

# **EAST DEVON DISTRICT COUNCIL**

## **Minutes of the meeting of Strategic Planning Committee held at Council Chamber, Blackdown House, Honiton on 3 September 2024**

### **Attendance list at end of document**

The meeting started at 10.03 am and ended at 5.43 pm

### **127 Minutes of the previous meeting**

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 6 August 2024 were confirmed as a true record.

### **128 Declarations of interest**

Minute 135 to 142.

In accordance with the Code of Good Practice for Councillors and Officers dealing with planning matters as set out in the constitution the Chair, Councillor Todd Olive, advised of extensive lobbying to all members in respect of the proposed housing site allocations.

Minute 135 to 142.

Councillor Matt Hall, Affects Non-registerable Interest – He works as a Planning Officer for Exeter City Council.

### **129 Public speaking**

Susie Culhane spoke on The Exmouth and Surrounds Local Plan Member Working Group note of discussions, and the Feedback on potential development sites at Exmouth and Lympstone in respect of Coastal Preservation Area and Green Wedge designation report. In her community, concerns had been raised about infrastructure capacity to cope with the needs of Exmouth and the surrounding areas. She asked if the unspent CIL funding could be utilised for this purpose as a matter of priority.

The Assistant Director for Planning explained the process in relation to the CIL funding, including consideration of bids later in the year for infrastructure projects.

### **130 Matters of urgency**

None.

### **131 Confidential/exempt item(s)**

None.

### **132 Notes of the CIL Working Party 1 August 2024**

The notes of the CIL working party held on 1 August 2024 were confirmed as a true record.

### **133 Housing Requirement Report**

The Assistant Director for Planning Strategy and Development Management set out his report to the Committee.

The Committee had previously discussed the housing requirement in August, when it was resolved that the emerging Local Plan should include a requirement of at least 946 homes per year. The report set out the housing requirement in more detail by identifying how many homes have already been built or have planning permission in the plan period. Windfall site expectations are then added to the total, to leave a remaining number of dwellings that should be allocated as sites, or broad locations for growth in the emerging Local Plan.

The calculations show that the current projected housing supply across the Local Plan period is sufficient to meet the requirement of 20,812 dwellings. However, the supply figure falls short of the Officer recommended 10% headroom by a total of 1,828 dwellings, with the supply headroom currently standing at 253 dwellings, or 1.2%. This figure needs to be kept under review as work progresses.

In addition, the report recommended adding two years to the plan period, to meet the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirement that plans should look ahead over a minimum of 15 years from adoption.

Discussion on the report included what weight a planning Inspector may place on an agreed percentage of headroom, and if the amount proposed in the report was normal practice for Local Authorities. In response, the figure was indeed good practice, and the reasons for a headroom element were explained including to provide resilience to maintaining a five year land supply.

**RESOLVED that**

1. The end date of the new Local Plan period be extended by two years to the year 2042;
2. The emerging Local Plan total housing requirement is 20,812 dwellings but is currently short of the officer recommended figure for an additional 10% of supply headroom;
3. The emerging Local Plan housing requirement can be met, subject to agreement on site allocations at this and future meetings; be noted.

**134 Proposed Housing Site Allocations - Exmouth and surrounding areas**

The committee considered the proposed site allocations for Exmouth and surrounding areas, as set out in these minutes.

**135 Exmouth Site Selection Report**

**Exmo\_50 Exmouth Police Station**

Proposed use: Housing and redeveloped police station

Number of dwellings: 20

Officer recommendation: Allocate

A statement was read out on behalf of ESCAPE (End Sewage Convoys and Pollution in Exmouth) on this site, but was also applicable to all other sites that would feed wastewater to Maer Lane treatment works. The statement covered the increase in population growth in the area, along with the current over-capacity on the current treatment works and the repeated failure of the sewer infrastructure. ESCAPE therefore recommended that planning development is refused until South West Water carried out a

full review, led by an independent expert, to lead to the production and delivery of a fit for purpose sewage infrastructure.

Officers advised the committee that there was continued engagement with South West Water, and they were very aware of the issues. The committee were charged with consideration of allocation of sites at this stage, and not conditions on planning applications.

