medieval track.
- AONB location.
- Some respondents were concerned about the loss of good quality agricultural land.
- Plenty of brownfield sites and empty buildings in north.
- Very sensitive location – don't destroy every piece of green space until Budleigh's unique character is gone forever.
- 300 homes would be unacceptable on traffic grounds but would support 50 homes with road improvements where narrow.
- The landowner supports the allocation of this site for housing. It is deliverable as a housing site and is well related to the existing built up area. It is well provided with facilities and there is a strong need for a mix of new housing including affordable housing.

LP_Budl_02 - Land at Barn Lane, Knowle - Potential 'Second Best' Allocation

- Budleigh Salterton Parish Council oppose any development on this site, which is grade 1 agricultural land, in a drinking water protection zone and could be at risk of flooding.
- Budleigh Salterton Parish Council state that one of the reasons the town was included in the AONB was because of the attractive vistas and views afforded of the local countryside in this area.
- Historic England- Further to our initial assessment of the proposed sites it would be helpful to see the full HESA of this proposed allocation to enable one to determine whether it can be reasonably demonstrated that it is likely to be able to accord with national policy, guidance and legislation including the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
- Wain Homes, which controls the site, comment that;
 - The site abuts the BUAB on two sides and is sustainable in other respects.
 - The characteristics of Budleigh and its surroundings and the scale and nature of the site and the proposed development indicate clearly that the scheme would not be "major" development in the AONB.
 - Landscape and other effects can be adequately mitigated.
 - The site could deliver about 50 market and affordable homes, public open space (including play space), safe access and off-road pedestrian and cycle connections to the town centre. This would represent a 2% increase in population for the town.
 - The site is relatively self-contained and the effects on long and short views and on the wider AONB can be mitigated through layout, design, materials and landscaping.

- All other effects can be mitigated, with the exception of the loss of agricultural land where any harm arising would be considered in the context of the remaining provision of best and most versatile land and would weigh in the planning balance against a range of public benefits arising from the scheme.
- Some respondents object as in the AONB.
- Object as too far from the town centre.
- Contrary to local plan policy because would not conserve or enhance the character and natural beauty of the AONB.
- Loss of good agricultural land.
- Allocation of this scale is not required.
- Site is in a drinking water protection zone.
- Inadequate pavement provision for site to the west.
- The landowner supports the allocation of this site for housing. It is deliverable as a housing site and is well related to the existing built up area. It is well provided with facilities and there is a strong need for a mix of new housing including affordable housing.

LP_Budl_03 - Land at Barn Lane, Knowle - Potential 'Second Best' Allocation

- Historic England- Further to our initial assessment of the proposed sites it would be helpful to see the full HESA of this proposed allocation to enable one to determine whether it can be reasonably demonstrated that it is likely to be able to accord with national policy, guidance and legislation including the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Particularly with regard to key views from principle elevation of Grade 2* Tidwell House
- Some respondents object as in the AONB.
- Object as too far from the town centre for older people.
- Loss of agricultural land.
- Contrary to local plan policy because would not conserve or enhance the character and natural beauty of the AONB.
- Roads inadequate.
- Allocation of this scale not required.
- The landowner supports the allocation of this site for housing. It is deliverable as a housing site and is well related to the existing built up area. It is well provided with facilities and there is a strong need for a mix of new housing including affordable housing.

LP_Budl_04 – The Old Orchard, Halse Hill - *Rejected Site*

- Budleigh Salterton Parish Council oppose any development on this site.
- Budleigh Salterton Parish Council agree that the site is unachievable and forms part of a green wedge designated in the neighbourhood plan. Green Wedges such as this site were instrumental in AONB's decision to include the whole of Budleigh Salterton in AONB.
- Will reappear as a 'windfall'
- Next to conservation area with protected trees on boundary.
- Opposite important woodland.
- Should be included in the conservation area so that it is protected.
- Site unsuitable and could flood.

LP_Budl_05 - Little Knowle - *Rejected Site*

- Budleigh Salterton Parish Council oppose any development on this site, which is adjacent to a green wedge, is at risk of flooding and the existing field forms an attractive feature in the street scene.
- Site unsuitable due to flooding.
- Dark Lane unsuitable for additional traffic and of historical and geological interest.
- Road network unsuitable for additional traffic.
- Would damage character of AONB.
- Poor access and visibility.
- Attractive field.
- SWW has a holding tank on part of the site.
- Erosion of rural environment.
- Should be left as attractive feature in street scene.

LP_Budl_06 - Budleigh Salterton Community Hospital - *Preferred Allocation*

- Budleigh Salterton Parish Council oppose any development on this site, which had been earmarked for closure, but is now a community health hub.
- Many respondents object to any loss of a much used and highly valued health and community facility.

LP_Budl_07 - The Old Smithy, Dalditch Lane - *New Site - not assessed*

- Budleigh Salterton Parish Council agree that this site is not suitable for development.
- The Environment Agency advise that the site is within floodzone 3 and would need to be subject to SFRA2, and the sequential and exception tests before being allocated.
- Would destroy quiet rural aspect on outskirts of town and encourage urban expansion.
- Agree should not be allocated but should be considered for self-build.

LP_Budl_08 - Lower Station Road Car Park - New Site - not assessed

- Budleigh Salterton Parish Council oppose any development on this site pending the result of the HELAA as it is a well used car park that reduces congestion.
- Loss of parking.
- Should remain to serve the public hall.
- Unusual shape not suited to housing.
- Increase in traffic from residents would endanger the users of the hall.

