

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 5 of 10

Chapter 6 (Part C) – Strategy for development at Service Villages / Other Sites

Pages 248-324

July 2023

Policy 26 - Development at service villages

General issues (not relating to specific settlements)

- Devon County Council note that some Service Villages do not have their own primary school or potential safe walking routes (such as Dunkeswell and Exton) and are therefore potentially an unsustainable location, need to provide additional home to school transport.
- Development at Service Villages should be modest to meet local needs only.
- Do not add second choice sites as these are unsuitable and not well related to the availability of jobs, services and infrastructure.
- Concerns that Smaller villages risk being abandoned if you don't provide some infill development which will attract more services in rural areas.
- Additional development in villages around Ottery will put even more pressure on infrastructure (schools, roads, doctors) in the town which cannot cope.
- Proposals seem proportionate to the villages.
- The East Devon AONB team state that settlements where allocations are proposed within the East Devon AONB should be subject to further assessment (either as LVIA or landscape appraisal) to assess the effect the proposals would have on the AONB. This relates to sites identified at Broadhembury, Chardstock, Dunkeswell (NB within the Blackdown Hills AONB), Kilmington, Musbury, Newton Poppleford, Otterton, Sidbury and Tipton St John. Policy 26 should be expanded to require that in those settlements additional assessments should be undertaken (using LVIA or landscape appraisals) 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.

Beer - General issues

- The Environment Agency welcome the designation of a coastal change management area.
- Several comments that Beer, along with other villages with similar level of population, facilities & services should/could support more development and not just to meet very local need, to support them to grow and thrive and serve surrounding areas and that Beer is more suitable for development due to level of amenities than some other villages in Tier 4.
- One respondent expressed surprise that no development is proposed at Beer in the draft plan and considers there are suitable sites but will need high quality design. Another welcomed no development being proposed at Beer.
- One comment suggesting Beer could be one location for increasing availability of Park & Ride facilities to further sustainable transport objectives.

LP_Beer_01 - Land at South Down Farm, Common, Hill, Beer - *Rejected Site*

- No comments made specific to this rejected site.

Omission sites at Beer

- Landowner representation putting forward land at Quarry Lane, close to the Beer Community Land Trust development at Little Hemphay, for inclusion in the Local Plan for employment, residential or recreational development, with suggested potential for this to include additional car parking to serve the CLT site.

Branscombe - General issues

- The Environment Agency welcome the designation of a coastal change management area.
- Very limited comments specific to Branscombe - one respondent expressed surprise that no development is proposed at Branscombe in the draft plan and considers there are suitable sites but will need high quality design. Another supported no development at Branscombe.

LP_Bran_01 - Land to the west of Cott Mead, Branscombe - *Rejected Site*

- No comments made specific to this rejected site.

LP_Bran_02 – Land at Cotte Barton Farm, Branscombe - *Rejected Site*

- One comment in support of development for affordable housing needed because the village is 'dying out' and young people are being forced out due to second homes and the costs of housing. No other comments and sentiments expressed specific to this rejected site.

LP_Bran_03 - Land at Deems, Branscombe - *Rejected Site*

- No sentiment expressed or comments made specific to this rejected site.

Omission sites at Branscombe

- None identified.

Broadhembury - General issues

- Generally respondents strongly objected to any new development at Broadhembury unless it was purely to provide affordable housing to meet local needs (and this was strongly supported). Many respondents felt that a settlement boundary was not justified and that this would preclude affordable housing which the community was already trying to provide.
- The Parish Council did not support the designation of site LP_Brhe_09 nor the new development boundary which includes it. Among other reasons, this would be inconsistent with policy and the NPPF (if it is interpreted in a way which recognises the dispersed nature of ED communities), doesn't comply with the LP objectives.
- The PC support the concept of 'service villages' but consider that some development should be allowed in the hamlets elsewhere in the parish in order to support the services, including affordable housing. They consider the hamlets to be a reasonable walking/cycling distance, accessible by electric vehicles and that the school serves this 'sustainable' hinterland.
- Overall, respondents were concerned that additional development would detract from the special historic character of the village, would impact upon heritage and natural assets and would exceed the capacity of local roads and infrastructure (especially the sewage pumpin station which is over capacity).

LP_Brhe_04 - Causeway End, Broadhembury - *Rejected Site*

- No comments were made

LP_Brhe_05 - The Old Orchard, Broadhembury - *Rejected Site*

- No comments were made but several 'sentiment' emojis indicated that respondents would be unhappy with development on the site.

LP_Brhe_07 - Land south of The Vicarage, Broadhembury - *Rejected Site*

- No comments were made but several 'sentiment' emojis indicated that respondents would be unhappy with development on the site.

LP_Brhe_09 - Land opposite Broadhembury Memorial Hall - *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 regarding Grade I LB.
- Devon County Council state that site design should consider any opportunities to enhance the existing watercourse running along the north east boundary, and the ordinary watercourse that crosses the site access.
- Site is not widely supported by the community
- Would support if development was only for affordable housing
- This is the least worst option, close to facilities and village hall, well screened, utilities are nearby
- May set a precedent
- Will block/detract from views of St Andrew's Church
- Unlikely that affordable housing will be provided by landowner
- Need to ensure that housing is affordable to local people
- Won't create an attractive gateway to the village, the approach lane is special in it's own right
- Object to settlement boundary as this will act against community desire to provide affordable housing
- Object to the introduction of a settlement boundary- not justified and doesn't take account of the whole village being a heritage asset
- Road access is dangerous
- Lighting will detract from dark skies
- May need third party landowner involvement to achieve access
- Detrimental to the setting of the village
- Residential garden paraphernalia and domestic outbuildings will detract from rural character
- Field is high biodiversity/ecology value
- Field already results in water run off and flooding
- Houses in Honiton and Cullompton are sufficient to meet need
- Broadhembury lacks infrastructure needed for new houses (and doesn't want it eg street lighting, pavements, signs)
- Oil central heating (no mains gas) will not be environmentally friendly
- Lack of capacity at local school
- Lack of sewage capacity- regularly overflows
- Any new development will detract from historic character of village
- The emerging Government guidance removes the requirement for a minimum amount of housing to be provided in the village

- The potential site boundary is arbitrary and doesn't follow natural features

Omission sites at Broadhembury

- LP_Brhe_02 at Dulford was submitted for 61 houses and was excluded from further consideration as Dulford is not a tier 1-4 settlement and so it did not meet the methodology for consideration for allocation. The owner advises that the site could alternatively be suitable for Gypsy/Traveller pitches should there be a need.

Chardstock - General issues

- The Environment Agency note that the village is in the catchment of the River Axe and that development will need to be nutrient neutral.
- The facilities available in Chardstock have been incorrectly assessed - there is no bus service or pub. The local post office sells that bare essentials only.
- The housing allocation for Chardstock would involve building on a green field site which is not climate change friendly or acknowledge the climate emergency.
- The existing village infrastructure struggles to support the present population and vehicle movements – adding another 30 houses will just add to the problem and increase pollution as there is no available public transport.
- Contrary to Neighbourhood Plan (NP) which only identified two affordable homes. Changes must reflect the NP.
- New housing is not likely to be affordable in the honest meaning of the word.
- Concerning proposed development Chardstock we live off the road into Chardstock at Honeyhill Farm our entrance comes onto the road into the village, between the times of 8.30am to 9.30 am and from 2.45 to 3.30 pm we find it impossible to get out of our lane and out to the main A358 due to the single lane road way, having put up with it for 39 years, we resolved not to go out at these times. On the occasion when we have had Ambulances and other emergency services trying to get to us, and our fellow neighbours, all have experienced life-threatening delays because of the difficulty getting through the lane. We are not opposed to the development subject to widening the narrowest parts of the lane.
- There is an undeniable need for housing especially for East Devon residents when looking for their own homes where they work.
- Would it be possible for as well as making properties affordable there could also be a Covenant to protect them from purchase from outside the area?
- Residents concerned over impact on road safety suggest that the secure infrastructure necessary for any future development must be reviewed and undertaken before any development is planned.
- It is appalling to consider ruining the peace and tranquillity of this beautiful rural village.
- The lives of the mainly older population would be devastated by such disruption to their daily lives by extensive long term building works, not to mention the increase in traffic which would be unsustainable.
- Consideration should also be given to local wildlife which would be destroyed by the removal of fields and hedgerow which form their habitat.

LP_Char_01 - Green Lane Farm, Chardstock - Rejected Site

- No comments

LP_Char_03 - Chubbs Yard, Chardstock - *Rejected Site*

- No comments

LP_Char_04a - Land off Green Land, Chardstock - *Preferred Allocation*

- Developer (Strongvox Ltd) supports the allocation of Char_04 as sustainable and suitable for development – commissioned landscape and design work show that 40 dwellings can be delivered.
- Developer (Strongvox Ltd) objects to employment land on this site as this will mean larger buildings that cannot respond as well to the landscape context and will reduce housing delivery.
- This site is within comfortable 20-minute walking distance of a primary school, community hall, convenience store, place of worship, pub, playing fields and bus stop.
- Access to the village is difficult, by narrow lanes with few passing places. This is particularly so at the start and end of the school day, when parents drive children to/from the school. There is no public transport to/through the village. Nearest is at A358 along a narrow lane with no footpath. Also, there is a lack of amenities within the village, eg pub is permanently closed and the situation of the local shop is precarious.
- I do not feel Chardstock can sustain any further housing developments due to all access roads to the village are single track, already very busy and dangerous to walk along.
- The river Kit is already failing due partly to sewage leaks.
- The bus service for the village runs along the A358 which is a mile from the centre of the village and not safe to walk along.
- Our pub is closed with little hope of it opening soon.
- There is talk about our church become a festival church. Even a housing development could not increase the numbers enough to change attendance figures enough to save this from happening.
- Our village shop is struggling to survive after a community buy out.
- Multiple comments expressed inadequacy of road network to cope with construction phase and development.

LP_Char_04b - Land off Green Land, Chardstock - *Rejected Site*

- Developer (Strongvox Ltd) supports the allocation of Char_04 as sustainable and suitable for development – commissioned landscape and design work show that 40 dwellings can be delivered.
- Developer (Strongvox Ltd) objects to employment land on this site as this will mean larger buildings that cannot respond as well to the landscape context and will reduce housing delivery.
- This site is within comfortable 20-minute walking distance of a primary school, community hall, convenience store, place of worship, pub, playing fields and bus stop.

Omission sites at Chardstock

- None identified

Clyst St Mary - General issues

- Need clarity on how the proposed allocations can support delivery of the Clyst Valley Trail.
- Clyst St Mary has seen much development recently without a corresponding increase in facilities.
- 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.

LP_Clima_01 - Land off Clyst Valley Road, Clyst St Mary - *Planning Permission Granted*

- No comments

LP_Clima_02 - Land at Winslade Park, Clyst St Mary - *Planning Permission Granted*

- This absorbs greenfield and plantation land. We should first develop brownfield land before moving on to essential land required to bring about sustainable food and promoting biodiversity in the region.

LP_Clima_03 - Homefield, Oil Mill Lane, Clyst St Mary - *Rejected Site*

- No comments

LP_GH/ED/53 - Land to the north of the A3052 between The Cat & Fiddle and Devon County Showground, Sidmouth Road, Clyst St Mary - *Rejected Site*

- No comments

LP_GH/ED/55 - Land to the north of the A3052 between The Cat & Fiddle and Devon County Showground, Sidmouth Road, Clyst St Mary - *Rejected Site*

- No comments

LP_GH/ED/56 - Land at Coxes Farm, Sidmouth Road, Clyst St Mary - *Rejected Site*

- No comments

LP_Sowt_01 - Land at Bishops Court Lane, Clyst St Mary - *Rejected Site*

- No comments

LP_Sowt_02 Land south of Bishops Court Lane, Clyst St Mary -*Rejected Site*

- No comments

LP_Sowt_03 - Land north of Sidmouth Road, Clyst St Mary - *Preferred Allocation*

- Agents for Core Strategic Land Limited (CSL) -
 - Fully support the Map extract for Clyst St Mary and in particular the inclusion of the site at Sidmouth Road in Clyst St Mary (Site Sowt_03) as a preferred allocation. This site and the general location is seen as suitable for new housing development.
 - The impact of developing this site would be minimal as it is already bounded on two sides by existing development, housing to the immediate west and The Show Ground to the immediate east. The existing boundary to the immediate east of the site, namely the Show Ground, prevents unfettered urban sprawl, therefore this is not an issue with development of this site.
 - This site is very suitable for housing, being a logical extension of the village, surrounded on two sides by existing development to the immediate south and west and up to a clearly defined and defensible boundary in the form of The Show Ground to the east. Therefore,

this sensible extension to Clyst St Mary at Site Sowl_O3 does not represent ribbon development but sensible rounding off.

