

EAST DEVON DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the consultative meeting of Strategic Planning Committee held Online via the zoom app on 29 September 2022

Attendance list at end of document

The meeting started at 9.31 am and ended at 4.50 pm. The meeting was adjourned at 1.10 pm and reconvened at 1.45 pm.

In the absence of the Chair, Councillor Paul Arnott, the Committee agreed to Councillor Olly Davey being the Chair and to Councillor Mike Howe being Vice Chair.

Councillor Paul Arnott was present at the meeting when it reconvened at 1.45 pm and so chaired the remainder of the meeting with Councillor Olly Davey as Vice Chair.

29 Public speaking

Councillor Alasdair Bruce spoke on behalf of Feniton Parish Council referring the Committee to the sites proposed for Feniton and the comments from the Planning Inquiry of 2014 where the Inspector had only passed one small site concluding that Feniton was not a sustainable location for new large scale housing developments.

He advised the Parish Council believed the description of 'modest' for the services and infrastructure was grossly misleading and suggested with only one pub, one small shop, a school at maximum capacity and no medical services was best described as 'low' given the large size of the current population. The road infrastructure in and around Feniton was inadequate for the level of traffic use and the number of potential jobs within easy access of the village was tiny with most employment opportunities requiring a car journey, contrary to EDDC policy to encourage less car usage. With the exception of site Feni_05 which could enhance Feniton the Parish Council believed that the categorisation of the majority of sites as 3 and 4 was not supported by the facts. He referred to the recent spate of sewage discharges into our bathing waters which only highlighted the glaring obvious inadequacy of our current overloaded system and any additional large scale development will not only serve to further overload the system but with its proximity to the River Otter would further endanger the water quality and environment.

Councillor Graham Long spoke on behalf of Upottery Parish Council asking for Members to consider to include the 2.3 acre housing site identified in Upottery village during the 2017 Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment which had been removed following advice from officers. He outlined four reasons why the site should be included:

1. The community supports additional housing similar in number to the growth the parish has seen over the previous 15 years. Upottery has a much cherished primary school and young families in the village are needed for the school to survive;
2. The role and functions of settlements report considered at Committee July 2021 showed Upottery to be a very slightly larger and more active parish than Broadhembury which is included in the Local Plan;
3. The fact that Upottery has a peripatetic post office whilst Broadhembury has a shop/post office seems to be the only reason the site was removed. The report did not take into account the neighbouring village of Churchinford, which is in Somerset and has a very active community shop, coffee shop and post office supported by Upottery residents;

4. Whilst residents of Broadhembury remain dependent on broadband delivered over copper wires, all three Upottery villages have access to full fibre gigabit broadband since 2019 which has been extensively used during the pandemic but also enables residents to shop online at all the major supermarkets.

The following statement was read out on behalf of Councillor Colin Brown, Ward Member:

Upottery has a field in the middle of the village opposite the village hall, which is just over 2 acres. The parish council would like to see development for the benefit of the village and its residents. We all know the planning system is against the creation of new homes in the countryside, especially where it is classed as unsustainable. Upottery is not that type of village!

In a recent appeal decision, the Inspector stated 'in allowing development one mile outside the village' paragraph 78 of the National Planning Policy Framework saying that rural housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities, in this regard, a small range of facilities and services, including a primary school, exists in the village, it is reasonable to consider that these facilities and services would see use by future occupants of the proposed development, this could help to sustain these facilities and services, benefiting the broader rural community.

Villages have only survived through organic growth. This village should be allowed organic growth in its centre to retain the lifeblood it needs to flourish and prosper, it has the facilities, the school and a good regular bus service.

Councillor David Key, Ward Member endorsed everything the two previous speakers had said about Upottery. He advised he had lived in the village for over 46 years which had grown into a thriving village with a thriving school, church and a brand new playing field and would like Upottery included in the Local Plan to help keep the school going and the village thriving.

The following statement was read out on behalf of Anthony Bragg, a resident of West Hill:

I object to any further development in West Hill specifically site West_01 as follows:

Local Amenity:

Although "Amenity benefit" does not have a definition in the Town and Country Act legislation, case law suggests: "*Pleasant circumstances or features, advantages.*"¹ As with many other residents the appeal to me of this area is the beauty and density of trees and woodland proximal to where I live. Development on this site would be a detriment to that amenity.

Site West 01 is in an elevated position and any housing development would overlook neighbours' houses and gardens situated on a lower level, compromising their privacy.

Wildlife habitat

The area is home to many species of wildlife – in fact Mr Robin Offer, the Arboricultural Officer noted, on site visit, the presence of fallow deer grazing. Owls are heard, and buzzards and bats are seen in this environment. See attached photo taken from our garden

Visibility

West 01 describes trees, groups and woodlands that are not only visible from the B3180 road but from the adjoining footpath (No.5) used by many residents, particularly from Eastfield and Hayes End. The trees not only contribute and have a relationship with the local landscape, but they also contribute to the special character and appearance of West Hill.