LP_Budl_09 - Brook Road car park - New Site - not assessed

- Budleigh Salterton Parish Council agrees that this site is unsuitable for development because of its size and the risk of flooding.
- The Environment Agency advise that the site is within floodzone 3 and would need to be subject to SFRA2, and the sequential and exception tests before being allocated.
- Invaluable parking close to High Street for the infirm.
- Should be kept for original use.

Omission sites at Budleigh Salterton

- None identified.

Colyton - General issues

- Scale of development at Colyton and Colyford will adversely impact on River Axe SAC/water quality due to poor quality sewage system.
- Colyton's infrastructure cannot cope with more housing – the primary school is full, lack of car parking.
- There is no need for more housing as the EDDC Housing Needs Survey (2022) states there is a need for 12 affordable homes which will be met by 14 affordable homes at for CeramTec site.
- There are already two new developments on Coly Road (Saxon Meadow, land at Yaffles), plus the imminent 72 homes and 6 business units at former CeramTec site, so Colyton does not need any more housing.
- Lack of jobs in Colyton means residents of new housing will have to commute elsewhere.
- Coly_02 were rejected at appeal, too far to walk into town centre, loss of privacy due to level differences and spoiling views of AONB.
- Roads not suitable for extra traffic.
- A smaller amount of development is proposed at Colyton compared to other local centres, no explanation as to why.
- Proposed sites at Colyton are of Great Landscape Value and highly visible from across the Axe Valley and would erode the rural setting of Colyton.

LP_Coly_01 - Land to the west of Fair View Lane - Rejected Allocation

- One respondent criticised the use of the term “too remote” as a reason for rejecting the site.

LP_Coly_02a & LP_Coly_02b - Land at Hillhead - 2a Preferred Allocation / 2b Potential 'Second Best' Allocation

- Reasons for objecting to this site included the loss of scenic views, the negative impact on the East Devon AONB, the capacity of the sewage system / water run-off (increasing the risk of flooding), the damage to local wildlife habitats (including the adverse ecological effect on the Beer Quarry Caves SAC) and ancient hedgerows, the loss of farmland, pressures on the local school, access (both vehicular and pedestrian), lack of public transport and new employment opportunities, that the site is on land outside of the development area and the increase in traffic and light & air pollution.

- Other comments made reference to the prominent position of the site (above 200ft) and the potential for views into the site from the AONB being spoilt. Respondents said development would be harmful to the landscape and also damaging to the setting of Colyton itself.
- One respondent said that housing quotas in the Colyton Neighbourhood Plan should be used as the benchmark rather than the new Local Plan, whilst another said Government targets were now “advisory” rather than “mandatory” and should be treated as such. Others said development of this site would be contrary to policies in the Colyton NP, which should be respected.
- Another comment said houses should be built where there are employment opportunities, in places such as Exeter, Honiton or Axminster, rather than Colyton.
- There was a feeling that development would erode the existing “marked and abrupt transition” from town to countryside and that new homes would be too far away from facilities.
- Reference was made to a scheme for large-scale housing on this site that had previously been rejected (15/1758/MOUT) due to the site’s location in the countryside and its acknowledged value to the landscape setting of the town. One respondent referred to the site being in the Local Plan 1995-2011 as an Area of Great Landscape Value, so questioned why it could now be seen as suitable for development.
- Another criticism was that the allocation would not meet the sustainability objectives of the NPPF, which are “interdependent and require land to be co-ordinated with the provision of associated infrastructure and contribute to protecting & enhancing the natural environment”.
- Many suggested that Clay Lane is unsuitable to accommodate the additional traffic that this development would generate. It was noted that Hillhead is steep and not conducive to walking into town, and that there was blind corner access from Hillhead to Old Sidmouth Road, with considerable on-road parking at the junction with Burnards Field Road (with a lack of parking for existing bungalows there).
- Reference was also made to existing properties losing privacy, as new dwellings would overlook directly into bedrooms, light would be lost in gardens and that there would be increase in noise & traffic danger on Hillhead.
- It was suggested that there is still sufficient opportunity within the boundaries of Colyton to meet need in the foreseeable future.
- On a positive note, some respondents were keen to point out that the new owners of the site has committed to taking care in regard to any drainage, traffic and access issues, and that a well-built and environmentally friendly proposal, in conjunction with reasonable purchase costs, would be of benefit for local people (particularly first time buyers or those in need of affordable housing).

LP_Coly_03 - Land adjacent to Fair View Lane - *Rejected Site*

- One respondent suggested this site would be a better option to develop than Hillhead (Coly_02) whilst another respondent suggested Coly_06 would be a better option.
- Other concerns included the capacity of the primary school (with Coly_06 the suggestion for the location of a new school) and the adequacy of the sewage system.
- Developer (Baker Estates) not clear why this site has not been allocated as would be delivered to a high standard.

LP_Coly_06 - Land to the east of Colyton - *Rejected Site*

- Prefer this site for new housing rather than Coly_02.
- There was criticism that this site was rejected on the grounds of being in a flood zone when permissions had been granted in close proximity which are also in the flood zone.

LP_Coly_07 - Land to the east of Fair View Lane - *Rejected Site*

- One respondent agreed with the decision to reject the site, making reference to the amount of wildlife in the area.

LP_Coly_09 - Land adjoining Clay Lane - *Rejected Site*

- Respondents agreed that this site should be rejected for development because of the beautiful surroundings, visibility of the site, loss of farmland, the wildlife present on site and its use as a favoured area for walking.