LP_Sowl_04 - Land at junction of Sidmouth Road and Oil Mill Lane, Clyst St Mary - *Rejected Site*

- No comments

LP_Sowl_05 - Land at junction of Sidmouth Road and Oil Mill Lane, Clyst St Mary - *Rejected Site*

- No comments

LP_Sowl_06 - Langdon's Business Park and occupied units - *Rejected Site*

- No comments

LP_Sowl_07 - Denbowe, Clyst St Mary - *Rejected Site*

- No comments

LP_Sowl_09 - Bishops Court Lane, Clyst St Mary - *Preferred Allocation*

- 3West Developments Ltd supports the identification of Clyst St Mary as a Tier 4 settlement and the allocation of 35 dwellings. However, the company objects to the requirement for 0.14ha of employment land, which is unjustified and poorly evidenced. The site is in one ownership and can be delivered quickly.

LP_Sowl_11a - Land at Bishops Court Lane, Clyst St Mary - *Potential 'Second Best' Allocation*

- Savills Planning on behalf of the landowner of SOWT_11a site, suggested that SOWT_11a is a "Second Choice" site but can be combined with SOWT 03 to deliver a range of potential benefits, such as accommodate the Clyst Valley Trail through both sites and the opportunity to consider a road link from the Sidmouth Road through both

sites. Combining the two sites can bring forward and deliver a number of infrastructure and other public benefits which are of wider significance and can only be achieved by combining these two sites.

LP_Sowt_11b - Land at Bishops Court Lane, Clyst St Mary - *Rejected Site*

- No comments

Omission sites at Clyst St Mary

- A landowner (Mr and Mrs Murray) support Option 3 subject to the inclusion of their land of 2.1 acres/22 dwellings at Shephards Farm (map attached to Commonplace response).

Dunkeswell - General issues

- Dunkeswell Parish Council - It is the opinion of the Council that Dunkeswell does not need any more larger development sites as is proposed in the Draft Local Plan. Dunkeswell has had what it considers, reasonable growth since the last Local Plan review, this includes the Pump Fields properties and also the 9 properties at Land North of Louis Way (below MUGA/Allotments). Rather they would wish to see "organic" growth of individual properties, as and where required, in keeping with this rural area.
- The Sewerage System - The system is old with small pipework and is easily overwhelmed in places currently, adding more homes would only add to this issue.
- Dunkeswell does have Charity run Pre-School, but does not have Primary or Secondary School and if it did, the likelihood could be that other smaller schools in the local area (ie Broadhembury/Upottery) may close, in addition there would transport to and from school to consider and would this fit well with green targets?
- Bus Services - Services have been cut in recent years and as far as we are aware there are no plans to improve service levels in Dunkeswell. Currently there is a Mon – Sat service and no service on Sunday. There is no direct or timetabled bus service to serve those working at the industrial estate.
- Employment - Residents of Dunkeswell do not necessarily work on the industrial estate, and it is the opinion of the Council that the majority of residents actually work elsewhere, travelling by car to other towns, with people, not resident in Dunkeswell travelling here (mainly by car) to work.
- Other Services - Other local services could be unable to offer or cope with a large increase in resident numbers.
- The Council has noted that in some local areas, housing has been identified by Parish Councils and Residents as being required/appropriate (ie Upottery) and yet this has been declined. Is it not better to have housing where it required and wanted? Lessening the burden in other areas where it is not wanted or required?
- Could the mobile homes already in place at Dunkeswell at Hornbeam Park be considered instead of building a new development? Could the Holiday Lodges be granted residential status to allow people to downsize thus providing homes in established areas to become available for those wanting to upsize their home.

LP_Dunk_01 - Land at Hutshayes Farm, Dunkeswell - *Rejected Site*

- The site was considered to be acceptable and appropriate in the first round working draft local plan in which it was allocated for approximately 53 homes. The Council are requested to reconsider their conclusion to not allocate the site and reallocate the site for housing development of approximately 53 homes.

- The land is on a slope and has a high elevation above Abbey Road, this is not ideal for getting in and out of the site. One side has quite a sheer drop and there have been small landslides previously. The infrastructure of Dunkeswell will not cope with more houses as it does not cope with the ones we currently have.

LP_Dunk_02 - Land east of Manleys Farm, Dunkeswell - Rejected Site

- The Parish Council refute suggestions that the site proposed by EDDC for 43 new homes and 0.17 hectare of employment on land at Brookfield's, Dunkeswell (old Football Field), is a sustainable location with good transport links on the following grounds:
 - Roads and Transport - To access Dunkeswell from the Honiton or Hemyock/Wellington direction is by using lanes, that currently are not adequate. Maintenance on these roads is sporadic at best and regularly potholes and road surfaces are eroded into the road surfaces causing dangerous driving conditions, narrow lanes and large freight cause issues and also flooding creates issues in heavy rainfall with run off water on the hills collecting at the bottom of the hills.
 - Pavements - Pavements are patchy or non-existent in places, along the main road through Dunkeswell, towards the airfield continuing like this until well into the Old Village. This lack of pavements combined with the high traffic flows (including heavy goods vehicles) at certain times of the day do not make walking/cycling a safe experience. In response to village requests the Parish Council has been working with the Police to establish a Speed Watch group. Police guidance for Health and Safety, since lockdown, has been amended recently resulting in every proposed SpeedWatch site being rejected, as the Police say they fail to offer protected safe areas for volunteers or Police Officers.
 - Interactive roadside speed signs have been investigated and Highways have rejected these saying there is no place suitable as the main through road does not allow enough forward vision for the signs to be sited safely.
- Trees - many trees in Dunkeswell are TPO'd, at Jenwood Road (backing onto the proposed preferred site), trees are TPO'd and already cause owners and DPC enormous problems, with residents not being allowed to remove and replace them and the constant concerns of trees falling in high winds and shading properties.
- The land is on a slope and has a high elevation about the main road, this is not ideal for houses. The infrastructure of Dunkeswell will not cope with more houses as it does not cope with the ones we currently have.

LP_Dunk_04 - Land north of Louis Way, Dunkeswell - Rejected Site

- No comments

LP_Dunk_05 – Broomfields, Dunkeswell - Preferred Allocation

- The above issues (Dunk_02) would be doubled by building on the Broomfield site on the Highfield Estate side and exacerbate an already existing issue.
- Access to the proposed development - The Council agree unanimously that the access to Broomfield's is very narrow and probably doesn't currently meet the standards.

Omission sites at Dunkeswell

- None identified

East Budleigh - General issues

- None identified

LP_Ebud_01 - Land off Frogmore Road, East Budleigh - *Rejected Site*

- Agree with EDDC site assessment – outside boundary so unacceptable.
- Unacceptable access.

LP_Ebud_02 - Ashfield, Vicarage Road - *New Site - not assessed*

- Respondents were concerned that development would harm the listed building and its setting.
- Outside boundary and marked as green space in neighbourhood plan and should remain as such.
- Access problems and no safe footway to village.

LP_Ebud_03 - Land on the south side of Russell Drive - *New Site - not assessed*

- Would prefer this site to Ebud_02.
- A couple of respondents felt that the site should be excluded from settlement boundary due to highway safety issues.
- Grade 1 agricultural land.
- Planning permission has been refused in the past.
- Could only be developed if home on Russell Drive demolished.

Omission sites at East Budleigh

- None identified

Exton - General issues

- Proposed sites will impinge on the Green Wedge and adversely affect the rural landscape.
- Proposals are contrary to the Neighbourhood Plan.
- Sites will add to traffic on the already congested A376, particularly alongside other sites at Exmouth and Lympstone, with no suggested mitigation.
- 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.
- Exton is not sustainable as it has few services, facilities and jobs compared to Ebford/Clyst St George.

LP_Wood_01 - Field 4583, Exmouth Road, Exton - Preferred Allocation

- Woodbury Parish Council support this preferred allocation.

LP_Wood_27 - Marandor, Exmouth Road, Exton - Rejected Site

- No comments

LP_Wood_28 - Land to the north and east of Exton Farm, Exton - Preferred Allocation

- The Environment Agency advises that the southern boundary fringes the Woodbury Brook main river and state that this area should be set aside for green infrastructure with a buffer of at least 8m from the watercourse, free from built development. There has been previous flooding on record. Development may, therefore, provide an opportunity for floodplain improvements to reduce flood risk to the community downstream.
- Devon County Council note there is a long history of flooding on the adjacent Exmouth Road and downstream Station Road, as well as along Mill Lane and the southern boundary of the site – therefore a robust drainage strategy that seeks improvements should be considered.
- Woodbury Parish Council support this site only if the critical flooding issues on Mill Lane are addressed prior to development occurring.

- The landowner supports the allocation of this site for housing. It will help support the vitality of the settlement and provide a source of rural housing for local residents, including affordable, and diversify supply.
- Flooding will make this site inaccessible.
- Developing this site will lead to sewage outfall.

LP_Wood_41 - Land adjacent to the A376, Feniton - *Rejected Site*

- Woodbury Parish Council do not support this site - it is an important Green Wedge and is in the Coastal Protection Area.
- Agree that this site is too prominent, it is Green Wedge and development would adversely affect the character of the village.
- Agricultural land comments are correct but the same can be said about many sites in the area.
- Good transport links.
- Object to developing this site as it is a wildlife corridor.
- Local infrastructure cannot cope.

Omission sites at Exton

- None identified

Feniton - General issues

- The following question was asked in the consultation - What level of additional housing development do you feel is appropriate for Feniton for the period from 2022 to 2040? The responses recorded were:

| | Responses | % of respondents |
|-------------------------------|-----------|------------------|
| Zero | 9 | 25% |
| Between 1 and 50 new homes | 17 | 47% |
| Between 51 and 100 new homes | 3 | 8% |
| Between 101 and 250 new homes | 3 | 8% |
| Between 251 and 500 new homes | 2 | 6% |
| 501 or more new homes | 2 | 6% |
| Total | 36 | 100% |

- Devon County Council (DCC) note all allocations are within the Feniton Critical Drainage Area, which means this catchment needs to be protected from development pressures.
- DCC state the SUDS hierarchy should be applied, all off-site surface water discharges from development should mimic “greenfield” performance – see CIRIA SUDS manual and LLFA guidance.
- A petition was received, objecting to the inclusion of all/any of the amber second choice sites due to a lack of facilities and infrastructure, additional car journeys on inadequate country lanes, exacerbation of existing flooding, issues of inconvenience and safety with the level crossing and loss of open countryside, agricultural land and wildlife habitat. Brownfield sites should be developed. Agree that the red ‘rejected’ sites should not be developed. Support 42 houses on the preferred site at the former Burlands Mead nursesey.
- There was more general public concern around flooding issues and the ability of the village to accommodate extra development without worsening flooding matters (recent and planned flood alleviation measures were cited as inadequate).
- Concern was raised that the train service is poor and many residents are car dependent with few actually using the train. Though it was suggested that roads to the village are poor.
- Concern was raised that there are limited employment opportunities at the village.
- Reasons for favouring development at Feniton included – the presence of a primary school, village hall, shop, recreation facilities, and proximity to Exeter.
- The capacity of facilities to accommodate growth was challenged and it was highlighted that the facilities that do exist are limited in number.

- A respondent advised that the allocation of a single site in Feniton risks housing delivery as it may have a lower yield or not come forward at all.
- Payhembury PC – Concerns over the scale of proposed development at Feniton including; impact on already stretched local infrastructure including facilities (school places, doctors, etc); impact of increased traffic on local, often narrow, roads; pedestrian and cyclist safety.
- Concern was raised that large scale development would completely change the character of the village.
- A number of respondents referred to the past ‘super Inquiry’ from 2014 where and Inspector rejected to larger scale development proposals, but accepted a smaller one.
- It was highlighted that the plan strategy places Feniton in Tier 4 where only modest development is proposed.
- Numerous respondents commented that the roads are unsuitable for additional traffic, especially the single track lanes around the village
- A lack of infrastructure was a common concern, with difficulty accessing dr’s, dentists, healthcare and with sewage capacity
- Railway crossing is the only crossing on a crossroads in England, and barriers are controlled in Basingstoke. Traffic congestion onto Ottery Road is already severe at times and additional traffic will worsen the danger
- Flood alleviation scheme was calculated based on existing houses, it won’t have capacity for the allocations (especially as some allocations develop land needed for alleviation)
- Insufficient sewage capacity for any extra houses

Many of the above matters were raised in respect of potential individual site option choices (below) and are not repeated again in the individual site assessments, unless a specific site relevant factor is highlighted.