Although all the trees are protected by TPO some of them could be under threat. The attached PowerPoints demonstrate this and relate to the area that could be affected by development.

Noise

The same trees not only provide a visual break from the B3180, but also an effective noise barrier from this busy road to local residents.

Flooding

There has been some minor flooding in lower neighbouring gardens in vicinity of West 01. It is understood there is an attenuation tank in the tree area T1 / T2. Any removal of said tank or surrounding trees, which are helping to control water runoff, may predicate increased risk of flooding to lower-level housing.

Councillor Robert Hatton, addressed the Committee on behalf of Bishops Clyst Parish Council about proposals for Clyst St Mary. He advised local facilities in Clyst St Mary were limited with only a half hourly bus service to Exeter or Sidmouth/Honiton, no doctor's surgery, with residents having to use surgeries at Pinhoe, Topsham and Woodbury, none of which are easily reachable by public transport. In 2018 the Greenspire development added 80 houses to the existing 350 in the BUAB, a 23% increase. Plans had been approved for a further 38 houses and 40 apartments, another 18% increase. In the draft Local Plan it was proposed to take a further increase of 17.7 - 25.1%, one of the largest allocations. 25% increase is not a fair proportion of the overall target for our community. Because of the traffic congestion at peak times the village has to suffer from the rat run through the village to avoid queues at the A376 roundabout and also from traffic using the back lanes from the A30 and Exeter Airport which exits through the village. This causes delays, congestion and safety issues in the village centre around the shop, school and pub. Many of the listed sites, including Sowt_09, would gain access through this area, making the current situation far worse. There are major recurring problems with sewage flooding, involving raw sewage running through the streets in the lower part of the village and also surcharging toilets of low lying houses. South West Water has so far been unable to resolve this problem and we are concerned that a solution must be found before there is any further development in the River Clyst catchment.

As noted in the report, we are in the process of reviewing our Neighbourhood Plan. We have had helpful and constructive discussion with EDDC officers and are consulting residents on the site options. We hope that the Local Plan consultation process will retain the flexibility to reflect our findings in the final site allocations.

The following statement was read out on behalf of West Hill Parish Council:
West Hill Parish Council will comment in detail on the draft Local Plan when it is published and we have had the chance to listen to our residents' views. However, we would like to make some preliminary comments on the proposed site allocations for West Hill.

There were very many sites around West Hill put forward through the HELAA process, and we are pleased that Officers have excluded the majority as possible site allocations. The preferred site allocations are WH04, WH06, and a 2nd best site, WH01.

There are problems with all of these sites.

WH04 – highways access to this site would presumably be from Windmill Lane. This is narrow and unlit, and totally unsuitable for the volume of traffic that would come from the development. The walking route to the village centre and facilities is about 1km, and along mostly unlit roads with no footway. The site is on some of the highest ground in

West Hill, and development is likely to breach the skyline and therefore have significant landscape impact.

WH04 and WH06 – both these sites are on land that has many springs and natural aquifers. There are problems with surface water runoff and flooding, which has already caused problems to residents in surrounding streets.

WH01 – proposed 2nd best allocation. This is a site with high landscape value, and many TPO'd trees. The current woodland acts as a buffer between the recent development at Hayes End and the busy B3180, and is a haven for wildlife.

The Parish Council also have concerns about the lack of infrastructure. We share many facilities with Ottery St Mary, and the proposed development there, which is excessive, will place even more strain on services. There are particular problems with primary and secondary school capacities, medical services at the Coleridge Medical Centre, and inadequate bus services. For West Hill itself, we have a severe lack of public open space and community facilities, and a single shop. Two thirds of workers commute out to work. These factors make West Hill less sustainable than many other communities, and yet we are proposed to have 9.1% growth – far more than many major towns such as Exmouth, Honiton and Sidmouth, and far more than many other Tier 4 villages, a significant number of which have 0 preferred sites for allocation.

The following statement was read out on behalf of Mike Drewe on behalf of the Trustees of Broadhembury Estate:

In response to your draft report concerning Broadhembury village and considering the site opposite the Memorial Hall, I would like to comment as to why it is not appropriate for development.

The infrastructure supporting Broadhembury village is at a capacity where it should not be subjected to the extra burden of increased traffic and human waste disposal. The roads supporting the village are inadequate, persistently damaged by flooding, the increased volume of traffic and size of agricultural vehicles. They are becoming more dangerous for pedestrians. The sewerage pumping station is now running beyond full capacity with frequent overflows of sewerage and would certainly not benefit from the additional waste from another 10 dwellings.

Flooding in the village is on the increase due to the speed and volume of the water that passes through the valley catchment area. Poor soil percolation properties and the speed of run off from this site already contribute to flooding and this would be exacerbated by any hard landscaping consistent with development. The river Tale at the lower end of the village struggles to cope with the volume of water that passes through when there is wet weather. Last year, flooding here rendered several properties uninhabitable, one of which took seven months to repair.