LP_Coly_10 - Land on the east side of Apple Orchard - *Rejected Site*

- No comments

Omission sites at Colyton

- None identified.

Lympstone - General issues

A very high number of residents provided detailed objections to the multiple sites proposed within Lympstone parish. These sites included those listed below and a number of sites included in the assessments for sites to the north of Exmouth. Comments are included below.

- Devon County Council are concerned about primary school capacity at Lympstone.
- Lympstone Parish Council held an open session in November 2022 to inform residents and invite their responses to the Draft Local Plan. During the public session, the residents, when asked for their main considerations for giving a view on a proposed site, overwhelmingly listed:
 - A376 already at capacity;
 - Maintaining Green Wedges and Coastal Preservation areas;
 - Access to proposed sites;
 - Required Infrastructure;
 - Flooding (please see supporting evidence from Lympstone Flood Resilience Group's own report in the Annex at the end of this report.);
 - Maintaining Exmouth / Lympstone gap – no coalescence.
- From the Lympstone PC consultation event:

Reaction to proposed sites for Lympstone (values rounded to whole numbers – in descending order of opposition)

Site name and number of houses proposed by EDDC	YES %	NO %	No Preference Expressed or judged Possibly %
Lympstone 07 100 houses	7	86	7
Lympstone 08 14 houses	19	81	2
GH/ED/72 131 houses	19	79	2
Lympstone 10A 75 houses	14	79	7
Lympstone 09 54 houses	17	76	7
Lympstone 14 59 houses	31	60	10
GH/ED/73 46 houses	40	57	2
Lympstone 01 14 houses	43	48	10
GH/ED/75 6 houses	52	36	12

- A site promoter supports allocations in tier 3 settlements, particularly where there are good sustainable transport links such as at Lympstone. They consider that the villages have been under provided for in past Local Plans and therefore appropriately sized allocations such as GH/ED/73 are needed to deliver local housing needs and to support the vibrancy of villages and their services.
- Concerns that proposed development at Lympstone would place excessive strains on services and facilities.
- The gap between Lympstone and Exmouth should not be eroded and accommodate development.
- New housing in and around Lympstone is disproportionate to the existing village.
- Development will overwhelm the resources (school, GP) and infrastructure (surface drainage, sewerage, roads).
- RD&E is already at capacity, and there will never be sufficient infrastructure of any type in Lympstone village to support that amount of increased housing, traffic and families such as their need for schools, doctors surgeries, parking etc. It also obliterates the green wedge which negatively impacts on wildlife, health and wellbeing.
- Proposals ignore the Lympstone Neighbourhood Plan.
- Proposals will add to traffic on the A376 which is already seriously congested / at capacity, particularly with other proposals to develop Exton and Exmouth.
- There is minimal employment in Lympstone so new housing will mean out-commuting.
- Most of Exmouth's development is being pushed into Lympstone parish.
- The real number of homes being allocated to Lympstone is 499, as a further 202 houses are in Lympstone parish but allocated to Exmouth.
- Planned development goes against neighbourhood plan and is on green wedge, agricultural land and more that 2 miles from village centre.
- Affordable homes need to be addressed. Homes already built in Lympstone are way out of affordable homes for the upcoming young in our village school.eg homes by the church all out of the price bracket for young with growing families.
- National Highways anticipate growth here to be significantly Exeter facing, creating commuter and leisure trips through M5 Junction 30, and future discussions with National Highways is required on transport assessment and potential mitigation.
- The health, well-being and quality of life of Lympstone residents, and of those in the west of East Devon, has been disregarded. The result is a report that erodes trust and leaves residents feeling ignored, disheartened and helpless
- Communities recognise the need for development but members and officers of EDDC should be seeking organic, sustainable and equitable growth across all of East Devon. Respect the views of communities and work with them to achieve a way forward that is agreed rather than imposed.

- Communities like Lypstone deserve the opportunity to thrive and survive rather than be buried in inappropriate housing simply to shelter other areas of East Devon from any development.
- The plan states 'proximity to employment' as a reason for development. Lypstone is a village and provides minimal employment. These houses, outside Lypstone and Exmouth BUABs, will be habited by absent property investors, second-homers, holiday lets and commuters to Exeter and further afield. They will not be part of Lypstone or Exmouth.
- For your information, a FoI request showed that as at 20 May 2022 there were 2,637 second homes in East Devon and of these 603 (23%) were in the Exmouth and Lypstone parishes. In addition, at the same date there were 1,909 Empty properties in East Devon and 491 (26%) of these were in the Exmouth and Lypstone parishes. It is likely that one quarter of any development will provide second homes rather than needed primary homes for residents.
- As a Lypstone resident I am concerned and alarmed that Lypstone has been designated as a 'Service Centre' and that this is then used as the basis to allow a much greater level of development, including provision of industrial and commercial buildings as part of new development. Putting Lypstone on a par with, for example, Budleigh Salterton, is clearly wrong; Lypstone, with one shop and one part-time art gallery and no through roads lacks any reality as a 'service centre'.
- On the proviso that you are able to make the substantial investments in infrastructure required before significant development we think the best place to build new houses in or around Lypstone is on your 'Second Choice' site adjacent to Courtlands Lane. Overall, we feel this site would have a less deleterious impact on Lypstone than your 'Preferred' option either side of Meeting Lane.
- Around 200 of Exmouth's housing allocation are sited in Lypstone, not Exmouth.
- Lypstone is choked with traffic and has no available space for development.
- Object to proposed development at Exton and Lypstone as it would impinge on the green wedge and adversely affect their character.
- Agent for the landowner - The overall rationalisation of the Built-up Area Boundary, both to reflect previous built development and to identify suitable locations for additional future development, is considered reasonable and justified.