Inclusion for allocation was proposed by Cllr Davey and seconded by Cllr B Bailey.

Committee **endorsed the recommendation to include Exmo\_50 in the site allocation.**

**Exmo\_03 land at bottom of Bampton Lane**

Proposed use: Housing

Number of dwellings: 5

Officer recommendation: Not for allocation

Committee **agreed to move on to the next site allocation.**

**Exmo\_23 Courtlands Barn, Courtlands Lane**

Proposed use: Housing

Number of dwellings: 12

Officer recommendation: Allocate

Ward Member Councillor Tim Dumper spoke against the allocation on the grounds of the site being in the coastal protection area, and if developed would result in coalescence of Exmouth and Lympstone which was not supported by local residents.

Committee debated the poor access issues and the opposition locally to the site.

A proposal to move onto the next site failed.

Inclusion for allocation was proposed by Cllr Howe and seconded by Cllr Hayward.

Committee **endorsed the recommendation to include Exmo\_23 in the site allocation.**

**Lymp\_07 Land at Courtlands Cross, Exeter Road, Lympstone**

Proposed use: Housing

Number of dwellings: 100

Officer recommendation: Allocate

Susie Culhane spoke in objection to the allocation, citing reasons of green wedge, and historical refusal of a planning application. She outlined some of the characteristics of the site and expressed concern of the single track access, as well as the lack of suitable water treatment system

Helen Dimond reminded the committee of the view of the Planning Inspector in 2012 and felt that to remove the green wedge between the settlements was not appropriate.

Susan Francis from Lympstone Parish Council outlined their concerns regarding the ecological impact and the risk of coalescence.

The committee discussed other reasons for not including the site, including the proximity of a grade 1 listed wall and the impact on Lympstone Manor. Officers confirmed that the

site was sensitive but could still be put forward as an allocation site with further work on mitigation of adverse impacts.

Committee **agreed to move on to the next site allocation.**

**Lymp\_12 Land fronting A376 and Summer Lane**

Proposed use: Housing

Number of dwellings: 14

Officer recommendation: Allocate

Committee **agreed to move on to the next site allocation.**

**Lymp\_08 Land off Summer Lane, Exmouth**

Proposed use: Housing

Number of dwellings: 174

Officer recommendation: Not to allocate

Susie Culhane spoke in objection to the allocation, citing reasons of greed wedge, and the need for a robust water treatment system.

Elements discussed by the Committee included future plans for a cycle route on the current access, which would be difficult to achieve. Other members felt it could work and should be included.

A proposal for inclusion of the site failed.

Committee **agreed to move on to the next site allocation.**

**Exmo\_04 Land at Marley Drive, Lympstone**

Proposed use: Housing

Number of dwellings: 50

Officer recommendation: Allocate

Andrew Roberts spoke against the allocation of this and related sites Lymp\_09 and Lymp\_10a on the grounds that these were green field sites, adverse impact on the brook, ponds and existing oaks on site, and risk of coalescence. Access to Lump\_09 was not acceptable and the site would adversely impact on historic woodlands. There was also no pedestrian access on the road relating to site Lymp\_10a. He asked the committee to take account of the views of both residents and the local councils as he felt those had been ignored.

Ward Member Maddy Chapman rejected the allocation on the grounds of the impact on wildlife and the natural watercourses. She referenced a rejection from Natural England.

Committee members raised issues of the adverse impact on other natural areas including the Pebblebed heaths, and that the access was not sustainable.

Committee **agreed to move on to the next site allocation.**

**Lymp\_09 Land fronting Hulham Road**

Proposed use: Housing

Number of dwellings: 54

Officer recommendation: Allocate

Helen Dimond spoke against the allocation for reasons of flood risk, whereby water currently drained into the site leading to flooding run off to the village. Any development will only exacerbate this problem.

Susan Francis representing Lympstone Parish Council also raised flood risks as outlined by the previous speaker, as well as the impact of increased traffic, unsuitable pavements and too remote from facilities, making the site unsustainable.