The site is not well screened and is elevated from the road. This in turn makes it visible along the main entrance to the village, from the village hall and from the northwest and west of the village. Development would compromise the vista towards the Grade I Listed church along the entrance to the village.

As has rightly been acknowledged, Broadhembury village is a Heritage Asset, a concentration of over twenty medieval/late medieval dwellings and a designated Conservation Area in the AONB. The site would compromise the setting of this Heritage Asset as it overlooks two Grade II* Listed Buildings and their curtilage, one of these being the pub and its public garden. Transversely, an important vista from the Conservation Area out into open countryside would be lost if there were to be any development there. The village and its vibrant surrounding wildlife benefit greatly from

dark skies and the land adjoining the site is host to amongst others, rare Barbastelle bats which are sensitive to light pollution, to lose this special benefit would be a tragedy.

The following statement was read out on behalf of Ruth Irish a resident of Bishops Clyst: I would like to highlight the potential perception of what is currently happening regarding Bishop's Clyst proposals and within surrounding parishes. As a resident, it feels as though there is building on every available space, all at the same time. It would be interesting to know what percentage of all of these sites truly offer affordable homes and is there a coherent overall plan.

As you are fully aware, there is a huge site in Topsham (which is creeping along in the direction of The Blue Ball). Cranbrook is about to double in size. Pinhoe developments are also extensive and on-going. Hotel built at Sandy Park and IKEA.

As for Clyst St Mary specifically, Greenspire has been established, properties squeezed in behind the Old Maltsters Arms and the Burrington Estates development of Winslade House, Defra building and surrounding grounds is incomplete.

Existing services such as health care and schooling will surely be put further under pressure. During evenings, a bus service is available only every 1.5 hours. Traffic and parking is a real issue. I have noticed that the residents of the recently renovated cottages opposite the shop have put up signs requesting consideration for the residential area in terms of noise and disturbance. Delivery vans visiting the village and shop are continuous throughout the day. Exiting the roundabout in the mornings can be very tricky due to the volume of traffic to and from Sidmouth, Exmouth and Exeter. Let alone, the short-cutting from the airport direction along Bishop's Court Lane and into the village along Frog Lane.

30 **Minutes of the previous meeting**

Members accepted the minutes of the consultative Strategic Planning Committee on 6 September 2022.

31 **Declarations of interest**

Minute 35. Site selection for the emerging East Devon Local Plan 2020 to 2040 - findings for Tier 3 and Tier 4 settlements - small towns and larger villages.

Councillor Mike Howe, Other Registerable Interest, Bishops Clyst Parish Councillor.

Minute 35. Site selection for the emerging East Devon Local Plan 2020 to 2040 - findings for Tier 3 and Tier 4 settlements - small towns and larger villages.

Councillor Mike Howe, Affects and prejudicial Non-registerable Interest, Owner of a convenience shop in Clyst St Mary. Advised not predetermined but had strong views.

32 **Matters of urgency**

There were no matters of urgency.

33 **Confidential/exempt item(s)**

There were no confidential/exempt items.

34 **Presentations from invited developers/agents/landowners promoting sites at Tier 3 and Tier 4 settlements which are recommended for allocation or as second choice sites for allocation by officers**

The following presentations were presented to Members.

Alex Bullock, Grass Roots Planning representing Land Value Alliances (LVA)

Brcl 12 – Land West of Whimple Road, Broadclyst

- Site boundary is circa 12 hectares (30 acres) consisting of 6 largely flat fields divided by mixed hedgerow and limited tree provision;
- Opportunity to provide 160 dwellings including affordable housing and self- build plots;
- The site has a collection of farm buildings;
- Large frontage onto Whimple Road;
- Public right of ways run through the site;
- Ability to deliver off-site improvements to public open space, cycle and footpath links via S106;
- Accessible to primary and secondary school and local facilities;
- Vehicle access from Whimple Road;
- Provision of pedestrian and cycle links to existing footpath network;
- Structural planting to strengthen existing site boundary features;
- Attenuation basins (sustainable drainage system);
- Generous new areas of public open space with potential space for new playing field alongside new play areas;
- Regular bus service linking Broadclyst with Exeter;
- Cranbrook train station is located circa 3km to the south of the site;
- Significant biodiversity net gain with an aim to exceed national target.

Richard Jackson, Senior Estate Manager, Killerton House

Brcl 29 – Land East of Town End, Broadclyst

- Potential to accommodate up to 24 dwellings offering high quality design and layout located close to the village and facilities;
- Approximately 1ha.
- Low land sensitivity;
- Key constraints include minor visual impact on surrounding properties, overlaps SSSI Impact Risk Zone, loss of productive agricultural land and vehicle access would need to be from Town End;

Nick Yeo, 3 West Group Ltd on behalf of Andy J Dyer Limited

GH/ED/73 – Land West of Strawberry Hill, Lymptone

- Existing development borders the north and south of the site and existing roads to the east and west;
- Retention of key hedgerows and mature trees within the site;
- Positive biodiversity net gain;
- Discussions ongoing with DCC Highways relating to appropriate points of access and to secure appropriate pedestrian linkages.