LP_GH/ED/71 - Gulliford Farm, Exmouth Road, Lypstone - Rejected Site

- It would ruin the character of the village, taking away rural green areas. Poor access and unsustainable location, not near rail. No jobs or shops anywhere near it. Dramatically increases traffic and cars on busy A376 and roads into Lypstone.

- Far too big to be tacked on to Lympstone Village. The infrastructure for the village (school, roads, community centres) is at capacity. A development of this magnitude cannot be tagged on with considerable negative impact on this infrastructure. Lympstone also prides itself on its sense of identity - the is maintained by its green field separation from neighbouring towns, villages, and other developments. This proposal joins up Lympstone to Nutwell Lodge, eroding that a distinct village community.
- Prime agricultural land needed for agriculture .Only access is onto A376 which is easily gridlocked. Frequently floods on to adjoining roads. Infrastructure not I place to support more people eg health and education.
- Good access on bus routes. Hidden from main road view.

LP_GH/ED/72 - Land at Meeting Lane, Lympstone - Preferred Allocation

- Historic England- Further to our initial assessment of the proposed sites it would be helpful to see the full HESA of this proposed allocation to enable one to determine whether it can be reasonably demonstrated that it is likely to be able to accord with national policy, guidance and legislation including the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Particularly with regard to setting of Nutwell Court and registered park.
- DCC state a culverted unmapped ordinary watercourse appears to cross centrally through the site and should seek opportunities to daylight and enhance this watercourse.
- A significant number of objections were received.
- This development will have a huge and negative impact on the health and wellbeing of Lympstone Parish residents.
- Lympstone PC -
 - This site is in Woodbury Parish but, if it is adopted, will impact Lympstone far more. Woodbury PC passed a motion to pass CIL money to Lympstone if this development is built but this intention could be rescinded and there is no regulation in place to ensure payment would happen.
 - As this development would sit in Woodbury Parish, precepts would pass to Woodbury and this is unacceptable as all the strain falls upon Lympstone. Lympstone's services and infrastructure would be unfairly strained if the site proceeded.
 - Even when asked if development took place on this site and it guaranteed provision of sports facilities and the dangerous junction accessing the A376 addressed, 60% still opposed development here and in GD/ED/73.
 - Heading south on the A376 this site is clearly visible. 131 houses will completely scar the rural landscape, impact the approach to Lympstone and change the character of the north

side of the village (as referred to in historic documents covering Nutwell Court and Gulliford Farm).

- The allocation is contrary to the neighbourhood plan approved in a local referendum. As a parish, we were assured that if we took the time to create a neighbourhood plan, this would protect the nature of the village from unwanted development. However, the built-up boundary for Lypstone has been quietly altered by EDDC with no local consultation
- The agent on behalf of the site owners has submitted a number of technical documents (relating to flooding, ecology, drainage and highways/access) to support their submission that this site is suitable for development. They object to the requirement for a mixed use scheme to incorporate 0.52ha of employment.
- I am a private resident of Glebelands road Lypstone. The impact of building directly behind us will not only be felt by a decrease in my property value, my and my family's wellbeing of having to endure living behind a major building site for a protracted period.
- The GH/ED/72 – 73 and 75 sites, which I am sure many residents are unaware of, are within the Woodbury Parish Council so therefore, Woodbury Parish Council would be collecting income and making decisions which impact on Lypstone rather than their own village. These sites will not be counted towards Lypstone quota and more housing will be required to fulfil Lypstone's quota of housing, this is very detrimental to Lypstone.
- Suggestions in the report of easy access to bus and rail and employment opportunities are unrealistic and presented in a misleading manner. Car use will be the norm for persons to travel to work on already overcrowded roads.
- The current infrastructure struggles to cope and schools, GPs, roads, public transport, flooding, drainage, sewage will be impacted upon. Few, if any, other areas of East Devon are being impacted upon in such a significant and disproportionate manner. Additionally, the A376 and RD&E hospital are both at capacity.
- Residents at this site suggested as remote from village core and therefore reliant on cars for travel.
- Housing density of site as proposed suggested a too high.
- The development will have significant negative effects on the environment.
- Farming land will be lost and the Coastal Preservation Area will be built upon and permanently lost – this directly contradicts your policy.
- Loss of ancient meadow land with flood implications.
- The green wedge between Lypstone and Exmouth will be seriously eroded; this directly contradicts your policy. It will accelerate the coalescence of settlements, destroying the sense of place and identity for residents.
- The open character of a green lung will be lost negatively impacting on the health and wellbeing of residents.
- Valuable wildlife corridors will be lost / loss of biodiversity.
- Important areas of landscape and visual amenity will be lost forever.

- A small number of comments expressed support for the site.
- Out of other sites this site does adjoin houses already and would look like a natural extension.
- A new access would be good along Nutwell road but Meeting lane i believe is on a bus route as there are 4 bus stops next to the site.
- Every village needs some growth to maintain its shops, schools even the pubs.
- The houses wouldn't be visible from the main road and if done nicely would be a lovely place to live.
- There are footpaths and cycle paths that could join this development enabling you to be safe when walking or cycling.
- Suitable site to build on- adjoins existing housing, you could walk to the bus stops and train station as well as local shops.
- A development that reflects local character would be welcomed.
- Site has sufficient space for local green spaces.