The committee discussed the previous discounting of the site and questioned adding it now as an allocation. Others referenced the need to deal with issues such as flood alleviation and traffic as part of the planning application process.

A proposal for including the site in the allocation failed.

Committee **agreed to move on to the next site allocation.**

**Lymp\_10 (a & b) land off Hulham Road, Lympstone**

Proposed use: Housing

Number of dwellings: 100

Officer recommendation: Allocate

Andrew Roberts spoke against the allocation, outlining the lack of pedestrian access.

Susan Francis, representing Lympstone Parish Council, made reference to some of report detail that stated that sections of the site were remote and therefore too remote for dwellings.

Committee discussed aspects that could be resolved as part of the planning application process. Others raised aspects that they felt were not sustainable for the site, including distance to reach local shops.

Committee **agreed to move on to the next site allocation.**

**Lymp\_14 Coles Field, Hulham Road**

Proposed use: Housing

Number of dwellings: 59

Officer recommendation: Allocate

Andrew Roberts spoke against the allocation, outlining the increased traffic in the area if developed, along with a planned industrial estate nearby. This would lead to unacceptable danger around the primary school site. Brixington facilities were also limited, making this site unsustainable.

Susan Francis of Lympstone Parish Council informed the committee that they had already been approached by the developer but objected to the site, due to the location in countryside, and being isolated from the village. She also explained issues of impact on wildlife, pedestrian safety and poor access.

Simon Collier, representing Eagle Investments Ltd spoke in support of the allocation and explained where access would be along the western boundary of the adjacent development.

The committee discussed the need to resolve the access and the potential for a cycle route to link up to Dinan Way.

Inclusion for allocation was proposed by Cllr Howe and seconded by Cllr Levine.

Committee **endorsed the recommendation to include Lymp\_14 in the site allocation.**

**Lymp\_13 Kings Garden Centre, Higher Hulham Road**

Proposed use: Housing

Number of dwellings: 25

Officer recommendation: Not to allocate

Committee **agreed to move on to the next site allocation.**

**Lymp\_17 Land at Marley House**

Proposed use: Housing

Number of dwellings: 80

Officer recommendation: Not to allocate

Committee **agreed to move on to the next site allocation.**

**Exmo\_07 Bystock Court, Old Bystock Drive**

Proposed use: Housing

Number of dwellings: 40

Officer recommendation: Not to allocate

Ward Member Maddy Chapman outlined reasons for not including the site.

The committee agreed with the officer recommendation not to allocate the site for reasons set out in the report.

Committee **agreed to move on to the next site allocation.**

**Exmo\_21 Land east of Bystock Court**

Proposed use: Housing

Number of dwellings: 40

Officer recommendation: Not to allocate

Ward Member Maddy Chapman outlined reasons for not including the site.

The committee agreed with the officer recommendation not to allocate the site for reasons set out in the report.

Committee **agreed to move on to the next site allocation.**

**Exmo\_20a Land at St Johns, Exmouth**

Proposed use: Housing development; if developed other uses

Number of dwellings: 550

Officer recommendation: Not to allocate

Simon Collier representing Eagle Investments Ltd advised committee that the site was available and could open up access to woodland. He outlined the scale and type of development that could occupy the site of this size.

Ward Member Councillor Matt Hall stated that there were a number of issues with the site, including the ecology, and the poor access, making the site unsustainable. Due to the size of the site and expected homes, this would result in considerable impact on already stretched services in the area. He spoke of the “golden triangle” of land expansion in the area but felt that this site alone was too small to attract the necessary scale of s106 monies needed to support such growth.

The committee were reminded that more analysis of the site was required, particularly on reservations about the access to the site, although if taken into account along with Exmo\_20b this may offer an improved means of access. Committee debated the need to carefully consider access and by mindful of St Johns In the Wilderness in that area.

Inclusion for allocation, against officer recommendation, was proposed by Cllr Ingham and seconded by Cllr Jung.

Committee **endorsed the recommendation to include Exmo\_20 in the site allocation.**

### **Exmo\_20b Land North of Liverton Business Park**

Proposed use: Housing development

Number of dwellings: 150

Officer recommendation: Allocate

Simon Collier representing Eagle Investments Ltd advised committee that the site was available and of a suitable size for rapid delivery. It was well connected in the landscape with minimal visual impact, with access at the western boundary and close to services and bus routes.