Questions raised by Members included:

- What proportion of the houses built would be affordable? Mr Yeo advised affordable housing would be provided with the expectation that it would be delivered in accordance with the council's affordable housing policy.

David Seaton, PCL Planning

GH/ED/75 – Land off Grange Close, Lymptone

- Site is adjacent to the Built Up Area Boundary (BUAB);
- Planning consent granted for new dwelling and car port (reference 21/0490/FUL) on adjacent land also outside the BUAB;
- Site is accessible from a private drive to the south, connecting to Grange Close;
- Existing trees would be retained with the provision of sensitive and domestic scale landscaping. All landscaping would carefully consider both existing wildlife and horticulture while attempting to establish

Sam Blight, Acorn Property Group

Lymp_01 – 22 Underhill Crescent, Lymptone

- Key constraint: the site falls within the Green Wedge;
- Proposal for sensitive and bespoke design of individual dwellings with due consideration of storey heights, materials, form and landscaping;
- Infill site – residential development to the north, east and west of the site;
- Detailed consideration to strengthen existing trees and planting along the southern boundary to produce a legible edge to the settlement;
- Two points of access from Underhill Crescent and Underhill Close suitable to serve small number of dwellings;
- Sustainable location within walking distance of local amenities;

Stephen Baimbridge, Greenslades, Taylor Hunt on behalf of Strongvox

Char_04 – Land off Green Lane, Chardstock

- Provision of at least 10% biodiversity net gain on the site as well as providing other environmental benefits;
- Opportunity to deliver up to 40 dwellings comfortably whilst maintaining a soft, green edge to the east of the site;
- Landscape and masterplanning work ongoing;
- Well located close to village facilities.

Questions raised by Members included:

- Clarification sought on whether the site would be viable with 30 houses on the site rather than 40 houses that you have suggested and would this include affordable housing. In response Mr Baimbridge advised Strongbox would deliver the number of affordable houses deemed acceptable by officers and whether it was 40 or 30 houses it would be delivered so that it sits comfortably within a sensitive landscape;
- Clarification sought on whether open space for residents would be provided. Mr Baimbridge advised the site's opportunities provided green splits to break up the site in suitable areas.

Richard Shaw, Savills

Sowt_11 – Land at Bishops Court Road, Clyst St Mary

- Sustainable location to deliver an appropriate level of housing focused around the existing village;
- Accessible to wider jobs and facilities within a public transport corridor;
- Within the Clyst Valley Trail and opportunities for cycling;

- Either or both areas of land can be readily developed for residential with appropriate supporting facilities;
- The number and range of houses can be flexible which can meet, identify local needs and should include affordable housing;
- Houses would be built to a high quality and well-designed development with appropriate infrastructure and facilities;
- Access is available from both parcels of land to the north and south from the road with existing frontier services available;
- No technical constraints;
- Potential opportunity to combine future modest scale on the south of Bishops Court with land to the south shown as Sowt_03.

Questions raised by Members included:

- In the report officers recommend the site as a 2nd best site with a maximum development of 30 dwellings. How will this affect your proposal for a maximum yield of 162 dwellings? In response Mr Shaw advised the landowner was flexible at this stage and that it would be logical for the 30 dwellings to be developed on the area of land to the south of Bishops Court Road. The facilities that could be delivered with those 30 dwellings would be open space and a mix of housing;
- Is the proposed land used by Devon County Showground? No
- What will be done to alleviate the sewerage issues which is full to capacity? South West Water would need to address these issues with a potential contribution from the landowners to the solutions.

Alan Breckon on behalf of Mrs N Hill and Mrs R Broom

Dunk_05 – Land at Broomfields, Dunkeswell

- The site is the former Dunkeswell football pitch which includes two dugouts that still stand on the northern side of the site (not listed buildings);
- It is a roughly square shaped parcel of grassland with a capacity for 36 dwellings to provide a low density scheme of mixed housing comprising single storey units along the western side with appropriately designed amenity space within the layout, respecting its AONB location;
- A range of house sizes could be provided catering for younger residents, families and the elderly including the required policy led affordable housing;
- There are two historic points of access, one off its 30mph road frontage and the other is a gated access to the north and a former access into the football pitch to the south;
- Trees along its northern and eastern boundaries are protected by TPOs and would be unaffected;
- Existing mature hedgerow boundary along its southern side would provide softening views of the proposed development and also provide a long term defensible boundary preventing any further development of land on the south side of the village

Daniel Rogers, Bell Cornwell on behalf of Concertare Burlands Mead Ltd

Feni_05 – Land and buildings at Burland Mead, Feniton

- Potential development in the region of 43 dwellings;
- 1.4ha.
- Sustainable location, close to the primary school and village shop;
- Limited sensitivities;
- The site is an infill development between the railway line and the main road to the north and to the north east and southeast;

- Existing pavement to provide safe walking;
- Site vacant for development.