LP_GH/ED/73 - Land north-west of Strawberry Hill, Lypstone - Preferred Allocation

- DCC state a culverted unmapped ordinary watercourse appears to cross centrally through the site and should seek opportunities to daylight and enhance this watercourse.
- A site promoter considers the site to represent a sensible 'rounding off' of the settlement and notes that it is well contained by roads and the settlement boundary. However, they do not consider it to be suitable any employment use (they state that it would be incongruous in this village setting) and question why this is proposed when residents of the proposed housing would have easy access to employment via train in Exmouth and Exeter or via an easy cycle ride to the Woodbury Business Park.
- Lypstone PC - A proportion of residents accepted that some development was inevitable and reluctantly thought it a possible site. (Other concerns as expressed above/below notwithstanding).
- A significant number of objections were received.
- This development, in conjunction with the others, will have a huge and negative impact on the health and wellbeing of Lypstone Parish residents.
- Suggestions in the report of easy access to bus and rail and employment opportunities are unrealistic and presented in a misleading manner. Car use will be the norm for persons to travel to work on already overcrowded roads.
- The current infrastructure struggles to cope and schools, GPs, roads, public transport, flooding, drainage, sewage will be impacted upon. Few, if any, other areas of East

Devon are being impacted upon in such a significant and disproportionate manner. Additionally, the A376 and RD&E hospital are both at capacity.

- The development will have significant negative effects on the environment.
- Farming land will be lost and the coastal preservation area will be built upon and permanently lost – this directly contradicts your policy.
- The green wedge between Lypstone and Exmouth will be seriously eroded; this directly contradicts your policy. It will accelerate the coalescence of settlements, destroying the sense of place and identity for residents.
- The open character of a green lung will be lost negatively impacting on the health and wellbeing of residents.
- Valuable wildlife corridors will be lost.
- Important areas of landscape and visual amenity will be lost forever.
- A small number of supporting comments were received.
- The site appears suitable for development provided an excessive number of properties and access roadways/pathways are not built. The worry being flooding of site and adjacent roads, particularly as there appears to be a natural spring on site.
- The Northern end of the site at Meeting Lane should be the boundary of the built-up area.
- This site is suitable and could be developed sympathetically. Housing should be of a good design i.e cottage style and affordable.
- DEVON BANK along Strawberry Hill must be kept, it is good visual entrance to the village, as well as for wildlife; this is also a natural speed calming measure. Entrance to the development for vehicles should be off Meeting Lane only with a pedestrian access onto Strawberry Hill.
- Site is already next to new houses.
- Natural extension of existing houses. Has a natural spring so water run off etc would have to be carefully mitigated. Not as good as the other site with regards to access and linking up of footpaths and open space.

LP_GH/ED/74 - Land at Strawberry Hill, Lypstone - Rejected Site

- Completely outside the Neighbourhood plan and huge extension to the village boundary. Also unsuitable for housing given its exposed nature and the impact on flooding. Would put significant pressure on already strained local services. Good to see it has been rejected.
- Happy that this site has been rejected for development. It must be protected for the sake of wildlife, the environment, and local residents.
- This should be a green wedge to protect Lypstone Village's identity and is a beautiful gateway to the village. Building on this land would have a detrimental impact to the area.

It is virgin green belt, a wildlife corridor between the River Exe and Pebble bed Heath and has a high landscape sensitivity to new development including the close proximity of St Peter's school and other Grade 11 listed buildings. This land should remain as good agricultural land which is in the Coastal Preservation Area and must remain protected. If this land goes to development along with others along the A376 it will be a continual mass development between Clyst St George and Exmouth which must NOT happen, as village communities will be lost.

- Steep site

LP_GH/ED/75 - Land off Grange Close, Lypstone - Preferred Allocation

- Lypstone PC -
 - This site was the only one from the Public Consultation that received a majority of 52% in favour of development.
 - A proportion of residents accepted that some development was inevitable and reluctantly thought it a possible site. (Other concerns as expressed above/below notwithstanding).
 - The site is for a small number of dwellings which our Neighbourhood Plan and residents prefer.
- Site promoter supports allocation as a sensible 'rounding off' of the settlement.
- This development will have a huge negative impact on the health and wellbeing of Lypstone Parish residents.
- Access to the proposed site is via Grange Close, a small cul-de-sac, with a narrow curved private road at the end. This is entirely unsuitable as an access for construction vehicles.
- The increase in traffic, through the narrow cul-de-sac, would cause significant disruption and risk to safety for the occupants of the existing 12 properties.
- The current infrastructure struggles to cope and schools, GPs, roads, public transport, flooding, drainage, sewage will be negatively impacted upon. Few, if any, other areas of East Devon are being impacted upon in such a significant and disproportionate manner. Additionally, the A376 and RD&E hospital are both at capacity.
- Land will be lost and the Coastal Preservation Area will be built upon and permanently lost – this directly contradicts your policy.
- The development will have significant negative effects on the environment.
- The open character of a green lung will be lost, negatively impacting on the health and wellbeing of residents.
- Valuable wildlife corridors will be lost.
- Unsuitable access for construction phase.
- Suggestions that the site is too small for 6 houses.
- Important areas of landscape and visual amenity will be lost forever.

- A small number of supportive comments.
- It is a natural rounding off of the village boundary and can be developed without significant impact on the surrounding area.
- This proposal is for only 6 houses, which would be OK were this the only current proposal. However, the overall aggregate of proposed new housing in the village is beyond our current capacity.
- Not highly visible, contingent with existing housing. Would need to make sure that density was appropriate and included provision for necessary impact assessment on traffic, infrastructure etc.
- Logical extension of existing houses. Only concern would be more cars entering Longmeadow road and trying to exit at the Sadllers Arms.