Ward Member Councillor Matt Hall stated that this site alone could not be supported as it would not deliver enough s106 monies to support infrastructure. He asked the committee to look at the wider picture, not at individual small sites.

Inclusion for allocation was proposed by Cllr Ingham and seconded by Cllr B Bailey.

Committee **endorsed the recommendation to include Exmo\_20b in the site allocation.**

### **Exmo\_24 Land to the North of Salterton Road**

Proposed use: Mixed use

Officer recommendation: Not to allocate

Clare James, on behalf of Clinton Devon Estates, spoke of ongoing engagement with the Council. She felt that the site was sustainable and in a good location on a transport corridor.

Ward Member Councillor Matt Hall advised that the site did not work as a stand alone site, but could work if part of a masterplan area. He did not feel the site alone was sustainable and was not of a sufficient size to generate s106 monies.

The Chair proposed to move on to the next site allocation.

Committee **agreed to move on to the next site allocation.**

### **Exmo\_18 Land directly to the East of Liverton Business Park**

Proposed use: 2.8 hectares of employment land

Officer recommendation: Allocate

Clare James, on behalf of Clinton Devon Estates, spoke in support of including the site for allocation. She spoke on the high demand for employment use land, with a good connection to the neighbouring business park.

Ward Member Councillor Matt Hall, advised that he supported the site for employment use due to the need for local jobs. He felt it was key to link with the County Council to make a request for a junction onto the road; and that the Dinan Way improvements go ahead as planned.

Inclusion for allocation was proposed by Cllr Jung and seconded by Cllr H Parr.

Committee **endorsed the recommendation to include Exmo\_18 in the site allocation.**

### **Exmo\_17 Land to the South of Littleham**

Proposed use: Mixed use development

Number of dwellings: 410

Officer recommendation: Allocate

Roger Gibson advised the committee that to include this site would not preserve the natural landscape as set out in the 2016 Exmouth neighbourhood plan. It would lead to a loss of productive farmland, wildlife habitat and more pressure on local services. He suggested other sites that could offer affordable apartments should be considered instead.

Clare James, on behalf of Clinton Devon Estates, spoke in support of including the site for allocation. She outlined the feasibility study undertaken, and the detailed design would incorporate an element of affordable housing, as well as employment land and an improvement to the local junction to Liverton Business Park.

Ward Member Councillor Nick Hookway, spoke against the inclusion of the site, advising that this would set a dangerous precedent for other development. He advised the committee of the topography of the site, being prominently visible due to its height and exposed location.

Ward Member Councillor Anne Hall advised that as the site was classified in the national landscape, it was contrary to the NPPF. Public consultation on the coastal protection area to include this site in that protection received strong public support.

The Committee were reminded that classification of being a National Landscape was the highest designation for a site, and the site was only recommended with the greatest reluctance.

Inclusion for allocation was proposed by Cllr Davey and seconded by Cllr Ingham.

Committee **endorsed the recommendation to include Exmo\_17 in the site allocation.**

### **Exmo\_06 Douglas Gardens, Exmouth**

Proposed use: Housing development

Number of dwellings: 44

Officer recommendation: Allocate

Clare James, on behalf of Clinton Devon Estates, spoke in support of the site, which had a resolution to grant planning in 2003.

Ward Member Councillor Anne Hall, advised that the site would not deliver the type of housing needed by the local community.

Inclusion for allocation was proposed by Cllr Jung and seconded by Cllr Howe.

Committee **endorsed the recommendation to include Exmo\_06 in the site allocation.**

#### **Exmo\_08 Littleham Fields, Exmouth**

Proposed use: Housing development

Number of dwellings: 40

Officer recommendation: Allocate

Clare James, on behalf of Clinton Devon Estates, spoke in support of including the site for allocation. She outlined the scoping undertaken, including access to the site through the neighbouring new development.

Ward Member Councillor Anne Hall, advised that the site was a bolt on to the neighbouring new development, and that it offered no additional facilities.