Questions raised by Members included:

- Clarification sought on the issue of flooding and existing drainage facilities. Mr Rogers acknowledged the concerns and advised this was currently being investigated by their engineers and the landowners had been liaising with officers to overcome this;
- What will the landowners be doing to resolve the issues of the flooding that regularly occurs at the bottom left corner of the site and sewerage provision to the sewerage pumping station opposite? Mr Rogers advised he could not provide an answer today and would report the issues raised to the landowner;
- Have you undertaken a survey on housing needs? Although Mr Rogers advised he did not have the information to hand he predicted 50% of the current development plan.

Stephen Baimbridge, Greenslade Taylor Hunt on behalf of NE & PM Harwood

Feni 08 – Land adjoining to the West of Beechwood, Station Road, Feniton

- There is now an additional approximately 2.2 hectares of contiguous land that is available as well as being suitable and deliverable;
- There has been no change to the extent of the northern side;
- The owners have the right to access the land and connect to utilities through the Wain Homes sites to the west;
- The additional land will now better connect the brownfield site to the built up area of Feniton ensuring the redevelopment would sit even more comfortably as part of a comprehensive development and improve the pedestrian and cycle experience;
- The land is available, suitable and deliverable with no significant constraints.

The Service Lead – Planning Strategy and Development Management drew Members attention to the additional land referred to in the presentation advising as it had not been submitted through the HEELA process and was not assessed it could not be considered today.

Dan Yeates, Chris Dolling, Angela Jacobs, Savills on behalf of Taylor Wimpey

Feni 09 – Land at Sherwood Cross, north west Feniton

- A walkable neighbourhood close to the heart of Feniton'
- Good access to transport links, local facilities, services and new bus stops;
- Potential to accommodate approximately 120 dwellings including affordable and market;
- Opportunity to deliver community and recreational facilities;
- New walking routes and an extensive area of public open space;
- The site is relatively contained visually by the topography and existing vegetation;
- Opportunity for biodiversity net gain, ecological enhancements for a range of species and trees and hedge planting as well as biodiversity education incorporated into the play trail;
- Site access from widened Colestocks Road;
- Opportunity for community facilities – pool, bikes, charging hubs, car sharing;
- Site in flood zone 1 and SuDS proposed to control surface water on the site and manage its discharge;
- There are two listed buildings in proximity of the site and important hedgerow within the site;

Questions raised by Members included:

- Clarification sought on the number of affordable housing. Mr Yeates confirmed it was 50%.
- Clarification sought on the direction of the surface water run-off. Mr Dolling suggested it would out to the River Tale but would need to double check the route
- Would the landowners be offering an improvement on the bus service? Mr Dolling advised he was happy to contribute towards the local bus service.
- Have you completed a survey to identify the types of houses that would be needed? Mr Yeates advised that Taylor Wimpey were open and flexible in exploring the benefits of different house types. Mr Dolling advised they wanted to build the right homes in the right location for the local people who want to live there and that a market research would be done to help understand what was needed.

Mathew Dalton Aram, Dalton-Aram Planning Ltd

Kilm_10 – Land to the west and south west of the Old Inn, Kilmington

- Kilm_10 should be allocated alongside Kilm_09. Immediately adjacent to each other;
- Opportunity for five dwellings;
- Well related to village, services and facilities and A35;
- Close to public transport links;
- Performs well in terms of accessibility and sustainability;
- Disagree that development would have 'high landscape impact';
- Council's Conservation Officer considered the dwellings should be reoriented along north-south axis to reduce the mass of built form, allow for wider views of landscape and would result in a more comfortable layout when balanced against the immediate and wider setting of the listed building;
- Devon County Highways raised no objection and considered a small residential development would unlikely to have a severe impact on the A35 trunk road;

In response to Mathew Dalton Aram's comments the Service Lead – Planning Strategy and Development Management advised that the site was not ruled out as it was currently a 2nd best choice site and suggested conversations were needed with the landowners regarding the constraints to help move the site forward.

Dan Yeates, Savills on behalf of LVA

Sidm_34 – Land between Furzehill and Hillside, Sidbury

- Opportunity for an exemplar low carbon sustainable development to provide a variety of housing types including affordable housing and self-build;
- The site would be able to deliver biodiversity net gain and enhanced habitat for wildlife;
- Located on the edge of the village and close to a range of local services and facilities including a school, shops and bus stops;
- Provides safe and secure off-road pedestrian/cycle infrastructure avoiding the dangerous parts of the A375 between Hillside and Sidbury;
- Opportunity to connect to cycle network;
- Opportunity to deliver open space, allotments and play area;
- Significant constraints include the site lies within the AONB, potential views of the site from the east and south west, the topography will have significant impact on the design of the proposals including the layout and architectural design. The site itself is steep, sloping downward from west to east;
- A walkable neighbourhood close to the heart of the village;