LP_Lymp_01 - Little Paddocks, 22 Underhill Crescent, Lympstone - Preferred Allocation

- This will be hugely destructive, in an elevated location that will disproportionately impact on the amenity of the village.
- The only access is on to the Underhill Crescent/Underhill junction which is congested and dangerous with poor visibility due to on-street car parking.
- Lympstone PC -
 - A proportion of residents accepted that some development was inevitable and reluctantly thought it a possible site. (Other concerns as expressed above/below notwithstanding).
 - The site is for a small number of dwellings which our Neighbourhood Plan and residents prefer.
- Likely to generate more on-street car parking in an area where this is already an issue.
- This development will have a huge negative impact on the health and wellbeing of Lympstone Parish residents.
- The current infrastructure struggles to cope and schools, GPs, roads, public transport, flooding and drainage will be negatively impacted upon. Few, if any, other areas of East Devon are being impacted upon in such a significant and disproportionate manner. Additionally, the A376 and RD&E hospital are both at capacity.
- The development will have significant negative effects on the environment.
- Farming land will be lost and the Coastal Preservation Area will be built upon and permanently lost – this directly contradicts your proposed policy.
- The green wedge between Lympstone and Exmouth will be seriously eroded, which directly contradicts your policy. It will accelerate the coalescence of settlements, destroying the sense of place and identity for residents.
- The open character of a green lung will be lost, negatively impacting on the health and wellbeing of residents.

- Valuable wildlife corridors will be lost.
- Important areas of landscape and visual amenity will be lost forever.
- Agent for the landowner - The identified preferred allocation of the Site Lymp_01 (identified in green in the above local plan map extract) is supported.

LP_Lymp_02 - Land lying north of Clay Lane, Lympstone - *Rejected Site*

- I agree this site should be rejected as described.
- In addition the amount of extra traffic through the centre of Lympstone village would have very dangerous safety implications.
- The site is unsustainable, outside the BUAB, it's affects would be drastic on the Wotton Brook flood plain problem.
- Poor access.
- Site floods.

LP_Lymp_03 - Lympstone Nurseries - *Planning Permission Granted*

- It would ruin this area of the village, also it's on a floodplain.

LP_Lymp_04 - Land to the south of Meadowgate Cottage, Church Road, Lympstone - *Rejected Site*

- Green wedge, poor access, on a floodplain
- Additional pressure on very narrow part of road. Inappropriate density of housing.
- Extremely poor access as drive along a footpath. Not suitable for development.
- Very bad access onto a village road, flooding.

LP_Lymp_05 - Land to the south-west of Dawlish Park Terrace, Lympstone - *Rejected Site*

- I strongly agree with rejection of this site.
- Development of this site would create additional unnecessary traffic in already busy country lanes with the increased risk of accidents, particularly to walkers and cyclists.
- Sustainability doubtful.
- This site could suit some development of smaller cottage style properties, it is not remote and some people prefer living on the outskirts of a village. This site if developed

would not impact the landscape, it has good access to the village by road or footpath. This land would not be agricultural land loss.

LP_Lymp_06 - Hollywell Nurseries, Courtlands Lane, Lympstone - *Planning Permission Granted*

- I strongly agree with rejection of this site.
- I believe the information on which this selection was dismissed as a site for allocation is incorrect. A planning application search on the council's website returned no approved applications for this site. However, I agree with the result that this site has been dismissed for allocation for development!
- This is ridiculous- the road access is very poor with only 2 passing places and a right angle bend; no easy access to bus or train so everyone will drive; no space in the school or GP surgery so will all have to travel to Exmouth.
- The site is not appropriate for development:
 - way outside built-up area boundary
 - unsustainable location
 - in open countryside
 - in green wedge
 - not a brown field site
 - it is agricultural land and should be cleared of derelict green houses, which have not been used for growing tomatoes since 1995.
 - very narrow lane for access
 - poor visibility for access

LP_Lymp_11 - Land off Harefield Road, Lympstone - *Rejected Site*

- No comments

LP_Lymp_16 - Land off Underhill Close, Lympstone - *Planning Permission Granted*

- Agents for landowners - While Site Lymp_16 is consented for one large dwelling with annex accommodation, it is considered the site could easily deliver up to 5 – 6 additional units – this figure being considered reasonable in light of the number of units identified as deliverable on the four preferred allocation sites – and therefore the realignment of the Built-up Area Boundary to include Site Lyp-16 is supported. This would allow

additional development to come forward on this site which has been confirmed via appeal as being a suitable location for new development. The progression of the outline and reserved matters applications on the site demonstrates that the site is fully deliverable.

LP_Wood_39 - Rose Cottage, Exmouth Road - *Rejected Site*

- No comments

LP_Wood_43 - Land near Exmouth Road, Nutwell Road, Lypstone - *Rejected Site*

- No comments

LP_Wood_44 - Land at Nutwell Road, Lypstone - *Rejected Site*

- No comments

Omission sites at Lypstone

- None identified.

Woodbury General issues

- The village of Woodbury does not have enough local amenities with only one shop selling limited provisions and infrastructure won't be able to cope.
- More houses taking over green spaces will damage wildlife and push local people out of the village.
- Objection to development at Woodbury given proximity (within 10km) of the designated Exe Estuary.
- Woodbury is already under pressure from traffic travelling through its village to Exeter.
- Woodbury Parish Council (WPC) identify infrastructure issues as a major concern, suggesting traffic calming, 20mph speed limits, and suitable pedestrian routes across the parish.
- National Highways anticipate growth here to be significantly Exeter facing, creating commuter and leisure trips through M5 Junction 30, and future discussions with National Highways is required on transport assessment and potential mitigation.
- The owner of Woodbury Business Park states it is operating successfully and remains consistently full, highlighting a severe undersupply and significant demand for employment land in the area.
- Limited bus service from Woodbury means that new residents will have to drive to work.

LP_Wood_04 - Land off Globe Hill, Woodbury - *Rejected Site*

- Woodbury Parish Council does not support this site and agrees with EDDCs report.
- Object as waste of prime agricultural land.
- Access onto Globe Hill will be dangerous.
- Developing this site will degrade the historic and rural feel of Woodbury.
- This site should join up with 07 and 08 to improve traffic flow onto the main road with potential for a roundabout at the top.

LP_Wood_05 – Land at Venmore Farm, Woodbury - *Rejected Site*

- Woodbury Parish Council does not support this site and agrees with EDDCs report.

LP_Wood_07 - Land off Globe Hill, Woodbury - *Rejected Site*

- Woodbury Parish Council does not support this site and agrees with EDDCs report.

- This site should join up with 04 and 08 to improve traffic flow onto the main road with potential for a roundabout at the top.

LP_Wood_08 - Land to the rear of Orchard House, Globe Hill, Woodbury - Rejected Site

- Woodbury Parish Council supports this site for allocation as it is within walking distance of the village and school, and development would have to provide traffic enhancement.
- WPC state need to justify building on best and most versatile agricultural land.
- The site promoter supports allocation of this site and states that the assessment process was inconsistent and this site performs as well as preferred sites, for example by referring to agricultural land classification on this site but not others which are equivalent grades.
- Access on to Globe Hill will be dangerous.
- Object due to impact on historic village centre.
- This site should join up with 07 and 08 to improve traffic flow onto the main road with potential for a roundabout at the top.

LP_Wood_09 - Land off Globe Hill, Woodbury - Rejected Site

- Woodbury Parish Council supports this site for allocation as it provides an opportunity to enhance the village centre and development would have to provide traffic enhancement.
- WPC state developers would have to overcome heritage and TPO concerns.
- This land currently has very limited amenity value as enclosed by surrounding walls, so support development to help open up this central part of the village.
- Support developing this site as close to existing facilities and could encourage further facilities and benefit the village centre.
- Given there are already houses in between the site and Grade I listed church, this does not seem a relevant factor in considering this site.
- The recent consultation on this site showed a low density, well-designed development retaining important the landscape and heritage aspects of the site.

LP_Wood_10 - Land at Gilbrook, Woodbury - Preferred Allocation

- The Environment Agency advises that there are floodplains and a designated main river along the site edge that should be set aside as green infrastructure, with a buffer of at least 8m from the watercourse, free from built development.

- Historic England- Further to our initial assessment of the proposed sites it would be helpful to see the full HESA of this proposed allocation to enable one to determine whether it can be reasonably demonstrated that it is likely to be able to accord with national policy, guidance and legislation.
- Woodbury Parish Council and residents do not support this preferred allocation as it has poor access and connectivity to the village, particularly the distance to the school.
- Woodbury Parish Council due to flooding concerns.
- Woodbury Parish Council due to loss of good agricultural land.
- DCC understand there is a mapped flood risk asset within the allocation that needs to be considered.
- The agent on behalf of the site owners supports the allocation for housing but objects to the requirement for a mixed use scheme to incorporate 0.24ha of employment.
- Support this allocation as logical approach to development.
- Delivery requires pedestrian access across adjoining development and through floodplain, can't provide safe pavement
- Impact on setting of adjacent listed building
- Has not taken account of landscape and elevated views.
- Concern about the impact of additional traffic.

LP_Wood_11 - Land at the rear of Escot Cottages, Broadway, Woodbury - Rejected Site

- Woodbury Parish Council does not support this site as it has poor access, flooding concerns and encroaching into green wedge.

LP_Wood_12 - Land to the east of Higher Venmore Farm, Woodbury - Rejected Site

- Woodbury Parish Council and residents do not support this site and agrees with EDDCs report.
- Bell Cornwell on behalf of landowner urges this site is reconsidered as mixed-use allocation, focussing development in the northern part adjacent to other allocations.
- This site could provide alternative access to Woodbury and green areas.

LP_Wood_13 - Critchards, Woodbury - Rejected Site

- Woodbury Parish Council does not support this site and agrees with EDDCs report.

LP_Wood_14 - Land west of Pound Lane, Woodbury - Rejected Site

- Woodbury Parish Council and residents do not support this site and agrees with EDDCs report.

LP_Wood_15 - Land east of Pounds Lane, Woodbury - Rejected Site

- Woodbury Parish Council and residents do not support this site and agrees with EDDCs report.

LP_Wood_16 - Land of Broadway (Phase 2), Woodbury - Preferred Allocation

- The Environment Agency advises that there are floodplains and a designated main river along the site edge that should be set aside as green infrastructure, with a buffer of at least 8m from the watercourse, free from built development.
- Historic England- Further to our initial assessment of the proposed sites it would be helpful to see the full HESA of this proposed allocation to enable one to determine whether it is likely to be able to accord with national policy, guidance and legislation. Particularly with regard to the conservation area and listed building setting
- Woodbury Parish Council supports this preferred allocation as it is within walking distance of the village and school, would require pedestrian access to village and traffic calming measures.
- WPC state the perimeter hedge must be maintained and enhanced, and a footpath constructed along the stream corridor.
- DCC state there are known surface water flow routes that abut all of the site boundaries so need to ensure these are managed and not worsened elsewhere within a robust drainage strategy.
- The landowner supports the allocation of this site for housing. It is deliverable as a housing site and is well related to the existing built up area. It is well provided with facilities and there is a strong need for a mix of new housing including affordable housing. The technical work supporting the current planning application demonstrates that the development is deliverable.
- Support this allocation as logical approach to development.
- Would significantly change the landscape and rural character of the village, high impact on AONB due to size and proximity of site.
- Negative impact on CA and listed buildings
- Long distance intervisibility, site can be seen from other side of Exe estuary

- Rural public right of way will be urbanised
- Loss of Grade 2 agricultural land which is currently in use to grow crops.
- Concerned about traffic issues and no safe pedestrian crossing point.
- The road from Broadway to the school is unsafe for pedestrians as it is very narrow with limited footpaths.
- This area could be combined with Wood_10 and Wood_12 to achieve multiple benefits.

LP_Wood_19 – Land on the east side of Parsonage Way, Woodbury - Rejected Site

- Woodbury Parish Council does not support this site as it has poor access.
- Woodbury Parish Council objects due to potential loss of trees.
- Agree with not allocating site for the reasons given.

LP_Wood_20 - Land at Town Lane, Woodbury - Preferred Allocation

- Woodbury Parish Council does not support this preferred allocation as Town Lane has traffic issues, there is a pinch point at the school, and no safe pedestrian access to the village or school.
- DCC state there is an ordinary watercourse that impacts upon this site and opportunities to enhance this should be sought.
- The landowner supports the allocation of this site for housing. It is deliverable as a housing site and is well related to the existing built up area. It is well provided with facilities and there is a strong need for a mix of new housing including affordable housing.
- Town Lane is very narrow to provide access and has no pavement, a traffic survey shows it is busy and cars exceed speed limit.
- AONB and intervisibility should be addressed in the assessment.
- Construction noise, dust will be unacceptable for nearby existing residents.
- Concerned that surface water run-off from development will lead to flooding in Town Lane and elsewhere in the settlement.
- There are a number of large trees that provide habitat for a rookery which will be negatively impacted by development.
- Local people rent this field to graze horses, sheep etc so oppose developing this site.

LP_Wood_21 - Land at Knoll Cottage, Woodbury - Planning Permission Granted

- No issues raised.

LP_Wood_23 - Ford Farm, Woodbury - Potential 'Second Best' Allocation

- Woodbury Parish Council does not support this second-choice allocation as Town Lane has traffic issues, there is a pinch point at the school, and no safe pedestrian access to the village or school.
- DCC state there is an ordinary watercourse that impacts upon this site and opportunities to enhance this should be sought.
- Rural facing site, close to AONB
- Poor relationship to village, facilities are a 10 minute walk and no pavement can be provided.
- Object due to impact on wildlife, including rodents, snakes, birds, pond.
- There is no mains sewage on the current Ford Farm site, so additional development likely to cause sewage and drainage issues.
- Object due to poor access onto the main road.
- 18 houses on this site is too high density and out of keeping with surrounding area.
- See the objections in the planning application 21/0299/OUT refusal in 2021 – nothing has changed since then.
- Development will cause surface water run-off, leading to flooding along Broadway (B3179).

LP_Wood_24 - Land north-east of Webbers' Meadow, Castle Lane, Woodbury - Rejected Site

- Woodbury Parish Council does not support this site as it has poor access to facilities and is remote from the village. Castle Lane would require widening and hedgerows would be lost.
- Site promoter objects to non-allocation of the site, which is considered to represent a sensible approach to infilling. The site assessment exercise conducted by EDDC was flawed in relation to highway considerations and landscape impacts could be mitigated by limiting development to up to 70% of the site adjacent to Webbers Meadow.

LP_Wood_33 - The Top Yard, land at Venmore Farm, Woodbury - Rejected Site

- Woodbury Parish Council does not support this site for allocation and agrees with EDDCs report.
- Bell Cornwell on behalf of landowner recommend this site is allocated, with several benefits such as previously developed land, close to facilities, small site.
- Developing this site will improve the visual impact as you enter the village and provide important homes.
- This site could be developed alongside Wood_12, turning the difficult bend into a roundabout which would improve safety and pedestrian access.

LP_Wood_37 - Cricket field of Town Lane, Woodbury - Rejected Site

- Woodbury Parish Council and residents do not support this site as it is an important and well-used amenity area including the community orchard, cricket field, and dog walk.
- Object to this site because of adverse landscape impact.
- Do not support this site because of poor pedestrian access along Town Lane.

LP_Wood_42 - Webbers Farm, Castle Lane, Woodbury - Rejected Site

- Woodbury Parish Council and residents do not support this site as it is an important amenity and would result in a loss of important holiday provision which would be detrimental to local tourism and businesses.
- WPC object as this site is remote with no pedestrian access to the village.
- Omission sites
- Bell Cornwell submits an employment site on behalf of the landowner to be allocated to the west of Woodbury Business Park, to extend this successful, established employment site.
- Landowner suggests field to the west of Wood_10 as available for development, as it has low ecological value and could improve walking/cycling safety by avoiding the right-angled Down Corner.