Inclusion for allocation was proposed by Cllr Howe and seconded by Cllr B Bailey.

Committee **endorsed the recommendation to include Exmo\_08 in the site allocation.**

#### **Exmo\_16 Land to the rear of Elm Lane**

Proposed use: Housing development

Number of dwellings: 5

Officer recommendation: Allocate

Clare James, on behalf of Clinton Devon Estates, spoke in support of including the site for allocation. She cited grounds of the sustainable location and that it should be considered as an in-fill site.

Ward Member Councillor Anne Hall, spoke against including the site for allocation. Mitigating measures were required for the Flood Zone 3 site, and amenities were not within walking distance.

Inclusion for allocation was proposed by Cllr Howe and seconded by Cllr B Bailey.

Committee **endorsed the recommendation to include Exmo\_16 in the site allocation.**

Proposed use: Housing

Number of dwellings: 14

Officer recommendation: Allocate

Helen Dimond outlined the flood risks related to the site, which she opposed for allocation. The expansion was too large for the village facilities to accommodate.

Susan Francis of Lympstone Parish Council also raised concerns about flood risk if the site was developed, and advised that there was a current planning application for two dwellings on the site. However the local parish did consider that some scale of development could be achieved on the site.

Chris Wintrell as landowner outlined details of the site including mitigation for water. He advised that the site was close to village amenities.

Committee discussed the close proximity of the site to the village.

Inclusion for allocation was proposed from the chair by Cllr Olive.

Committee **endorsed the recommendation to include Lymp\_01 in the site allocation.**

#### **GH/ED/72 Land at Meeting Lane, Lympstone**

Proposed use: Housing

Number of dwellings: 131

Officer recommendation: Not to allocate

A statement from Jane Moffatt was read out which outlined reasons against allocation of the site, which included reasons of being in the coastal protection area, the lack of infrastructure to support development on this scale, flooding issues, and being unsustainable.

Ken Perry representing Woodbury Parish Council, felt that the site could be included but required work on drainage and waste water management to make it viable.

Steve Parks, as landowner, outlined the type of housing that could be on the site, and advocated the connections to local facilities. Nutwell Road would provide access.

Committee raised the issue of the visual impact on the northern boundary.

Committee **agreed to move on to the next site allocation.**

#### **GD/ED/73 Land North West of Strawberry Hill, Lympstone**

Proposed use: Housing

Number of dwellings: 46

Officer recommendation: Allocate

A statement from Jane Moffatt was read out which outlined reasons against allocation of the site, which included reasons of being in the coastal protection area, the lack of infrastructure to support development on this scale, flooding issues, and pedestrian safety.

Susan Francis representing Lympstone Parish Council, objected to the inclusion of this site for reasons of considerable work to make the site viable.

Simon Collier, on behalf of Eagle Investments, spoke about the viability of the site and explained that the site did not have views to the sea or estuary.

Committee discussed the need to mitigate issues at the planning stage but felt the site could be included.

Inclusion for allocation was proposed by Cllr Jung and seconded by Cllr Olive.

Committee **endorsed the recommendation to include GD/ED/73 in the site allocation.**

#### **GD/ED/74 Land at Strawberry Hill, Lympstone**

Proposed: Housing

Number of dwellings: 141

Recommendation: Not to allocate

Susan Francis, representing Lympstone Parish Council, did not support the allocation and outlined issues with watercourses through the site.

Committee **agreed to move on to the next site allocation.**

#### **GD/ED/75 Land off Grange Close, Lympstone**

Proposed: Housing

Number of dwellings: 6

Recommendation: Not to allocate

Susan Francis, representing Lympstone Parish Council, did not support the allocation and outlined issues of habitat loss and unacceptable access points.

Committee **agreed to move on to the next site allocation.**

137

### **Woodbury Site Selection Report**

#### **Wood\_04 Land off Globe Hill, Woodbury**

Proposed: Housing

Number of dwellings: 28

Recommendation: Not to allocate

Committee **agreed to move on to the next site allocation.**

#### **Wood\_06 Land to rear of Orchard House, Globe Hill, Woodbury**

Proposed: Housing

Number of dwellings: 30

Recommendation: Allocate

A representative from Woodbury Parish Council, spoke in support of the allocation and outlined benefits to the local community.