- Approximately 40-50 dwellings for options 1 and 2 and 38 dwellings for option 3 including affordable and market;

Questions raised by Members included:

- Do you know what the time of the last bus is out of Sidbury is now? Mr Yeates advised he did not have that information to hand. It was advised the last bus was 7pm so connectivity was challenged.
- Clarification sought on the current state of funding for the cycle path given that phase two would go through the site. Mr Yeates advised he had been informed that phase one funding was in place but not for phase two.
- Do you know whether there are any spaces at the primary school to take additional places? Mr Yeates advised the number hadn't been checked in the last couple of weeks but suspected, as most primary schools, they were close to capacity and it was something that needed to be looked at as part of wider engagement. For Mr Yeates information he was advised the school was full.
- Clarification sought on the preferred access to the site and whether it would be via the existing housing estate. Mr Yeates advised it would be on Chapel Street but other options were being looked at.
- Clarification sought on whether the cycle path would link to the industrial estate at Sidford. Mr Yeates advised it was not appropriate for him to answer and to direct to Devon County Council.

Simon Collier, Collier Planning on behalf of Strongvox Homes
West_04 – Land adjoining Windmill Lane, West Hill

- The site lies at the southern end of Windmill Lane with a road frontage within Windmill Lane on its north-eastern boundary and an existing dropped kerb point of access;
- It is surrounded by development on three sides;
- It has TPO trees on its boundaries which provide good visual containment to the site;
- Within walking distance of the village shop, school and close to bus stops through Moorlands and Beech Park;
- Opportunity for between 30 – 40 dwellings including affordable housing and open space;

Questions raised by Members included:

- Clarification sought on where the children from this site would go to school. In response Mr Collier assumed that Devon County Council would take this into account and if there was an issue with school capacity Strongvox could work with Devon County Council to overcome this.
- Clarification sought on whether some of the walk near the site is unpaved. Mr Collier confirmed it was emphasising if the site was developed alongside the adjoining sites there was potential to make than an even shorter walk;
- How many trips will be generated from the development? Mr Collier did not have the figures to hand advising it would be looked at before submitting the planning application.

In response to issues raised about school capacity the Service Lead – Planning Strategy and Development Management advised it was a very complex issue and from information provided West Hill School had some limited capacity but not the level of capacity expected to take the level of growth expected for West Hill. It was not a reason to take sites out of consultation at this stage but the need to seek public views to have a clear idea how these needs could be met in partnership with Devon County Council.

Simon Tofts, Blue Cedar Homes

West 06 – Land north and east of Eastfield, West Hill

- This site is in two parts, the first part to the north measures approximately 2 acres and the site to the southeast measures approximately half acre;
- Existing developments from the site is to the north, east and south;
- Opportunity for communal green space;
- Gardens and landscaping to boundaries;
- Looking to work closely with officers to develop a scheme suitable for the site.

Questions raised by Members included:

- Clarification sought on the number of dwellings proposed. In response Mr Tofts advised it had been earmarked for 31 dwellings in the draft Local Plan but at this stage no numbers had been confirmed;
- How many school children do you think this site would generate? Mr Tofts advised he did not have the information at this stage and said he would work with Devon County Council and the Local Education Authority to alleviate the problem;
- As the site is bordered heavily with trees will these be kept safe? In response Mr Tofts advised some trees were protected, protection areas would not be built in and there was no plans to remove any trees as they would provide screening and are an attractive feature.

35 **Site selection for the emerging East Devon Local Plan 2020 to 2040 - findings for Tier 3 and Tier 4 settlements - small towns and larger villages**

Before inviting the Service Lead – Planning Strategy and Development Management to present his report the Chair addressed Committee Members and proposed to amend the recommendations in line with the tier 1 and tier 2 recommendations to read as follows: 'Recommend endorsement of the preferred sites and 2nd choice sites as suitable for public consultation.'

The Committee considered the Service Lead – Planning Strategy and Development Management's report that specifically concentrated on the assessment of potential sites to allocate for development in tier 3, Budleigh Salterton and Colyton and tier 4, selected villages that had a good range of services and facilities. The sites in each of the tiers listed in the report were shown as preferred sites for allocations for development and 2nd best choices for allocation to ensure that sufficient housing was met to ensure the plan could be found sound by the Planning Inspector at examination.

The Service Lead – Planning Strategy and Development Management referred Members to the Chair's proposed recommendation addressing a caveat to give consideration to the scale of growth in Feniton and Whimble and how to frame the level of growth for those two settlements in the consultation.

The Chair suggested the Committee go through the settlements alphabetically.