There were, however, also (limited) representations in favour of development at Feniton:

- Agents for Bloor Homes advised: Feniton represents an unconstrained area. Indeed, it is strategically well placed with few environmental constraints, located outside the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty [AONB] and Coastal Preservation Area with relatively strong sustainability credentials including the railway station and a reasonable provision of facilities and services including primary school, shops, pub:
- A respondent commented that Feniton is sustainable, with a range of facilities and good public transport, more housing sites should be identified

LP_Feni_01 - Land at Feniton forming park of Sherwood Farm - *Potential 'Second Best' Allocation*

Objection to site Feni_01 as a development choice were raised on the grounds of:

- being agricultural land;
- relevance to flood prevention;
- Site and adjacent lane are prone to flooding;
- wildlife interest;
- Being outside of the existing Built-up Area Boundary for the village;
- Would merge Feniton into the hamlet of Colesworthy

Issues in favour of the site included:

- The right side of the level crossing to get to the A30 highway.

LP_Feni_03 - Land at Long Park Farm, Feniton - *Rejected Site*

Objection to site Feni_03 as a development choice were raised on the grounds of:

- Loss of agricultural land;
- DCC welcome the rejection of this site as it is located within or close to a Mineral Safeguarding Area or Mineral Consultation Area.

LP_Feni_04 - Land off Ottery Road, Feniton - *Rejected Site*

Objection to site Feni_04 as a development choice were raised on the grounds of:

- Highway access to the site is poor and adjacent road is congested at key points in time and there are narrow points and congestion at the rail crossing;
- Lack of pedestrian access alongside the site;
- DCC welcome the rejection of this site as it is located within or close to a Mineral Safeguarding Area or Mineral Consultation Area.

Issues in favour of the site included:

- A respondent advised: The only advantage of this site is that of all the sites in Feniton it is closest to the A30 where most traffic will inevitably head.
- Agents for Bloor Homes advised that:
 - Strategic Policy 26 is appropriate in terms of proposing growth at Feniton;
 - the proposed site allocation at Feniton for 42 homes would be insufficient to meet development needs for the village for the plan period;
 - The site is well located to accommodate development with low levels of constraint/sensitivity;
 - The site has good public transport connections;
 - There are lower levels of landscape sensitivity at the site;
 - The site will aid delivery of new market and affordable housing
 - The site will help delivering local flood mitigation -
 - The site will provide publicly accessible open spaces
 - The Site will be designed to achieve a biodiversity net gain.
- Agents for Bloor Homes (advise they) have submitted a Mineral Resource Assessment [MRA] (prepared by Wardell Armstrong, dated September 2022) to the Council following the Call for Sites consultation. The report concludes that due to the small quantity of the safeguarded mineral on this site, it is highly unlikely that the mineral would ever be suitable for, or subject to, commercial extraction either now or in the future. In addition, the proposed development will not prejudice the future working of the safeguarded mineral resource to the southwest of the site. The site therefore meets the requirements of adopted mineral safeguarding policy “Policy M2: Mineral Safeguarding Areas”. They object to the Council’s conclusions that Site meets the definition of ‘unachievable’.

LP_Feni_05 - Land and buildings at Burland Mead, Feniton - Preferred Allocation

This site is proposed as an allocation and received more comments in favour of development than other site options in the village.

Objection to site Feni_04 as a development choice were raised on the grounds of:

- Existing problems of foul and surface water drainage may be worsened by development of this site;
- The removal of any trees from this sight will impact on the carbon footprint of the village and ha a detrimental effect on wild life that have had 30 years to make this their home. Maybe some endangered species live here
- Question whether this site is capable of accommodating 42 dwellings given the site size and nearby constraints.

Issues in favour of the site included:

- A respondent advises: Most suitable site for development to satisfy the housing requirements of the village. Ideal, central location with good access. Unused (brownfield) site.
- Development of this site could offer opportunities to improve this part of the village the sites has lain derelict for some time.
- It was suggested: A new over 55's development would be great and might encourage older residents to move and free up family housing stock in the village.
- This site is closer to the A30 so the impact on the village of additional traffic and extra car journeys could be somewhat less than other sites.
- The site is seen to fit within village boundaries and make use of vacant land.

LP_Feni_06 - FPFA Club, Station Road, Feniton - Rejected Site

Objection to site Feni_06 as a development choice were raised on the grounds of:

- Loss of sports grounds and community facilities in the village with no other better locations for such provision

LP_Feni_07 - Lyndale, Feniton - Potential 'Second Best' Allocation

Objection to site Feni_07 as a development choice were raised on the grounds of:

- DCC state there appears to be significant flowpaths running through or adjacent to this site which cause flooding to property in Feniton, so consider opportunities to reduce peak runoff.
- EDDC appear to have forgotten that planning permission was granted some years ago to site the attenuation pond in this field, being part of phase4 of the very important and long overdue Feniton Flood alleviation scheme.
- Traffic from this site would exit the village from north of the railway line. It is also some distance away from access to the A30. Traffic already backs up through the village and to the north when the level crossing barriers are down.
- Increased risk of flash flooding in Station Road, as concreting over this area will reduce the ability of the ground to absorb run off from the higher ground behind.
- Access onto the thin lane, which is already difficult and dangerous for pedestrians, cyclists and cars, would be awkward and would increase traffic near the primary school which is already very busy.

Issues in favour of the site included:

- The natural & logical choice if a Second Best site has to be developed, as it would partially blend Old Feniton village with new Feniton. Level site with reasonable, safe access.

LP_Feni_08 - Land south-east of Beechwood - *Potential 'Second Best' Allocation*

Objection to site Feni_08 as a development choice were raised on the grounds of:

- Too close to Old Feniton to the point where old and new Feniton will almost join and will spoil the picturesque land surrounding old Feniton;
- This site is impractical for access by vehicles approaching from the old village from Green Lane or heading towards the old village. Developing the site will cause substantial and constant traffic bottle necks along this part of Green Lane.
- It was a site rejected at the Feniton super appeal.

Issues in favour of the site included:

- Agent submits this land plus land to the south in support of response that Feniton should have a greater level of development – entire site could accommodate around 95 dwellings.
- This site is within comfortable 20-minute walking distance of public transport including bus stops and the train station providing connections to Exeter and beyond.
- The bulk of this site lies outside the built up area boundary for Feniton; however a small section lies within it. Small scale development on this small section only may be achievable.

And Greenslade Taylor Hunt as agents for the prospective developer advise:

- The plan is not consistent with national policy in respect of not allowing villages to thrive and grow (cross references to Policy 1);
- All sustainable settlements should help deliver housing growth (this cross references to Policy 2).
- Allocation for housing at Feniton and settlements under Policy 2 does not reflect local needs. There should be an overarching methodology used and applied to establish need, or a set figure for housing growth should be established.

- The site lies outside of protected landscapes;
- There are no nearby wildlife designated assets;
- The land does not present any obvious physical or planning constraints that would limit its development.
- Land falls in full within Flood Zone 1, the lowest category of risk from flooding. There is ample space on site to attenuate surface water on site 14 | Page and connect into the upgraded systems to provide a betterment.
- There is no evidence of contamination;
- A range of housing types could be accommodated;
- Development would be viable.

LP_Feni_09 & 11 and LP_GH/ED/38 - Land at Sherwood Cross - 09 & 11 - Potential 'Second Best' Allocation / GH/ED/38 - Rejected Site

Objection to sites Feni_09&11 and LP_GH/ED/38 as a development choice were raised on the grounds of:

- DCC state there appears to be significant flowpaths running through or adjacent to this site which cause flooding to property in Feniton, so consider opportunities to reduce peak runoff.
- The road bisecting 09 and 11 is a narrow country road which already struggles to properly support existing traffic levels, let alone the additional traffic development here would bring.
- The site contains a ridge to the north which would make housing more visible.
- Colestocks Road, from which access to the site(s) would be gained, runs north/ south from Feniton to Colestocks. There are numerous pinch points along this road which do not allow two cars to pass.
- Traffic congestion would also increase travelling south from these sites, causing more stationary traffic back up from the level crossing.
- The field on which site Feni 11 is proposed currently absorbs significant amounts of runoff water from Charlton Hill and Cheriton Hill. Development would exacerbate flooding problems.
- The roads around this site flood from surface runoff.
- These sites are all north of the railway line. They are also the furthest away from the A30. Traffic already backs up through the village and to the north when the level crossing barriers are down.
- Development could result in demolition of a listed building.
- The loss of open countryside, productive agricultural land and wild life habitat would be huge.

Issues in favour of the site included:

- A respondent advised: best place in Feniton to build much needed new houses the land is relatively flat and being on the North Weston side of Feniton does not interfere with Old Feniton and has no heritage impact its nice and close to a train station giving residents easy access to Exeter and Honiton
- The site promoter of Feni_11 confirms that the site scores well in SA terms and is generally unconstrained. Landscape impacts could be minimised through planting of a landscape buffer and development on the site would represent a logical and integrated extension of the settlement with some degree of containment within the existing settlement framework. The creation of a landscape buffer on the northern, eastern and western extents of the site, with associated native structural tree planting, would substantially reduce landscape and visual effects with respect to sensitive visual receptors. Furthermore this would provide an new defensible landscape buffer to the north of Feniton, creating a softer and more integrated settlement edge to the village than exists at present.

LP_Feni_10 - Westlades, Feniton - Potential 'Second Best' Allocation

Objection to site Feni_10 as a development choice were raised on the grounds of:

- This site is north of the railway line. It is some distance away from access to the A30. Traffic already backs up through the village and to the north when the level crossing barriers are down.
- Too close to old Feniton Village and will spoil the land.
- Building here would be detrimental to the government's aim to cut greenhouse gasses by removing these well established trees. As such a small site it would be impractical in achieving your target of delivering houses.
- Would exacerbate traffic pressure on old Feniton with existing roads already used as a "rat-run".

In support of the site was representation reading:

- As owners of site LP Feni 10, we can confirm that this site is deliverable as set out in Local Plan Appendix 2 Site Selection- interim findings at Tier 4 settlements.

LP_Feni_15 - Long Park Farm, Feniton - *Potential 'Second Best' Allocation*

Objection to site Feni_15 as a development choice were raised on the grounds of:

- This site is currently an established orchard. Trees are so important to the world an orchard really should be prioritised over other forms of land use.
- Alongside the inherent food production value, the area is a wildlife habitat. Rare bird have been seen in the trees and owls are heard at night.

Issues in favour of the site included:

From agents, Mantra Planning, acting for the landowner made representation advising that LP_15 and land to the east, Feni_03 (though in representation reference is to Feni_13 and also Feni_12) are suitable and appropriate for development they consider:

- Feniton is, in principle, an appropriate location to accommodate residential development, they cite the role and function if settlement study;
- The note lack of landscape, heritage or ecological constraints as highlighted in the sustainability appraisal
- Weight should not be attached to Devon County Council education capacity comments as concerns raised are a widespread strategic issue, apply to many sites and education provision can be addressed;
- It is considered it is highly unrealistic that the sites will be utilised for mineral working in the future;
- In landscape terms the site is shielded from wider landscape views
- The site feels close to the centre of Feniton;
- A Planning Permission in Principle applies to part of the overall site area;

LP_Otry_20 - Land to the south-east of Bridge Cottages - *Potential 'Second Best' Allocation*

Objection to site Feni_20 as a (employment site) development choice were raised on the grounds of:

- This site is currently an orchard. Trees are a vital part of our environment. Granting permission for these to be replaced by buildings would fly in the face of the recently adopted Devon Tree Strategy.

- Green Lane cannot handle increased traffic. The exit onto Ottery Road is dangerous and includes a blind corner, there are also blind pinch points by the railway bridge.
- There is no pedestrian footpath along any part of Green Lane.
- The building is a chicken farm which hasn't been used for 3 years but will be used in future to enhance our agricultural heritage here in Feniton.
- The roads around this site flood from surface runoff.