Inclusion for allocation was proposed by Cllr Jung and seconded by Cllr Ingham.

Committee **endorsed the recommendation to include Wood\_06 in the site allocation.**

**Wood\_07 Land off Globe Hill, Woodbury**

Proposed: Housing

Number of dwellings: 9

Recommendation: Not to allocate

Committee **agreed to move on to the next site allocation.**

**Wood\_09 Land off Globe Hill, Woodbury**

Proposed: Housing

Number of dwellings: 28

Recommendation: Allocate

Roger Stokes spoke in objection to the allocation, setting out reasons of poor access and as heritage grounds alongside a grade 3 listed building. The site had originally been purchased to prevent building on it, and now acted as a wildlife corridor as well as a landing spot for the air ambulance.

A representative from Woodbury Parish Council spoke in support of the site and that development of it would improve the village centre.

Inclusion for allocation was proposed by Cllr Ingham and seconded by Cllr Jung.

Committee **endorsed the recommendation to include Wood\_09 in the site allocation.**

**Wood\_10 Land at Gilbrook, Woodbury**

Proposed: Housing

Number of dwellings: 60

Recommendation: Allocate

Cheryl McGauley spoke as a local resident in objection, citing reasons of pedestrian safety as a major issue and the road and bridge not being suitable for the level and type of traffic developing the site would create.

Peter Oliver, a local resident, outlined his grave concerns for the safety of road users and questioned the measurements used for tractors in calculating the width of access. Visibility was also very poor and the area had a history of accidents.

Woodbury Parish Council did not support the allocation due to reasons of the inability to assign space for safe pedestrian access into Woodbury.

Simon Collier, spoke in support, outlining the good range of local facilities and the lack of objection from statutory consultees in the outline application currently in place.

The committee were advised of the work on the current application, but the aspects put forward for pedestrian safety were still challenged locally.

Committee **agreed to move on to the next site allocation.**

**Wood\_11 Land at rear of Escot Cottages, Broadway, Woodbury**

Proposed: Housing

Number of dwellings: 5

Recommendation: Not to allocate

Committee **agreed to move on to the next site allocation.**

**Wood\_12 Land to the East of Higher Venmore Farm, Woodbury**

Proposed: Housing

Number of dwellings: 141

Recommendation: Not to allocate

Committee **agreed to move on to the next site allocation.**

**Wood\_14 Land West of Pound Lane, Woodbury**

Proposed: Housing

Number of dwellings: 18

Recommendation: Not to allocate

Committee **agreed to move on to the next site allocation.**

**Wood\_16 Land of Broadway (phase 2) Woodbury**

Proposed: Housing

Number of dwellings: 67

Recommendation: Allocate

Woodbury Parish Council spoke in support of the site but there were still concerns on related traffic impact and pedestrian safety that needed resolution. There was a request for the provision of a crossing and close liaison with the Parish.

Clare James on behalf of Clinton Devon Estates outlined that the site was ready to proceed with a developer in place and permission granted in November 2023.

Inclusion for allocation was proposed by Cllr Jung and seconded by Cllr Ingham.

Committee **endorsed the recommendation to include Wood\_16 in the site allocation.**

**Wood\_20 Land at Town Lane, Woodbury**

Proposed: Housing

Number of dwellings: 28

Recommendation: Allocate

Woodbury Parish Council did not support the site, due to the narrow nature of Town Lane and the access to the local primary school was already dangerous, with poor visibility.

Clare James on behalf of Clinton Devon Estates, spoke in support of the site and outlined the type of development and considered as an in-fill site. Access could be discussed further based on concerns raised.

A proposal to include the site failed

Committee **agreed to move on to the next site allocation.**

**Wood\_23 Ford Farm, Woodbury**

Proposed: Housing  
Number of dwellings: 18  
Recommendation: Not to allocate

Committee **agreed to move on to the next site allocation.**

**Wood\_24 Land North East of Webbers Meadow, Castle Lane, Woodbury**

Proposed: Housing  
Number of dwellings: 45  
Recommendation: Not to allocate

Simon Stokes, representing the site owners, spoke in support of the site and outlined the housing density of the site that could still leave a good amenity proportion, as well as joining the existing bridleway with a new footpath.

Committee **agreed to move on to the next site allocation.**

**Wood\_37 Cricket Field off Town Lane, Woodbury**

Proposed: Housing  
Number of dwellings: 81  
Recommendation: Not to allocate

Clare James on behalf of Clinton Devon Estates, spoke in support of the site. Housing could be designed around the existing cricket pitch and there was no intention to diminish the value of the pitch.

Committee **agreed to move on to the next site allocation.**

**Wood\_42 Webbers Farm, Castle Lane, Woodbury**

Proposed: Housing  
Number of dwellings: 101  
Recommendation: Not to allocate

Committee **agreed to move on to the next site allocation.**

**Wood\_46 West of Wood\_10**

Proposed: Housing  
Number of dwellings: 23  
Recommendation: Not to allocate

Committee **agreed to move on to the next site allocation.**

**Wood\_31 Woodbury Business Park, Woodbury**

Proposed: Employment land  
Recommendation: Not to allocate

Committee **agreed to move on to the next site allocation.**

Proposal: 71.2 hectares employment land  
Recommendation: Not to allocate

Woodbury Parish Council spoke against the allocation of the site, to protect the woodland there.

Colin Danks, representative of the landowner, outlined the continued demand for business space, the rapid rate that the land could come into use, and the consequences of not meeting the demand of businesses already at Greendale Barton.

Committee **agreed to move on to the next site allocation.**

139 **Exton Site Selection Report**

**Wood\_01 Field 4583, Exmouth Road, Exton**

Proposal: Housing  
Number of dwellings: 14  
Recommendation: Allocate

Woodbury Parish Council supported the allocation, providing that the flooding issues are resolved before any development takes place.

Inclusion of allocation was proposed by Cllr Ingham and seconded by Cllr Jung.

Committee **endorsed the recommendation to include Wood\_01 in the site allocation.**

**Wood\_28 Land to the North and East of Exton Farm, Exton**

Proposal: Housing  
Number of dwellings: 39  
Recommendation: Allocate

Woodbury Parish Council supported the allocation, providing that the flooding issues, particularly relating to Maer Lane, are resolved before any development takes place.

Clare James on behalf of Clinton Devon Estates explained that work was ongoing with tenants further upstream on the issue of flood risk.

Inclusion of allocation was proposed by Cllr Ingham and seconded by Cllr Jung.

Committee **endorsed the recommendation to include Wood\_28 in the site allocation.**

**Wood\_41 Land adjacent A376 Exeter Road, Exton**

Proposal: Housing  
Number of dwellings: 225  
Recommendation: Not to allocate

Committee **agreed to move on to the next site allocation.**

140 **Budleigh Salterton Site Selection Report**

**Budl\_01 Land adjacent to Clyst Hayes Farmhouse**

Proposal: Housing

Number of dwellings: 355

Recommendation: Not to allocate

Clare James on behalf of Clinton Devon Estates spoke in support of the site.

Councillor Doorbar of Budleigh Town Council spoke against including the site, due to grade 1 agricultural land being at a premium, and a lack of infrastructure.

Committee **agreed to move on to the next site allocation.**

### **Budl\_02 Land at Barn Lane, Knowle**

Proposal: Housing

Number of dwellings: 25

Recommendation: Allocate

Councillor Doorbar of Budleigh Town Council spoke against the allocation of the site, including that pedestrian access and speeding in that area was still an issue.

Simon Coles, representing Wayne Homes, supported the allocation and asked the committee to consider an increase in the number of dwellings for the site, as capacity was felt to be for 35 dwellings.

A statement was read out on behalf of Ward Member Charlotte Fitzgerald, who supported the application.

Ward Member Melanie Martin also spoke in support of the allocation.

Inclusion of allocation was proposed by Cllr Jung and seconded by the Chair.

Committee **endorsed the recommendation to include Budl\_02 in the site allocation.**

### **Budl\_03 Land at Barn Lane, Knowle**

Proposal: Housing

Number of dwellings: 40

Recommendation: Not to allocate

Clare James on behalf of Clinton Devon Estates spoke in support of the site and work that would provide safe access to the town.

Committee viewed photographs of the site and were reminded of the classification of the site as National Landscape, the highest classification of protection. Such sites would not usually be put forward for allocation, but the pressure of meeting the requirements meant that the site had been included. Committee felt this was an unacceptable use of grade 1 farmland.

Committee **agreed to move on to the next site allocation.**

### **Budl\_05 Little Knowle**

Proposal: Housing

Number of dwellings: 5

Recommendation: Not to allocate

Councillor Doorbar of Budleigh Town Council spoke against the allocation of the site, including that the site was an attractive feature in the Streetscene currently and added to the risk of flooding if developed.

Clare James on behalf of Clinton Devon Estates, felt the site should be included as it was close to facilities and could support modest development.

Committee **agreed to move on to the next site allocation.**

#### **Budl\_06 Budleigh Salterton Community Hospital**

Proposal: Housing

Number of dwellings: 20

Recommendation: Not to allocate

Councillor Doorbar of Budleigh Salterton Town Council spoke of the success of the current hospital hub and felt the site should not be allocated.

Committee **agreed to move on to the next site allocation.**

#### **141 East Budleigh Site Selection Report**

##### **Ebud\_01 Land off Frogmore Road, East Budleigh**

Proposal: Housing

Number of dwellings: 22

Recommendation: Allocate

Clare James, on behalf of Clinton Devon Estates, spoke in support of the site with good connections to facilities.

Inclusion of allocation was proposed by Cllr Jung and seconded by Cllr Ingham.

Committee **endorsed the recommendation to include Ebud\_01 in the site allocation.**

#### **142 Otterton Site Selection Report**

##### **Otto\_01 Bell Street**

Proposal: Housing

Number of dwellings: 10

Recommendation: Allocate

Clare James, on behalf of Clinton Devon Estates, spoke in support of the site, including good connections to transport and local facilities.

Inclusion of allocation proposed by Cllr Howe, seconded by Cllr Jung.

Committee **endorsed the recommendation to include Otto\_01 in the site allocation.**

##### **Otto\_02 Adjacent to North Star**

Proposal: Housing

Number of dwellings: 8

Recommendation: Not to allocate

Clare James, on behalf of Clinton Devon Estates, spoke in support of the site, as an in-fill site.

Committee sought advice on the flood zone classification, and if that could be overcome through planning conditions.

Inclusion of allocation, against officer recommendation, proposed by Cllr Ingham, seconded by Cllr Jung.

**Committee endorsed to include Otto\_02 in the site allocation against officer recommendation.**

**Otto\_15 Hayes Lane**

Proposal: Housing

Number of dwellings: 32

Recommendation: Not to allocate

Committee **agreed to move on to the next site allocation.**

**Otto\_04 Rydon Close**

Proposal: Housing

Number of dwellings: 32

Recommendation: Not to allocate

Committee **agreed to move on to the next item.**

- (a) **Exmouth and Surrounds Local Plan Member Working Group Note of Discussions**  
The committee noted this item for information.
- (b) **Feedback on potential development sites at Exmouth and Lympstone in respect of Coastal Preservation Area and Green Wedge Designation**  
The committee noted this item for information.

**Attendance List**

**Councillors present:**

B Bailey

C Brown

O Davey

P Fernley

P Hayward

M Howe (Vice-Chair)

B Ingham

G Jung

Y Levine

T Olive (Chair)

H Parr

**Councillors also present (for some or all the meeting)**

I Barlow

J Brown

M Chapman

R Collins  
T Dumper  
P Faithfull  
M Martin

**Officers in attendance:**

Matthew Dickins, Planning Policy Manager  
Ed Freeman, Assistant Director Planning Strategy and Development Management  
Debbie Meakin, Democratic Services Officer  
Damian Hunter, Planning Solicitor

**Councillor apologies:**

J Bailey  
B Collins

Chairman ..... Date: .....