Councillor Ingham sought clarification on whether there was a percentage chart for tier 3 as detailed in paragraph 4.6 for tier 4. In response the Service Lead – Planning Strategy and Development Management apologised advising it could be produced in due course if necessary emphasising the general point was to discuss the scale of growth for Feniton and Whimble indicating the number of sites proposed for both these settlements as preferred and 2nd choice sites would be strategically significant for our strategy. He also

referred to other settlements that had in excess of 10% growth that Members may want to discuss and suggested that Members could still consult on all of the preferred sites and 2nd choice sites in those locations with a frame for the consultation about how much growth would be considered in those two settlements as well as other settlements if Members had concerns about the volume of growth.

A discussion took place on a suitable way forward for the meeting where it was addressed there was a very real risk that the plan would fail at examination as it was placing larger levels of housing in tier 3 and 4 settlements. In response the Service Lead – Planning Strategy and Development Management suggested the consultation could be framed in a way to suggest it was looking at ranges of level of growth in locations and gave Exmouth as an example, as tier one, which could be argued that the scale of growth proposed was an acceptable level but if you include all the preferred sites and 2nd choice sites in some of the villages it would not be an acceptable level. This could be done in terms of developing the Spatial Strategy for the Local Plan which was another key part of the consultation that was needed to be undertaken.

The Chair sought clarification on the consequences if Feniton and Whimple were not ready at this stage to go out to consultation. The Service Lead – Planning Strategy Development Management advised that they could not be excluded at this stage as this would only lead to further consultation at a later stage.

Further discussion took place where Members addressed their concerns about development in a number of villages in tier 4. A suggestion was made to put all the sites out for consultation with an explanation about why they are there emphasising the council did not want settlements to double in size. In response the Service Lead – Planning Strategy and Development Management advised this could be done by asking the public to rank sites in an order of preference which would hopefully address Members concerns and avoid the need for further consultation.

The Service Lead – Planning Strategy and Development Management acknowledged Members concerns about the scale of growth and reminded Members that the shortfall in housing numbers was reported to them back in August 2021 where they were given a number of options which were not debated on. He advised in order to avoid further consultation it was important that the consultation identified all the options that Members wish to consider and take forward and to keep options open at this stage so that it can be done later on.

Clarification sought about Upottery wanting more development but was not in a tier 4 settlement. In response the Service Lead – Planning Strategy and Development Management advised if it was for Members to decide the threshold in terms of what constitutes a sustainable community and reminded Members the hierarchy of settlements had been debated on four separate occasions. He further advised the way to accommodate growth should villages want it would be through community led developments and through neighbourhood plans.

The Chair invited Members to comment on the sites proposed in the settlements:

Clarification was sought on whether there was an opportunity to look at strategically planning sites for development including those that had not been put forward in the call for sites. The Service Lead – Planning Strategy and Development Management acknowledged there was an opportunity to do this as we are required to look at all supply sources. It could be worth exploring sites on the edge of settlements suitable for growth that had not been put forward and also when considering the new community options but

we would need a willing land owner in order to allocate them. A further option would be to upgrade some of the 2nd best sites in locations such as Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

TIER 3

Budleigh Salterton

- The report suggests it can accommodate up to 300 homes but officers have only recommended 50 2nd best choices; This is an opportunity for substantial additional development in a town with a good range of services and facilities;
- Far less houses compared to Feniton and Whimble. There is a need to look at towns that are more sustainable;
- There is a need to see the Housing Needs Assessment for Budleigh Salterton to deliver its need;
- Support for growth in the AONB. The Service Lead – Planning Strategy and Development Management advised that the whole of the town was in the AONB;
- Need to consider architecture in AONBs. Tighter controls are needed.

Colyton

- The site assessment says the site has High/Medium landscape sensitivity- a prominent position & there are views into the site from the AONB.
- It would also have a significant moderate adverse ecological effect- within the Beer Quarry Caves SAC
- There are significant infrastructure implications- Colyton and Seaton primary schools have some capacity but not to total levels- the committee should know that Colyton Primary School was landlocked, with inadequate open space/ play area.
- Axe Valley, our nearest Secondary School could not take all the children.
- Colyton Parish Neighbourhood Plan had recently been made. At para 8.21 the NP states that development above the 200' contour has long been resisted by Colyton PC for protection of landscape reasons. This site would be completely contrary to policies in the NP and the parish will not understand why people did all this work on producing a plan, at great cost, which EDDC accepted, only to railroad through it. This will be seriously controversial. A Planning Application for land at this site was refused in 2016 because of detrimental impact to the landscape setting of the town. It forms a key undeveloped skyline.
- Cannot agree with the assessment of the potential accesses. Clay Lane and Old Sidmouth Road are single track, very narrow country lanes quite unsuitable for access for around 50 more dwellings, 25 on the preferred area of the site and 24 on the 2nd best land.
- Where are the Employment opportunities mentioned? Colyton lost 70 jobs when the CeramTec Factory shut. Employment opportunities are sadly lacking. Development at this land would increase car use with all its associated harm to the environment.
- Across the road from this land is Seaway Head. This development was an Exception Site- all the houses are affordable, for locals in perpetuity.
- What Colyton wants is Affordable Housing, not housing which is damaging to the landscape, located miles away from employment and unaffordable to locals.
- Coly_02 – it was suggested that an appropriate scale of houses could be built on a section to the right hand side of the site similar to the existing affordable housing site south of the Old Sidmouth Road. Ideally it should be affordable. It is outside the built up area boundary and the natural suggestion might be that the landowners could look at this as an exception site.