Mantra Planning, acting for the landowner advised:

- Otry_20 has been submitted for inclusion as an employment/ Commercial site. There is an existing agricultural barn on site which would benefit from Class R (GPDO 2015 as amended) Permitted Development Rights. The wider site is available for commercial/ employment use and this includes the erection of new buildings. The current trees surrounding the site are that of a commercial apple orchard, a suitable tree strategy could be implemented which sees partial removal of the orchard.

Issues in favour of the site included:

- There are very few employment opportunities in Feniton. The vast majority of people who work therefore have to travel - mostly by car.
- There is an existing agricultural barn on site which would benefit from Class R (GPDO 2015 as amended) Permitted Development Rights. The wider site is available for commercial/ employment use and this includes the erection of new buildings. The current trees surrounding the site are that of a commercial apple orchard, a suitable tree strategy could be implemented which sees partial removal of the orchard.

Omission sites at Feniton

- The land promoter requests that further consideration be given to sites Feni_12 and Feni_13 as they were harshly assessed and prematurely discounted from the site selection process based on landscape impacts and mineral consultation area designation. Proximity to existing properties mean that onsite mineral working would therefore raise a number of issues in terms of impacts on existing neighbour amenity levels. It should also be noted that, unlike many of the other MCA sites in the plan area, the mineral rights for these sites are in private ownership and are unlikely to be sold to any third party. Therefore, it is highly unrealistic that the sites will be utilised for mineral working in the future and further consideration should be given to their allocation in the draft Local Plan, particularly given their suitability in all other areas.

- The sites were assessed as being of “some prominence in landscape terms.” We would respectfully point out that the sites are bordered by residential development on two sides and rising land to the south; any development would therefore either be obscured by or seen within this built context. In addition, any formal application would be informed by a landscape assessment to ensure a sensitive scheme is developed and mitigation measures incorporated to avoid, reduce or offset significant negative effects on the landscape.

Hawkchurch - General issues

- The Environment Agency note that the village is in the catchment of the River Axe SAC and that development will need to be nutrient neutral.
- Object to Hawkchurch being classified as a Tier 4 settlement, it should not accommodate development.
- The scale of development proposed at Hawkchurch is far too high given it has had the highest number of new houses of any village in East Devon in the last 20 years.
- 20 houses is more realistic for Hawkchurch.
- Development will increase the number of cars travelling along narrow lanes, safety concern.
- Lack of jobs and facilities apart from a shop and once a week bus service.
- Increasing population by 30% without improving local services and transport is irresponsible.
- Proposed development will mean a loss of tranquillity in this rural village.
- Adverse impact on water supply and sewerage.
- Insufficient infrastructure, facilities and roads for additional development.
- Will spoil character of beautiful area.
- Hawkchurch Parish Council (PC) – The PC makes the following conclusions regarding the draft Local Plan:
 - The inclusion of Hawkchurch as a Tier 4 village is based on flawed assumptions (including the claimed hourly bus service which in reality is one service per week) and does not align with the spatial and low carbon strategic policies.
 - The level of proposed development is too high, is not required locally and there would be a significant negative impact from the scale of development on the character of the place.
 - It would be preferable for the Neighbourhood Plan to identify sites for smaller scale development that is in keeping with local needs.
 - The proposed development is identified as a 32% increase in housing. Does the 32% include exception sites in the calculation rather than development within the settlement boundary only.
 - Siting large scale development in Hawkchurch runs counter to the spatial and low carbon strategies as proposed.
 - The figure of 38 houses does not account for the 0.6Ha of employment space and should be reduced accordingly.
 - The approach to each allocation has not been consistent with regard to the minimum / maximum allocations for each site.
 - Changes to the settlement boundary are not clear in terms of both revisions made and the rationale for the inclusion of land.
- Hawkchurch Parish Council (PC) - Multiple residents commented on the lack of public transport, increased traffic, access at the junction, narrow lanes, congestion in the

centre of the village, inadequate infrastructure (drainage, sewerage, and water supply systems), impact of traffic on pedestrians (including elderly residents and children on roads with no paving), and limited local employment opportunities. A housing estate shouldn't be in a rural village, the proposed density of housing is too high, partly green site, actively used pastureland, the shop is a tiny community shop and has limited supplies, the children's playground in the centre of the village is adjacent to the proposed access road junction with the main street, the shop is located on the site to be developed.

- Hawkchurch Parish Council (PC) - Reasons cited against the development of employment land at this site include: Noise, increased traffic, access, narrow lanes, spoil the peace and tranquillity of the place, won't create employment for villagers, even more parking needed, current industrial units are not fully occupied.

LP_Hawk_01 - Norton Store, Hawkchurch - Preferred Allocation

- This site was rejected in the SHLAA 2014 because of poor access.
- CG Fry & Son Ltd on behalf of client -
 - G Fry supports the inclusion of Hawkchurch as a Service Village capable of supporting limited new development. Such new development is the lifeblood of smaller settlements and helps to support local services and facilities which are, in the case of Hawkchurch, the primary school, public house and village/community shop. Such new development is often promoted by landowners themselves or SME housebuilders such as C G Fry and the quality of development and quality of local engagement around its delivery is highly likely to be far superior to larger PLC/volume housebuilder schemes. Schemes like this support the SME sector and support the delivery of high quality local open market and affordable homes.
 - C G Fry has instructed a technical team to assess Hawk_01 and those investigations confirm that the site is suitable, available and deliverable and has no obvious constraints beyond the matter of phosphates in the River Axe SAC catchment. Studies undertaken include preliminary drainage assessment, foul drainage assessment, wider utilities assessment, ecological assessment, landscape assessment work on physical access into the site and wider connectivity.
 - C G Fry can see no practical reason why this proposed allocation should not proceed and C G Fry looks forward to engaging with the Hawkchurch community to deliver a high-quality housing-led scheme.
 - C G Fry would also be delighted to engage with Officers to discuss and share the evidence base at the appropriate juncture. For now, C G Fry looks forward to the allocation being retained in the emerging LP.
- Suggestion that the allocation would represent over development of the site / locale.

- Totally unsustainable with only one bus per week. The heavy traffic on the single lanes is already dangerous. And everyone who moves into the proposed new dwellings will drive cars. So much for your vaunted climate change policy!!
- Concerns expressed from multiple representations over lack of infrastructure with implications for road network, school places, health services, flooding, drainage, sewage, local facilities.
- Concerns expressed over local biodiversity, trees and hedgerows.

LP_Hawk_02 - Field south-east of Hawkchurch School, behind and adjacent to School Close - *Rejected Site*

- The number of homes planned for Hawkchurch, 38, is simply not feasible. This a a small, rural village, accessed by narrow lanes, serviced by a once-a-week bus, with only a village shop as an amenity. The village school will not be able to accommodate the number of additional children, the road cannot support an additional 38-76 vehicles, there are limited job opportunities within the village so people will have to travel for work if not able to work from home. The proposed locations mean the houses will be 'packed in', and therefore unlikely to be in keeping with the area and road access to the sites is already poor. 38 homes is simply too many for the village to support.
- This is not an appropriate site for further development. I believe the building of some additional homes can be supported, but not a development of 38 homes. Hawkchurch does not have the infrastructure to support an increase in population of that order. A cap of 20 homes should be applied.

Omission sites at Hawkchurch

- None identified

Kilminster - General issues

- None identified

LP_Kilm_01 - Land off Shute Road, Kilminster - *Rejected Site*

- Destruction of farmland.
- This is just another piece ribbon development as are most sites in Kilminster. Inappropriate.
- Outside the original building area and too far out of the village. Encroaching on the Shute Woods area.

LP_Kilm_02 - Birchwood Farm, Shute Road, Kilminster - *Rejected Site*

- Outside of building line, developments should be infill only.
- Destruction of farmland impacts on the ability to provide crops for both human and animal consumption. There would be a huge impact on the local ecology and habitat, especially with climate change looming.
- Ribbon development and destruction of high quality farmland essential to UK's food security.
- Would not want this site developed.

LP_Kilm_03 - Land off Springhead Lane, Kilminster - *Rejected Site*

- Poor road access, loss of habitat
- The site would be a great location for a small-scale housing development for locals and key workers. The site borders some woodland, but it has been untouched for many a year and has not been maximised for its ecological benefit.
- Ribbon development causing destruction of high quality farmland essential to UK's food security.
- This is outside the existing building area of the village. It is good agricultural land - we do not want to lose it.
- Would not want this site developed as access off springhead lane would mean increased traffic through the centre of village to access the A35, via The Street, The Hill and George Lane.

LP_Kilm_04 - Paddock off Springhead Lane, Kilminster - Rejected Site

- Outside of building line, Poor road access, loss of unspoilt habitat
- Ribbon development. Destruction of high quality farm land essential to UK's food security.
- Would not want to see this site developed as access to it via Springhead Lane it would result in increased traffic through the central part of the village to reach the A35 via The Street, The Hill and George Lane

LP_Kilm_05 - Land at Pit Orchard, Bimbom Lane, Kilminster - Rejected Site

- Poor road access, too close to conservation area, loss of habitat
- Outside of building line, road access unsuitable, not suitable for development
- Inappropriate development onto narrow dangerous lane; public transport and amenities such as shops, schools etc. only accessible via such lanes or A35. All residents would require personal transport.
- This site should not be developed as access is poor via very narrow single track roads- BimBom Lane and Silver Street. Traffic from the site would have to use these lanes and also George Lane, increasing vehicles traveling through the central residential part of the village to reach the A35.

LP_Kilm_06 - Land at Gore Lane, Kilminster - Rejected Site

- Destruction of high quality agricultural land essential to UK's food security. Development would be adjacent to narrow dangerous lanes and would vastly increase vehicular traffic as there is no public transport serving this area and highly unlikely to be any in near to mid-term, maybe never.
- Would not want to see this site developed as it would result in increased number of vehicles traveling through the residential area of the village to reach the A35. The site is also on higher ground so the development would be very visible to the rest of the village.

LP_Kilm_07 - Land adjoining Breach, Kilminster - Rejected Site

- Outside of building line, poor road access, loss of more unspoilt habitats.
- Infill but access via poor quality lane and adding traffic to narrow lanes.
- Situated on a pleasant footpath - would spoil the walk.

- Not the place for a lot of housing which would not sit well with the surroundings. One or two houses could fit.

LP_Kilm_09 - Land east of George Lane, Kilmington - Preferred Allocation

- Devon County Council (DCC) state this site has surface water flooding and an unmapped ordinary watercourse which should be considered as part of the design.
- DCC note this site falls within the Waste Consultation Zone for Gammons Hill Waste Transfer site, which should not be constrained by development (see Waste Plan Policy 10).
- Place Land disagrees with the statement that the Neighbourhood Plan takes precedence over the Local Plan. The Local Plan will take precedence once adopted, and the Parish Council has acknowledged that the Neighbourhood Plan may need to be reviewed.
- Place Land supports the proposed capacity of 37 dwellings for Kilm_09. This is based on further design work that has been undertaken, including landscape appraisal, drainage strategy, ecology survey, and heritage appraisal. The findings of the additional surveys confirm that the site is capable of accommodating around 39 dwellings.
- This site in the heart of the village - should be developed smartly to provide new pedestrian and nature interconnecting pathways in the village. Housing should be affordable, low density & very low energy to address the imbalance of older generations & larger homes in the village. This could be a clear demonstration of how to do in-fill development the right way rather than just for profit.
- Allocation of 37 homes - too many. Smaller is preferred
- Although it is a shame about the proximity to the busy A35 (could a reduction in the speed limit be reconsidered) it is a good site. It would be really important to consider some shared ownership properties for local people. There is a very limited supply of housing stock in the village. This is particularly difficult for first time buyers who are key workers and on a limited income.
- The last development only included affordable rentals which obviously does not help anyone get onto the property ladder.
- A logical develop site but will be noisy from A35 and be dangerous vehicular access either via George Lane or direct onto A 35
- Good site, nearer to the village facilities and easy access to the main road
- It is an AONB site with rooks and buzzards nesting. It will have a huge impact on my property and our road.

LP_Kilm_10 – Land to the west and south-west of The Old Inn, Kilmington - Potential ‘Second Best’ Allocation

- DCC note this site falls within the Waste Consultation Zone for Gammons Hill Waste Transfer site, which should not be constrained by development (see Waste Plan Policy 10).
- Very poor road access as on to the A35, too close to listed building.
- Too large a development area. High impact on local community.
- Obvious position although increased vehicular traffic onto Whitford Rd/Old Inn junction to be deplored.
- Not a very good site really - would only be good for 1 or 2 houses.
- Already has houses near this site, a good way to fill in, good access to main road.
- Adding this site with just five houses to the A35 site next to it, seems logical in the future. However too many new houses too quickly could increase the population too quickly and the village school and village hall etc would not be big enough. This site would give access via a footpath from George Lane to the recreation ground and on to Whitford Road. The car park at the Old Inn needs to be a reasonable size as in the summer it can get full.

LP_Kilm_11 - Land to the east of and off Whitford Road between Ashes Farm and The Beacon Chapel, Kilmington - 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 proximity of Grade 2* listed Church.
- Devon County Council (DCC) state this site has surface water flooding and an unmapped ordinary watercourse which should be considered as part of the design.
- Density of housing should be suitable for the site, i.e. plenty of space not crammed in for maximum profit. Needs to fit in with adjacent properties. Should have shielding from light pollution from the nearby Petrol Station.
- Ideal site especially for bungalows for the older population, & would free up larger homes in the village.
- This housing makes sense for elderly people as it's close to the village hall, churches, recreation ground for walking and shops. It fits well along the Whitford Rd.

LP_Kilm_12 - Land on the north side of Shute Road (Gapemouth Corner), Kilmington - *Rejected Site*

- Outside of building line, loss of village buffer to A35, already had loss of trees on this site which should be allowed to regenerate
- Recent destruction of tree cover means the noise block for the village has been lost. Properties here would be noisy and add dangerously to traffic onto the A35. Not a sensible development.
- It should be tidied up and planted with more trees to be a sound barrier from the road noise.
- Would not want to see development on this site as the woodland will create a buffer between the busy, noisy A35 and the housing in the central part of the village.

Omission sites at Kilmington

- None identified

Musbury - General issues

- The Environment Agency note that the village is in the catchment of the River Axe SAC and that development will need to be nutrient neutral.

LP_Musb_01a - Baxter's Farm, The Street, Musbury - Preferred Allocation

- Devon County Council, as landowner, supports allocation as site but feels that no boundary should be draft to separate it from Musb_02 until a development layout is put forward through a planning brief or a planning application.
- The Environment Agency note that part of the north of the site is within floodzone 3 and state that this area should be set aside as GI, 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 including the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Opportunity for retention of farmstead buildings that contribute to the character and appearance of CA
- Use of village hall could cause disturbance for future residents so better for small industrial starter units.
- Conversion of existing buildings good.
- Not suitable for traveller pitches because of potential for clashes with village hall and pub.

LP_Musb_01b - Baxter's Farm, The Street, Musbury - Rejected Site

- 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.
- Agree site should not be used.
- Representation on behalf of landowner for other sites in Musbury queries deliverability of site.

LP_Musb_02 - Maidenhayne Lane, Musbury - *Rejected Site*

- Representation on behalf of landowner stated that the land is no longer available for development (it has been withdrawn from the HELAA process).
- Agree this orchard site should not be used – access is dangerous.

LP_Musb_03 (whole site) - Churchpath Road, Axminster Road, Musbury - 3a - *Potential 'Second Best' Allocation* / 3b - *Rejected*

- Representation on behalf of landowner states that access to Doatshayne Lane could be improved and there is scope for a new access to the A358 with a footway providing safe access to the bus stop and village services.
- Representation on behalf of landowner suggests whole site should be allocated to allow holistic approach and making the most of site opportunities and contributing to meeting overall housing targets.

LP_Musb_03a - Churchpath Road, Axminster Road, Musbury - *Potential 'Second Best' Allocation*

- Do not think should be included as green field and access is potentially dangerous.

LP_Musb_03b - Churchpath Road, Axminster Road, Musbury - *Rejected Site*

- Agree site should not be built on as it is a green field.

LP_Musb_04 - Field known as Adcroft, Mounthill Lane - *Rejected Site*

- Representation on behalf of landowner states that the lower parts of the site could be developed with a negligible impact on landscape and any residual impacts could be mitigated as there is significant space for landscaping and view to the Grade 1 listed church are largely screened by woodland. Site is well related to core of village.
- Agree site should not be built on as it is a green field.

LP_Musb_05 - Doathayne Lane, Musbury - *Planning Permission Granted*

- Representation on behalf of landowner states that the site should be considered as there is no extant planning permission.
- Would provide some family housing in village with high proportion of older people.
- Close to allotments and playing field for families.

Omission sites at Musbury

- None identified

Newton Poppleford - General issues

- Surprised that Newton Poppleford has no allocations given it is well-served by buses, and a new and thriving primary school.
- Make Back Lane more vehicle-friendly and it will have potential for development.
- Create a public park in the Back Lane area to adjoin existing recreational areas, and at the former railway station.
- Village centre could be improved.

LP_Newt_01 - Goosemoor Farm, Exeter Road, Newton Poppleford - Rejected Site

- Happy with the proposal to refuse.

LP_Newt_02 - Littledown Farm, Littledown Lane, Newton Poppleford - Rejected Site

- Happy with the proposal to refuse.
- A couple of respondents noted that there is no safe way to walk or cycle to the village.
- Turning onto Exmouth Road is dangerous.
- Motorists speed along Exmouth Road.
- In AONB and site is covered with trees and wildlife.
- Access via Littledown Lane is on a corner and unsuitable for additional traffic.

LP_Newt_03 - Land north of Burrow Lane, Newton Poppleford - Rejected Site

- Agree site should not be developed as in the AONB and building would be highly visible.

LP_Newt_04 - Land to the west of Badger Close, Newton Poppleford - Rejected Site

- Happy with proposal to refuse development as no safe way to walk to village facilities, AONB and good agricultural land.
- Previous application to build was refused on appeal.

LP_Newt_05 - Land to the east of Exmouth Road, Newton Poppleford - *Rejected Site*

- Happy with proposal to refuse development as no safe way to walk to village facilities, AONB and good agricultural land.

LP_Newt_07 - Land off Back Lane, Newton Poppleford - *Rejected Site*

- Access onto Venn Ottery Road is too narrow for more cars.
- Agricultural land in AONB.

LP_Newt_09 - Field adjacent to Hawthorn House, Back Lane, Newton Poppleford - *Rejected Site*

- Access onto Back Lane is too narrow for more cars.
- Agricultural land in AONB.

LP_Newt_10 - Land north of Back Lane, Newton Poppleford - *Rejected Site*

- Access onto Back Lane is too narrow for more cars.
- Heavily wooded and in AONB.
- Adverse impact on wildlife.

LP_Newt_11 - Oak Tree Garage, Station Road, Newton Poppleford - *Rejected Site*

- Access to A3052 is dangerous and on a floodplain.

LP_Newt_12 - Coal Yard, Newton Poppleford - *Rejected Site*

- No Comments

LP_Newt_13 - Land off Down Close, Newton Poppleford - *Rejected Site*

- Too far from village centre along unpaved, unlit footpath which is unsafe for a large section.
- Important trees and site on rising ground where development would be visible against the treeline.
- Impact on AONB.
- Impact on wildlife.

LP_Newt_14 - Seniors Farm Yard, Newton Poppleford - *Rejected Site*

- Happy to refuse as access to village facilities by foot or cycle is incredibly dangerous as is access for cars turning onto A3052.

LP_Newt_15 - Land to the north of Exeter Road, Newton Poppleford - *Rejected Site*

- Dangerous for people to walk or cycle to village facilities and dangerous to turn onto A3052 as on a bend.
- Floodplain.

LP_Newt_16 - Land to the rear of Langford Mews, Newton Poppleford - *Rejected Site*

- No Comments

LP_Newt_18 - Pearces Yard, Bridge End - *Rejected Site*

- This section of the A3052 is extremely dangerous not only for walkers and cyclists but for vehicles trying to turn onto the A3052.
- Low lying land on floodplain.

Omission sites at Newton Poppleford

- None identified

Otterton - General issues

- Otterton Parish Council held consultation events that informed a survey and discussion on various forums. The findings were that:
 - 6/10 respondents were against further development;
 - The preferred development site was Otto_04, followed by Otto_2, Otto_3a, Otto1 and lastly Otto_3b;
 - 94% voted in favour of more affordable housing noting that the village contains a lot of small privately rented homes and demand from first time buyers outstrips supply;
 - There is concern about elderly people having to leave the village to downsize and 89% supported more housing suitable for older people;
 - Only 33% wished to see larger family homes;
 - Almost unanimously parishioners supported local people seeking to buy their own property, including first time buyers – self build schemes were not widely supported;
 - People were concerned about the effect of further housing development in terms of traffic congestion and many wanted to see a new car park; and
 - Any new housing should have individual driveways for each home.
- What measures are in place to replace green space is developed?
- Will existing trees and hedges be retained?
- Properties along main road are prone to flooding.
- Hourly bus service is at risk.
- Severe traffic congestion in the summer.
- Single track lanes unsuitable for development.

LP_Otto_01 - Land off Bell Street, Otterton - *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.
- Title should read 'Land off Behind Hayes (The Old Orchard).'
- Open space is part of character of village with views up to hills from centre of village.
- Risk of runoff to neighbouring properties.
- Difficult access via narrow roads with poor junctions – may need to demolish houses.

- Loss of mature trees.
- Destroys only green lung in centre of village.
- Contributes to distinctive character of village.
- Old orchard sites within village should be protected as form part of open, linear settlement pattern
- Some respondents advise that development would be contrary to neighbourhood plan which retains open areas and rural character.
- Increase in traffic.
- Impact on wildlife.
- Should not be considered because local plan says there is no need for an increase in housing
- The landowner supports the allocation of this site for housing. It will help support the vitality of the settlement and provide a source of rural housing for local residents, including affordable, and diversify supply.
- Surely only part of the site is needed for just ten homes – neighbourhood plan prioritises smaller homes.

LP_Otto_02 - Land adjacent to the North Star, Otterton - *Potential 'Second Best' Allocation*

- The Environment Agency note that part of the site is within floodzone 3 associated with the main river Otterton Brook. The site would need to be subject to SFRA2, and the sequential and exception tests before being allocated. While it may be possible to build outside the area at risk of flooding on the eastern portion of the site, the floodplain cuts it off from Ottery Street so it is unlikely there would be any safe access or egress.
- 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. Would like to consider further assessment when available
- Suitable site as long as development does not exacerbate flooding in the village.
- Only site with safe and reasonable access to highway network
- Site remote from school and shop.
- A couple of respondents were concerned about access from a busy narrow road with no footway.
- Narrow stretch of Ottery Street and would need new bridge across Otterton Brook.
- A few respondents were concerned that the lower part of site is at risk of flooding.

- A couple of respondents noted that the site is next to conservation area and development of the site would have a negative impact on it.
- Incompatible with policies ONP1b and ONP31 of the neighbourhood plan.
- Loss of natural habitat.
- Would destroy beauty of fields and open spaces in AONB.
- Contrary to neighbourhood plan.
- Previously Otterton was considered unsuitable for development and no explanation has been given for what has changed.
- The landowner supports the allocation of this site for housing. It will help support the vitality of the settlement and provide a source of rural housing for local residents, including affordable, and diversify supply.

LP_Otto_03a - Land at Hayes Lane, Otterton - *Potential 'Second Best' Allocation*

- Several respondents thought the site would be difficult to access and develop.
- There were concerns that the development could compromise children's playground.
- A number of respondents considered the proposed allocation to be contrary to neighbourhood plan as on high ground.
- Detrimental to character of AONB and village.
- Does Otterton require additional housing?
- Not adequately assessed.
- The landowner supports the allocation of this site for housing. It will help support the vitality of the settlement and provide a source of rural housing for local residents, including affordable, and diversify supply.
- Very steep slope and narrow lanes will restrict removal of soil.

LP_Otto_03b - Land at Hayes Lane, Otterton - Rejected Site

- Steeply sloping site unsuitable for development.
- Very prominent site where building would be seen across the valley and harmful to character of AONB and village.
- The landowner supports the allocation of this site for housing. It will help support the vitality of the settlement and provide a source of rural housing for local residents, including affordable, and diversify supply.

LP_Otto_04 - Land east of Rydon Close - New Site - not assessed

- The Environment Agency note that part of the site is within floodzone 3 associated with the main river Otterton Brook. The site would need to be subject to SFRA2, and the sequential and exception tests before being allocated. While it may be possible to build outside the area at risk of flooding on the eastern portion of the site, the floodplain cuts it off from Ottery Street so it is unlikely there would be any safe access or egress.
- Savills on behalf of FWS Carter and Sons state this site is incorrectly shown in yellow on the interactive map meaning “not assessed”, however this site was assessed in the HELAA and considered to be available, suitable and probably achievable.
- A couple of respondents would prefer affordable housing to permission for conversion to MOT testing and motorcycle repairs.
- Remote from village.
- Several respondents expressed a preference for housing rather than employment.
- There was some support for more affordable units here or homes for the elderly of the village.
- Flood risk.
- Difficult to walk to village.
- Disruption to wildlife.
- Should not extend beyond existing boundary.
- No need for extra homes.
- Most appropriate site provided flooding issues can be addressed.

Omission sites at Otterton

- None identified.

Payhembury - General issues

- None identified.

LP_Payh_01 - Units and agricultural field at Slade Barton - *Rejected Site*

- No comments

LP_Payh_02 - Agricultural field adjoining Payhembury village recreation ground - *Rejected Site*

- No comments

LP_Payh_03 - Agricultural field adjoining Payhembury built-up area - *Rejected Site*

- No comments

Omission sites at Payhembury

- None identified

Plymtree - General issues

- Agents for FW Clarke - We support the change to the settlement hierarchy and the amended distribution strategy. The amended settlement hierarchy includes Local Centres (Tier 3), which encompasses Woodbury, Lymptstone, Broadclyst, Colyton and Budleigh Salterton. Tier 4 includes, amongst others, Plymtree. At present, no housing growth is expected at Plymtree at all over the plan period whereas many other Tier 4 settlements are expected to experience some housing growth. We object to the lack of housing growth expected at Plymtree.
- Agents for J Persey -
 - Request for the Plan to allow limited development to meet local needs at the Service Villages of Beer, Branscombe, Broadhembury, Chardstock, Clyst St Mary, Dunkeswell, East Budleigh, Exton, Feniton, Hawkchurch, Kilmington, Musbury, Newton Poppleford, Otterton, Payhembury, Plymtree, Sidbury, Stoke Canon, Tipton St John, Uplyme, Westclyst, West Hill and Whimple. The identification of Plymtree as a Service Village is supported. The village has a good range of facilities (school, shop, pub) and is not environmentally constrained being entirely outside of the AONB. It ultimately has more facilities and is less environmentally constrained than many other villages in the district. It is a perfect village to receive an allocation, and the scale and form of growth can be carefully controlled through local development management policies so that it complements the character of the area and helps meet local needs. Collectively, villages could make a meaningful contribution to the district's overall housing land supply and growth of this type would also have the advantage of diversifying supply, meeting local needs and supporting rural facilities.

LP_Plym_01 - Agricultural field adjoining the north-west of Plymtree village - *Rejected Site*

- No comments

LP_Plym_02a - Agricultural field adjoining and contained within Plymtree village to the north, east and south - *Rejected Site*

- No comments

LP_Plym_02b - Agricultural field adjoining and contained within Plymtree village to the north, east and south - *Rejected Site*

- No comments

LP_Plym_03 - Land at Plymtree - *Rejected Site*

- Bell Cornwell for J Persey - Urges the LPA to provide a formal allocation in Plymtree on the Plym_03 land and have provided further technical information to demonstrate how this could be achieved.

LP_Plym_04 - Two agricultural fields between Plymtree village and Norman's Green - *Rejected Site*

- No comments

Omission sites at Plymtree

- New site presented to west of village hall.

Sidbury - General issues

- Any development at Sidbury is likely to close the gap with Sidford.
- Developers should contribute towards a footpath/cycle link from Sidbury to Sidmouth, preferably along the river.

LP_Sidm_11 - Burnt Oak (existing garage block), Sidbury - *Planning Permission Granted*

- This site has already obtained planning permission. Although given the access to the site is on a blind junction on the busy A375 I am surprised that this alone did not lead to the site being rejected when previously considered.

LP_Sidm_25 - Field bordering junction of Cotford Road and Roncombe Lane, Sidbury - *Rejected Site*

- This agricultural site has been submitted for residential purposes to accommodate just under 40 properties.
- The site is situated within the AONB, with landscape visibility, on the edge of Sidbury village outside of its boundary settlement. Access to the site would be either from Roncombe Lane, which is a narrow lane or from the busy A375 at a point where joining it from the site would not be appropriate and potentially dangerous.
- Some or all of the site is contained within Flood Zone 3 and there is high risk flooding along roads adjacent to the site and the development of this site could add to increased storm water runoff will exacerbate downstream flooding.

LP_Sidm_34 - Land south of Furzehill, Sidbury - *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. Would like to consider further assessment when available.

- Developing this site will change the character of Sidbury and close the Green Wedge with Sidford, contrary to Policy 3 in the Neighbourhood Plan and Policy 78 in Draft Local Plan. Particularly with regard to setting of ancient monument and LB.
- DCC suggest access from Furzehill but there is likely to be third party land ownership (“ransom strip”) in this area which creates uncertainty on delivering the site.
- DCC state this site has multiple ordinary watercourses running through it and any proposed development should improve these watercourses and avoid culverting.
- The Town Council does not support the allocation of employment land within the AONB at Sidm_34.
- SVA -
 - This development will change the character of Sidbury and close the Green Wedge with Sidford (contrary to Policy 78 of this draft Local Plan and Policy 3 and Map 9 of the adopted Sid Valley Neighbourhood Plan which seeks to prevent settlement coalescence). - Separately, this Sidbury development proposal provides for 0.15 Hectares of Employment Land but there is no demand for Employment Land – refer to the Sidford Business Park proposal where the land is now for sale due to the property owners’ stated admission that there is ‘no demand for Employment Land’.
 - Additionally, this proposal is contrary to this Draft Local Plan’s Policy 75 as the site is within the AONB and it will not enhance the AONB. Rather this proposal will be detrimental to the AONB.
 - Also, this proposed site is contrary to Policy 3 of the adopted ‘Neighbourhood Plan for the Sid Valley 2018- 2032 seeking to avoid ‘Settlement Coalescence’).
- Sidmouth Cycling Campaign state the potential site for allocation in Sidbury (Sidm_34) encompasses the route of the proposed off-road cycle route from Sidford to Sidbury that Devon County Council are promoting. Construction of this route and links to the adjacent housing should be included as a condition of any planning permission for this site. This would support Strategic Policy 65 and Policy 66
- Agents for Land Value Alliance - In our view, second choice sites such as SIDM_34, which are being relied upon as part of the draft housing supply and distribution should logically and sensibly be identified as preferred allocations. Such a change would also ensure that Sidbury, identified as one of the sustainable villages in the District, is served by an allocation within the Draft Plan, land should be allocated at Sidbury to ensure the local housing need is addressed and there are no other realistic site options capable of accommodating housing to meet the need.
- Proposal for 38 dwellings is not based upon a robust assessment of site capacity.
- No reference in the site assessment to the proximity of Sidbury Castle Scheduled Monument, development will adversely affect its setting.
- We understand the need for additional affordable housing in the area but consider this location and additional housing in Sidbury will have a very serious lasting negative effect on all village folk and its limited infrastructure. For the following critical reasons:

1. As indicated above, the existing road system is clearly unable to support additional traffic and this will already be further taxed by the approved new Sidford Industrial Site and the LP_Sidm_1 Sidbury housing traffic.
2. Widening / Realignment of the existing road is not an option.
3. The small car park located in the centre of the village is generally fully occupied.
4. The Village Primary school is operating at maximum capacity with no space for further development of the site.
5. Delivery and collection of school pupils is very hazardous' causing significant traffic disruption at times.
6. Drainage within the fields is complex with several active springs. At least 4No draining in large volumes into our grounds.
7. Provision of adequate access to all new properties will be complex / expensive due to the significant gradient of the sites / drainage plus forming a safe viable access onto the main road.

Omission sites at Sidbury

- None identified

Stoke Canon - General issues

- None identified

LP_Stok_01 - Land lying to the west of Chestnut Crescent, Stoke Canon - *Rejected Site*

- No comments

LP_Stok_02 - Oakhay Barton, Stoke Canon - *Rejected Site*

- No comments

LP_Stok_03 - Imbert Green Technology Park, Stoke Canon - *Rejected Site*

- No comments

LP_Stok_05 - Field 7414, Stoke Road, Stoke Canon - *Rejected Site*

- No comments

LP_Stok_06 - Fields 7425 & 8333, Stoke Road, Stoke Canon - *Rejected Site*

- No comments

LP_Stok_07 - Oakhay Barton, Stoke Canon - *Rejected Site*

- No comments

LP_Stok_08 - Land and buildings known as Stoke Cottage, Stoke Canon - *Rejected Site*

- No comments

LP_Stok_09 - Bridge Farm, Stoke Canon - *Rejected Site*

- No comments

LP_Stok_10 - Field 6700 & 6907, Stoke Road, Stoke Canon - *Rejected Site*

- No comments

Omission sites at Stoke Canon

- None identified

Tipton St John - General issues

- Ottery St Mary Parish Council comment that a site for a new Tipton St John Primary School should be found within the village.
- Devon County Council and the County Councillor request that a primary school site is allocated in Tipton as it is identified in the provisional Schools Rebuilding Programme.
- The agent acting on behalf of the owners of Site LP_Otry_04 have suggested two alternative schemes, one for housing and one for a relocated school with some self/cusom build housing to ensure that this facility remains in the village. They also support designation as a tier 4 settlement and object to the site being a second, rather than first, choice

LP_Otry_04 - Land south of Otter Close, Tipton St John - *Potential 'Second Best' Allocation*

- 45 homes on this site would be too dense, out of character with the area.
- Highway safety concerns- traffic already speeds here, poor access onto the main Sidmouth to Ottery road, lack of pavements, volume of extra traffic, too close to Otter Close entrance
- Impact on sunken lane
- Need for extra houses should be demonstrated
- Previous appeal was refused and the reasons remain relevant
- Lack of public transport
- The site is relatively level and is well screened with mature roadside hedging.
- Visual impact is minimised as the plot sits in an area between already established housing developments.
- The school could be relocated to this site, along with some custom/self build houses to ensure that the village remains sustainable and a tier 4 settlement
- If the school relocates to OSM then this site isn't justified and the tier 4 status should be lost as the village is unsustainable

LP_Otry_06 Land next to Coombe Vale, Tipton St John - *Rejected Site*

- Will harm the appearance of the AONB and character of the valley, impact on tranquility.
- Unacceptable impact on ecology- cuckoos, barn owls and woodpeckers are on the site.
- The road is a narrow lane already impacted by modern vehicles. Can't be widened as banks are not in applicants control.
- Access to the main road on the cross roads is already hazardous

- Site is far from the village centre, increasing residents dependency on cars and contrary to sustainable objectives of the local plan.
- The proximity of the steep Goyle means that the south part of the land is liable to erosion and subsidence in addition to being part of the flood plain
- Will impact on mature trees and a diverse range of habitats and wildlife including wetland, woodland and meadow.
- Will increase flooding and run off

Omission sites at Tipton St John

- The field opposite (Coombe Bank) to Site LP_Otry_04 was submitted to the SHLAA in 2015 and should be included as a better development site. Respondent states “We will send supporting documents”. A plan has subsequently been submitted confirming that the land lies to the west of Coombe Bank, adjoining the crossroads
- The relocated primary school could be sited on LP_Otry_04 along with a small number of custom/self-build houses. (Submitted on behalf of site owner)

Uplyme - General issues

- Lyme Regis Town Council note that no suitable sites have been submitted as yet and request that any that do come forward minimise the impact on Lyme Regis, particularly traffic and parking issues.

LP_Uply_01 - Land at Sidmouth Road, Uplyme - *Rejected Site*

- Uplyme Parish Council is against development of this land and are satisfied that EDDC have taken the same view about the unsuitability of the site.
- Representation on behalf of landowner comment that:
 - The land is available for development and could provide around 120 homes with 50% of these being affordable.
 - The draft Dorset Local Plan states that more than 20% of the housing stock in Lyme Regis is second or holiday homes resulting in a lack of affordable housing in the town.
 - A greater stock of affordable and affordable home ownership products are needed to prevent younger families being forced out of Lyme Regis.
 - East Devon and Dorset should cooperate to allocate land for housing as the 40 units allocated in the emerging Dorset plan is insufficient.
 - The East Devon Local Plan should allocate this site to meet the cross boundary needs of neighbouring Dorset Council.
 - There is no evidence of joint working to address the needs of Lyme Regis under the 'Duty to Cooperate';

Omission sites at Uplyme

- None identified

Westclyst - General issues

- Westclyst is not a separate community, it is part of Broadclyst.
- Westclyst relies on nearby Plinhoe and Broadclyst for services and infrastructure as, apart from the school and corner shop, no extra infrastructure has been delivered in Westclyst.

LP_BrcI_01 - Land to the east of Parkside Crescent - *Planning Permission Granted*

- No Comments

LP_BrcI_04 - Land adjacent to Poltimore Park - *Rejected Site*

- Support, the site should be rejected as development would increase the flood risk and reduce the land for nature in the area.

LP_Polt_03 - Land to the north of Old Park Farm, Pinn Hill - *Rejected Site*

- Support, the site should be rejected, as building in a flood zone would be foolish, and it would have an adverse effect on Poltimore Park. It would be better to build on brownfield sites.

Omission sites at Westclyst

- None identified.

West Hill - General issues

- West Hill PC state the village has had significant growth of more than 10% since the start of the current Local Plan in 2013 and is being burdened by with disproportionate levels of housing.
- West Hill PC and residents are concerned about infrastructure inadequacies such as over capacity of schools, health services, highways, water supply, sewage, inadequate open space and recreation facilities.
- West Hill PC note the outskirts of the village are a considerable distance from the village centre facilities, exacerbated by the hilly nature of the lanes which have no footways or street lighting – further development here would not be sustainable.
- West Hill PC state it is very important that a Green Wedge covers the entire area of Neighbourhood Plan Policy NP4 to prevent coalescence and preserve the separate identities of Ottery and West Hill.
- 57 homes are just about manageable, but the planning application for site at Oak Road is unsustainable and would be unacceptable in addition.
- Many of the sites in the HELAA are in “valued views” protected by policy NP6 in the Neighbourhood Plan so are not suitable for development.
- Important to have mixed use development with some affordable homes to attract younger people.
- Retain West Hill as it is to preserve a jewel in the landscape where people and wildlife cohabit.
- As there has been no recent increase in employment in West Hill, any new residents will be forced to commute elsewhere to work.
- The River Otter has a phosphate issue which must be addressed before development.

LP_GH/ED/23 - Land lying to the south of Holyfield - *Rejected Site*

- This site is too far from facilities.
- Developing this site would remove the existing green corridor between West Hill and Ottery.
- This will increase car traffic along narrow single track lanes.
- Building here will increase surface water run-off and flood risk to Ottery lower down the hill.

LP_West_01 - Land at Westhayes / Hayes End, Eastfield - *Potential 'Second Best' Allocation*

- DCC state that nearby land has been associated with surface water flooding, and it is currently unclear whether there is a feasible discharge point for this site.
- West Hill PC note mixed views from residents, some see it as appropriate for low density development if existing trees are protected, others value the wooded land, wildlife, and screening from the busy B3180.
- A developer (Morrish Homes) objects as part of site is protected as s.41 habitat, TPOs, Nature Recovery Site.
- A developer (Morrish Homes) states this site should not be considered available until the landowner can demonstrate that necessary rights are in place for access and connection of services.
- A developer (Morrish Homes) objects due to proximity to busy road (B3180) causing noise.
- Object as future house owners will want to remove trees due to loss of light and for fear of damaging their house.
- Support this site, tree removal can be avoided in a similar way to previously approved schemes such as Hayes End.
- Object as topography means that developing this site will cause overlooking of neighbouring properties.
- Object as development will lead to flooding of lower neighbouring gardens.
- Object as site is home to much wildlife such as owls, buzzards, bats.

LP_West_02 - Field at junction adjacent to Prickly Pear House (at junction of B3180 Exmouth Road and Bendarroch Road, West Hill) - *Rejected Site*

- West Hill PC object due to high landscape impact, forming one of the valued views in Neighbourhood Plan Policy NP6.
- The site owner supports allocation of the site. In summary, he states that it performs similarly to the preferred options other than in landscape impact and access to services. Landscape impact can be mitigated by a landscaping scheme, long and mid range views are blocked by existing trees and development would be seen in context of existing built form. The site is a similar distance from services as the preferred sites and a pedestrian link can be provided.
- This could be a suitable site as long as there is no through road from Eastfield and the adjacent junction on the B3180 is improved.

LP_West_03 - Rear of Hasta-La-Vista, Windmill Lane - *Rejected Site*

- West Hill PC object due to high landscape sensitivity, with previous planning applications and appeals dismissed on these grounds.
- Access will be suitable if old dangerous tree was removed as per recent tree report.

LP_West_04 - Land adjoining Windmill Lane - *Preferred Allocation*

- DCC note the concerns of residents over surface water run-off to the east of this site, so a robust drainage strategy will be required.
- DCC state this site seems to be very steep so infiltration will need to be considered very carefully.
- West Hill PC and residents main concern is traffic impact as Windmill Lane is narrow and not suitable to provide access.
- Object due to poor visibility from exit to Bendarroch Road, where cars go too fast making it unsafe for pedestrians.
- Support developing this site but should be at a density comparable with surrounding properties to maintain a village character.
- Object as surface water runs off the field to Windmill Lane which cannot cope.
- Local residents have commissioned a flood risk screening report which concludes that surface water flooding affects the southern part of West_04 and across to West_06 – the EA's surface water flood map showing a very low risk of surface water flooding is not accurate.
- Concern about the adverse impact on wildlife, including deer, bats and owls.
- Object as there are TPOs on all trees along with border.
- Object as it will devalue my house.
- Application for two dwellings (13/2624/FUL) in northern part of site was dismissed at appeal as harmful to character and appearance of the area, so do not understand how it can now be preferred.
- A developer (Morrish Homes) objects given the long route for pedestrians to facilities along un-paved and unlit roads, with no guarantee that access could be provided through West_06.
- A developer (Morrish Homes) objects due to adverse landscape impact.
- Support allocation as will round off the development area.
- Support this site as easy access to B3180 and A30.
- Support as close to facilities through the adjacent Moorlands estate.
- There have been large developments in this area of West Hill over recent years, and not fair to add more in the same area.

LP_West_05 - Land off Oak Road - Rejected Site

- DCC welcome the rejection of this site as it is located within or close to a Mineral Safeguarding Area or Mineral Consultation Area.
- West Hill PC object due to restrictive covenant limiting any development to two dwellings.
- West Hill PC and residents object because of impact upon TPO covering the site boundary and on-site tree.
- West Hill PC and residents object due to significant distance from village centre along hilly lanes with no footways or street lighting.
- West Hill PC object because Oak Road access is a “valued view” in the Neighbourhood Plan.
- West Hill PC object as within high pressure gas pipeline middle/outer zones.
- The agent for the site owners objects to the failure to allocate the site. The assessments are not consistent, this site ranks similarly to preferred sites in many respects. Many sites are subject to minerals constraints but this is not recorded, other sites are further away from facilities and contain TPO'd trees but rank higher. It is disputed that the site appears as open countryside.
- A developer (Morrish Homes) objects to non-allocation of this site, noting technical reports on transport, trees, ecology and landscape in current planning application 22/2533/MOUT show the site is suitable.
- A developer (Morrish Homes) notes that Devon County Council has withdrawn its minerals objection.
- A developer (Morrish Homes) states that there will be no ‘category 3 or 4’ development within the site, so the Health and Safety Executive will not advise against development, so this constraint no longer applies.
- Object as unacceptable wildlife impact, including proximity to East Devon Heaths SPA/SAC, rare moths and three very rare bats.
- Contrary to Neighbourhood Plan.
- Object as Oak Road is a single track lane, dangerous to add more traffic.
- The exit onto the B3180 is on a blind bend and extremely hazardous.
- The bottom of this field is a bog and would require water pumps to drain it.
- The pebble bed ground is unstable for development.
- Development will cause unacceptable landscape impact.
- Not clear whether the current surface water run-off that affects part of Higher Broad Oak Road will be exacerbated.
- Facilities are well over the 1km quoted in the site assessment: should state 1.6km to shop/PO; 1,7km to school, village hall; 2km to main bus route, British Legion; 2.2km to church; 2.3km to garage, dentist, hairdresser.

LP_West_06 - Land north and east of Eastfield - Preferred Allocation

- DCC state this site seems to be very steep so infiltration will need to be considered very carefully.
- West Hill PC have concerns regarding traffic impact due to narrow roads.
- West Hill PC are concerned about flooding from the many springs and aquifers in the site.
- Blue Cedar Homes control this land and support its allocation but should be increased to 30 dwellings – there are no constraints and intend to submit planning application in next few months.
- Blue Cedar Homes object to 0.1 ha employment land as there is no justification for this.
- A developer (Morrish Homes) objects as uncertain whether access can be obtained via Eastfield Gardens.
- A developer (Morrish Homes) objects due to presence of TPOs, potential impact upon root protection areas and may be pressure to remove trees by future residents.
- A developer (Morrish Homes) notes this site formed part of a larger site that was dismissed at appeal in 2011 (APP/U1105/A/11/2155312) due to adverse landscape impact.
- Support developing this site but should be at a density comparable with surrounding properties to maintain a village character.
- Local residents have commissioned a flood risk screening report which concludes that surface water flooding affects the southern part of West_04 and across to West_06 – the EA's surface water flood map showing a very low risk of surface water flooding is not accurate.
- There is a protected copse and oak tree in the north eastern corner – will this be cleared?
- Concern about the adverse impact on wildlife, including deer and owls that nest in the trees.
- Part of larger site dismissed at appeal (10/0761/MOUT) so do not understand why it's now appropriate to allocate.
- Any link between West_04 and West_06 will create a rat-run.
- Very good location for development, close to local amenities.
- Access from Eastfield Orchard is narrow and often obstructed by parked vehicles.
- There have been large developments in this area of West Hill over recent years, and not fair to add more in the same area.
- House prices mean that local need is not being met.

LP_West_07 - Land at Lower Broad Oak Road - *Rejected Site*

- West Hill PC object due to restrictive covenant preventing development;
- West Hill PC object as a “valued view” in the Neighbourhood Plan;
- West Hill PC and residents object due to significant distance from village centre along hilly lanes with no footways or street lighting.

LP_West_08 - Land adjacent to Badgers Bend, Lower Broad Oak Road - *Rejected Site*

- West Hill PC object as a “valued view” in the Neighbourhood Plan.
- West Hill PC object as high landscape sensitivity.
- West Hill PC object as site is covered by a TPO.
- West Hill PC object as boggy site with surface water flood risk.
- Access is along narrow, twisty, and hilly roads with no pavements, causing a safety risk for pedestrians and cyclists.

LP_West_09 - Land adjoining The Gap, Lower Broad Oak Road - *Rejected Site*

- West Hill PC object due to high landscape sensitivity.
- West Hill PC object due to surface water flood risk.
- Access is along narrow, twisty, and hilly roads with no pavements, causing a safety risk for pedestrians and cyclists.

LP_West_10 - Land east of The Pygthle, Lower Broad Oak Road - *Rejected Site*

- West Hill PC object due to unsuitable access onto Lower Broad Oak Road.
- West Hill PC object as prominent site with high landscape sensitivity.
- West Hill PC and residents object as significant distance from village centre along hilly lanes with no footways or street lighting.
- Site should be excluded from the settlement boundary.

LP_West_11 - Land adjacent to Hilden, Lower Broad Oak Road - *Rejected Site*

- West Hill PC object as site is inaccessible along an unmade track, remote from village.

LP_West_12 - Hollybrook Nursery, Exmouth Road - *Rejected Site*

- DCC welcome the rejection of this site as it is located within or close to a Mineral Safeguarding Area or Mineral Consultation Area.
- West Hill PC object as remote from village; dangerous access onto the B3180.

LP_West_13 - Weggis Farm - *Rejected Site*

- DCC welcome the rejection of this site as it is located within or close to a Mineral Safeguarding Area or Mineral Consultation Area.
- West Hill PC object as significant distance from village centre along hilly lanes with no footways or street lighting;
- West Hill PC object as access onto Oak Road is a “valued view” in Neighbourhood Plan;
- West Hill PC object as within high pressure gas pipeline middle/outer zones;
- West Hill PC object as in a Mineral Safeguarding Area.

LP_West_14 - Pikes Farm - *Rejected Site*

- DCC welcome the rejection of this site as it is located within or close to a Mineral Safeguarding Area or Mineral Consultation Area.
- West Hill PC and residents object as significant distance from village centre along hilly lanes with no footways or street lighting.
- West Hill PC object as within high pressure gas pipeline middle/outer zones;
- West Hill PC object as within Mineral Safeguarding Area.
- Planning and Design Group on behalf of landowner recommends allocation as not in a protected landscape and surrounded by large mature trees so minor landscape impact; on-line shopping and high fuel prices mean people are travelling less by car, making pedestrian access less important; proximity to high pressure gas pipeline does not preclude development.
- Landowner states this site has 7 out of 12 facilities within 1,600m, one more than the preferred allocations.

- Object as site is attractive agricultural land, covered by the “valued views” in Neighbourhood Plan Policy NP6.

LP_West_15 - Flower Cottage, Elsdon Lane - *Rejected Site*

- West Hill PC object due to restrictive covenant preventing housing.
- West Hill PC object as access is required over land owned by another individual.
- West Hill PC object as adverse landscape sensitivity due to woodland and open land in centre of village.
- Concerned about surface water run-off affecting homes below the site.

LP_West_16 - Elsdon House, Elsdon Lane - *Rejected Site*

- West Hill PC object as woodland is a Local Green Space in the Neighbourhood Plan Policy NP5 and covered by a TPO.

LP_West_17 - WI Building and adjoining land, West Hill Road - *Rejected Site*

- West Hill PC note this site was dismissed at appeal, and object as it is a “valued view” in the Neighbourhood Plan forming part of the approach to West Hill from Ottery.
- West Hill PC object due to surface water flood risk.
- Adjacent to a sewage pumping station and therefore not desirable for residential use.
- Site can probably only accommodate three dwellings.

Omission sites at West Hill

- None identified

Whimble - General issues

- The following question was asked as part of the consultation - “What level of additional housing development do you feel is appropriate for Whimble for the period from 2022 to 2040?” The responses recorded were:

| | Responses | % of respondents |
|-------------------------------|-----------|------------------|
| Zero | 11 | 32% |
| Between 1 and 50 new homes | 15 | 44% |
| Between 51 and 100 new homes | 1 | 3% |
| Between 101 and 250 new homes | 3 | 9% |
| Between 251 and 500 new homes | 2 | 6% |
| 501 or more new homes | 2 | 6% |
| Total | 34 | 100% |

- Whimble Parish Council highlight a desire for the village to remain separate from Cranbrook and for no further land between the settlements to be developed. The Parish Council point out the single track elements of the highway network and the potential for an increase in housing to exacerbate existing problems. They also raise concerns about confusion over the level of housing development proposed for the village. Evidence from the neighbourhood plan is cited that residents do not wish to see more than 10 new properties and these should provide small clusters focused on affordable housing and for local young people.
- The Environment Agency advises that Whimble has a long history of flooding and has a need for additional flood management infrastructure. Any development which satisfies the sequential and exception tests will be expected to contribute to helping to reduce flood risks overall for the community.
- The Environment Agency advise that all the preferred and second-choice sites here have some degree of FZ3 and/or FZ2 present within them. These sites would need to be subject to SFRA2, and the sequential and exception tests before being allocated.
- DCC state the SUDS hierarchy should be followed, all off-site surface water discharges from development should mimic “greenfield” performance – see CIRIA SUDS manual and LLFA guidance.
- Protect our Whimble and Rockbeare Group (POW+R) have the guiding principle of self-determination for the citizens of the Parish of Whimble as expressed through the neighbourhood plan that it is preparing with the Parish Council.
- POW+R believe that the parish of Whimble has contributed sufficiently to the housing needs of East Devon through the 500 homes allocated in the parish through the Cranbrook Plan.

- POW+R is concerned that development to the west of Whimble would jeopardise the green wedge between Cranbrook and Whimble.
- POW+R consider the maximum number of swellings each 5 years should be 10 with 50% of these being affordable.
- POW+R set out historical background to orchards and wish to retain them.
- More than 500 homes should be built as villages have always provided an array of services – the original form of sustainability.
- Should not be trying to push new houses through with a new local plan as the existing local plan is still valid.
- Whimble can support some new development to strengthen the community but more than 20 would put too much strain on local services.
- Several respondents supported up to 50 new homes and felt that more would be unacceptable for a number of reasons including, would go against draft policies, road infrastructure, should preserve greenfield sites and unsustainable for local infrastructure.
- Several respondents felt that no more homes should be built for a variety of reasons including, contrary to neighbourhood plan, very car dominant with poor train service, will change character of area, lack of services, no demand for new homes, impact on flooding and wildlife, loss of traditional orchards and facilities and poor, single track roads.
- Train service is infrequent.
- No more than 10 homes should be built together to keep a vernacular appearance and avoid estates.
- Don't build to west of village to keep separation with Cranbrook.
- Whimble Parish Council asked for residents comments to be carefully considered and highlighted a desire to remain separate from Cranbrook.
- The Parish Council expressed concern about the single track road network serving the village and the poor road surfaces.
- Absorption of Whimble into greater Exeter should be avoided.
- The Parish Council also raised confusion over the number of new homes proposed for the village and stated that neighbourhood plan surveys showed that residents wanted no more than ten new homes in small clusters to support younger people in need of affordable homes.
- Concerns around the capacity of the roads accessing the village (all have significant lengths of single-track width with no footways or lighting) and
- Development sites options will impact on the rural buffer between the village and the planned extension of Cranbrook.
- Several respondents were concerned about flooding.
- Several residents were concerned about the ability of the road network to accommodate additional traffic.

- Sewerage system already at capacity.
- Open green spaces should be protected.
- Whimble needs protecting even though it's not in an AONB.
- Only one shop and a lack of facilities in the village mean no more development.
- Small development should be allowed at Daisymount.
- Development should be kept west of the M5.
- Any further development should benefit the village for example by providing a foot/cycle path to the Hand and Pen.
- Unique character of village must be preserved – people have chosen to live in a village, not a town.
- An increase in population of up to 10% is acceptable, but should be phased over time and change should happen organically.
- A new school should be built, and Church Road improved before any more development.
- Opportunities should be provided for small businesses along old A30.
- Cranfield already meets need for new houses in this area.
- Orchards are priority habitats under the UK's Biodiversity Action Plan – the orchard next to Bramley Gardens provides habitat for little owls, green woodpeckers, Greater spotted woodpeckers, tree creepers and tawny owls, all of which use the old apple trees to nest in and feed on. Several species of bats have been seen in the summer.

LP_Whim_03 - Land to the south side of Grove Road - Potential 'Second Best' Allocation

- DCC note this site falls within the Whimble Critical Drainage Area which means this catchment needs to be protected from development pressures.
- Increased flood risk to surrounding properties.
- Lack of open space in village.
- Sewerage system already at capacity.
- Increase traffic along narrow roads.
- Loss of rural character

LP_Whim_04 - Hits Farmhouse, Lilypond Lane - Rejected Site

- No comments

LP_Whim_07 - Land fronting Broadclyst Road - *Potential 'Second Best' Allocation*

- DCC note this site falls within the Whimble Critical Drainage Area which means this catchment needs to be protected from development pressures.
- Site floods.
- Sewerage system already at capacity.
- Loss of historic orchards.
- Small site but would extend village edge so not appropriate for development.

LP_Whim_08 - Land west of Church Road and Bramley Gardens - *Potential 'Second Best' Allocation*

- Forms part of important green wedge separating Whimble from Cranbrook.
- Sewerage system already at capacity.
- Increase traffic along narrow roads.
- Loss of historic orchards.
- Agree part of site could be developed using existing access from Bramley Close, but development should not extend up to Church Road so that feel of village is preserved.
- Relief road should link Bramley Close to Church Road and a large station car park provided.
- Loss of rural character.
- Risk to school children from additional traffic as no footway along many village roads.

LP_Whim_09 - Land at Church Road and Woodhayes Lane - *Rejected Site*

- No comments

LP_Whim_10 - Land adjoining Woodhayes Country House - *Rejected Site*

- No comments

LP_Whim_11 - Land at Station Road - *Preferred Allocation*

- The Environment Agency advise that part of the site is at risk of flooding and an appropriate buffer should be set aside for green infrastructure and kept free from built development and to provide biodiversity net gain.
- 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. Would like to consider further assessment when available.
- DCC note this site falls within the Whimble Critical Drainage Area which means this catchment needs to be protected from development pressures.
- POW+R note previous designation as land of local landscape importance and wish to keep as green space, preferably with public access.
- Object as this area of land has been designated for recreational purposes linked to Richard Whiteway Memorial Land, a key person in Whimble's history.
- Contrary to Neighbourhood Plan as development is for over 10 dwellings.
- No evidence of a need for 33 homes in Whimble.
- Substantial harm would be caused to Grade II listed Slewtton House.
- The mature hedgerows, trees, grassland, and meadow support abundant wildlife and must be protected.
- DEFRA website shows the site and north east of site as Woodland Priority Habitat and Woodland Improvement Area, Priority Habitat (woodland and orchard), and a national habitat and network enhancement zone 1.
- Development would be harm the landscape, including trees, watercourse, setting of houses on Talaton Road and tranquility, wildness, intactness and enclosure.
- The site is a key local viewpoint and open space – development would harm views.
- All access routes are narrow country lanes, so development would exacerbate existing problems of safety, congestion, noise and impact on amenity and historic environment.
- Site is in a critical drainage area and development would cause flooding off-site.
- Memorial grounds great village asset and of local landscape importance.
- Traffic issues and lack of footways.
- Villages have always rejected building on this site, including a petition signed by 425 people in 1988.
- Designated as land of local landscape importance.
- Parish Council withdrew its nomination as its 'preferred site' in 2015.
- Insufficient open space for village and site meets open space criteria.
- Considered unsuitable for development in 1995 due to traffic and environmental issues.
- Site floods.
- Should be kept for wildlife or used as open space.

- Field acts as dark sky zone.
- Inadequate sewerage system.
- Designated Land of Local Amenity Importance in 1999 in local plan.
- Land to north designated national wildlife site.
- Loss of rural character.
- Regret loss of open area but makes sense to build here if accept need for 10% growth.
- Tree in middle of old cricket pitch is unique, mentioned in Wisden and should be preserved as of historic importance.
- Walking/cycling track should be provided to link with other tracks.
- Logical development site that would not result in loss of agricultural land since it was previously a cricket ground.
- Relatively small site that has not been in use since cricket on the site ceased and likely to remain unused. Also surrounded by housing and acceptable for development.
- A number of respondents noted that 500 homes had been allocated in the parish for Cranbrook and felt that this was sufficient.
- Need homes for local working people – many adult people living with their parents.

LP_Whim_12 - Land at Lillypond Lane - *Rejected Site*

- No comments

LP_Whim_13 - Land north of Grove Road - *Potential 'Second Best' Allocation*

- DCC note this site falls within the Whimble Critical Drainage Area which means this catchment needs to be protected from development pressures.
- Increased flood risk to surrounding properties.
- Lack of open space in village.
- Sewerage system already at capacity.
- Increase traffic along narrow roads.
- Loss of rural character

LP_Whim_14 - Land at Perriton Barton - *Rejected Site*

- No comments

LP_Whim_18 - Field between Orchard Lea and Church Road - *New Site - not assessed*

- No comments

LP_Whim_19 - Hitts Farm, Lillpond Lane - *New Site - not assessed*

- DCC note this site falls within the Whimble Critical Drainage Area which means this catchment needs to be protected from development pressures.

LP_Whim_20 - Orchard Lea - *New Site - not assessed*

- No comments

Omission sites at Whimble

- None identified.

Sites suggested at other settlements

Some consultation responses propose sites for development at settlements not contained in Chapter 6 - i.e., not identified as a Principal Centre, Main Centre, Local Centre or Service Village. The following bullet points summarise the main issues raised in these site-specific responses, by settlement.

Colyford

- Developer (Baker Estates) proposes land at Colyford (Coly_05 and Coly_07) for development, noting that the full extent of these sites would be disproportionate to the size of the settlement, but smaller-scale development should be considered.

Cowley

- Allocate land at the A377 at Cowley for Park and Ride (policy 66) and affordable housing to meet local need and that of key workers (plan attached to JLL response).
- Upto_04

Talaton

- Concerned that Tala_13 has been overlooked as not shown on the Commonplace interactive map despite being in HELA

Upottery

- Developer states Land at Manor Green, Upottery (0.2 hectares) should be allocated for up to five dwellings, a highly suitable site for a range of reasons including accessible location, will not extend into the countryside, no heritage or ecological constraints.

Venn Ottery

- Concerned that Newt_20 has been overlooked as not shown on the Commonplace interactive map despite being in HELAA.

Woodbury Salterton

- Concerned that Wood_45 has been overlooked as not shown on the Commonplace interactive map despite being in HELAA.