Lympstone

- Lymp_01, GH/ED/73 and GH/ED/75 supported for consideration;
- GH/ED/72 not for consideration at this stage;
- GH/ED/72 not within the parish boundary of Lympstone but in the parish of Woodbury. Support this allocation going forward for inclusion if the benefits through CIL and 106 payments were somehow only the benefit of this site or Lympstone Parish.

Woodbury

- Wood_24 – residents have supported this site;
- Wood_10 - supported;
- Wood_09 – should be included in the consultation as it is within the heart of the village and would be suitable for low density housing.
- Wood_12 - which is adjacent to Wood_10 and to the preferred site of Wood_14 - would be supported for inclusion for consultation;
- Wood_20 – cannot support as it is on a lane without a footpath and large section of the site is the community orchard and community dog walking field area. Losing these facilities would be detrimental to the community;
- Wood_23 – cannot support as it is some distance from the village centre with no public footpath along a very busy road.

TIER 4

Broadhembury

- Brhe_04 & Brhe_06 – supported;
- Brhe_07 – supported as sits just outside the village;
- Need to be mindful to protect the character of the village.

Clyst St Mary

- Sowt_09 – not suitable for a preferred choice as it's on a busy road with no street path. It has extremely congested heavy vehicles using the road;
- Sowt_11 & Sowt_03 should be put together to allow a link road from the A3052 to stop the rat run;

Dunkeswell

- Dunkeswell in the past has been classed by the Inspectorate as unsustainable because it does not have a school. It only has one shop, no public house and limited regular bus service and the main transport is by private motor car. There is opportunity for development at Hornbeam which has holiday restrictions. It would give the opportunity to buy at affordable end of the market and would help East Devon increase its housing availability to local first time buyers;

Exton

- If Wood_01, Wood_27 and Wood_28 were all put forward it would represent growth of 15% which is excessive for the village
- Wood_28 - could only be supported for a maximum of 20 dwellings (which was the original suggestion) and if the flooding issue is resolved;
- Wood_01 – support

Feniton

- Feni_01 – support with a well-designed drainage system to help reduce flood risk to Feniton and Gosford;

- Feni_04 and Feni_05 – There would be a great benefit to open this culvert up to become an open watercourse and potentially slow flood flows down;
- Feni_07 – development here with additional storage would reduce risk for everyone
- Feni_08 – similar to Feni_07 but to a lesser extent;
- Feni_09 – this is a large site with the east field which is the main cause of the level crossing flooding and properties to the south;
- Feni_10 – is a tree heavy large garden, so from flood risk perspective it would be difficult to improve;

Payhembury

- Payh_01 – clarification sought about whether this came in as a planning application. It was suggested the southern part of the site had planning permission although it was not a preferred allocation or 2nd choice site;

Plymtree

- Plym_03 – more than enough with 30 houses!

Sidbury

- Sidm_25 – reservations about this site – access and connectivity issues and no funding earmarked for phase 1 cycle scheme.

Tipton St John

- Otry_04 – history of previous planning application being refused on the basis the village was unsustainable. Any significant development should consider the requirement for a new primary school

West Hill

- West_01, West_06 and West_04 – do not support as one greenfield sites, no jobs, no school places and no playing fields;
- Do not support any of the sites for West Hill;

Whimble

- Whimble is a small village with three main routes via a single lane which causes a build-up of traffic;
- Whim_03 – no footpaths;
- Whim_07 – flooding issues;
- Whim_08 – poor pedestrian and cycle links to the village centre;
- Whim_11 – flooding issues;
- Whim_13 – too remote from the village centre

The Chair invited Members to vote on the recommendation proposed from the Chair.

RECOMMENDATION:

Recommend endorsement of the preferred sites and 2nd choice sites as suitable for public consultation.

Attendance List

Councillors present:

P Arnott (Chair)

O Davey (Vice-Chair)
J Bailey
K Blakey
M Howe
B Ingham
R Lawrence
D Ledger
G Pratt
P Skinner

Councillors also present (for some or all the meeting)

M Armstrong
A Bruce
P Faithfull
J Kemp
D Key
J Loudoun
P Millar
H Parr

Officers in attendance:

Ed Freeman, Service Lead Planning Strategy and Development Management
Shirley Shaw, Planning Barrister
Damian Hunter, Planning Solicitor
Wendy Harris, Democratic Services Officer
Sarah James, Democratic Services Officer

Councillor apologies:

M Allen
S Chamberlain
A Moulding
E Rylance

Chairman

Date: