

Report to: Strategic Planning Committee



Date of Meeting 27 April 2021

Document classification: Part A Public Document

Exemption applied: None

Review date for release N/A

Scoping and vision report for the new local plan

Report summary:

This report sets out the issues associated with setting a scope for the new Local Plan having considered the views of respondents to the Issues and Options Consultation which are summarised in an appendix to this report. Member's views are then sought on the proposed single plan approach, the objectives for the plan and starting to establish a vision for the plan that will help to focus officer's work moving forward on the issues of highest priority to Members.

Is the proposed decision in accordance with:

Budget Yes No

Policy Framework Yes No

Recommendation:

1. That Strategic Planning Committee endorse, in principle, the approach of producing a single local plan only that covers all key planning policy matters.
2. That Members consider the consultation responses to the proposed objectives for the new Local Plan and confirm that these remain the objectives that they wish the plan to focus on.
3. That Members consider the issue of a vision for the future of the district and identify some initial key priorities and outcomes for the new Local Plan to provide a focus for future plan production.

Reason for recommendation: To ensure that Members are given the opportunity and are encouraged to provide an early steer on the scope and vision for the new local plan.

Officer: Ed Freeman, Service Lead – Planning Strategy and Development Management, e-mail - efreeman@eastdevon.gov.uk, Tel: 01395 517519

Portfolio(s) (check which apply):

- Climate Action
- Corporate Services and COVID-19 Response and Recovery
- Democracy and Transparency
- Economy and Assets
- Coast, Country and Environment

- Finance
- Strategic Planning
- Sustainable Homes and Communities

Financial Implications

The general financial considerations of the local plan are wide ranging, not only upon planning specific budget areas but also impacting the council's major income streams such as Business Rates, Council tax and New Homes bonus. There are no specific financial implications within the report that require comment at this early scoping stage.

Legal Implications

The Council's approach to delivering the Development Plan is set out in the adopted Local Development Scheme and should there be any change in the agreed approach this will necessitate approval by Council to a revised Scheme. Otherwise, as the report relates to the early stages of the development of the Local Plan there are no specific legal implications requiring comment.

Equalities impact Low Impact

Climate change Low Impact

Risk: Low Risk;

Links to background information – See links in the attached the report.

Link to [Council Plan](#):

Priorities (check which apply)

- Outstanding Place and Environment
- Outstanding Homes and Communities
- Outstanding Economic Growth, Productivity, and Prosperity
- Outstanding Council and Council Services

1 Introduction

- 1.1 At Strategic Planning Committee on the 30 March 2021 a local plan work programme was agreed. The programme advised that for this meeting (27 April 2021) a paper on the matter below would be considered:

***“Scoping and Vision of the plan** - This paper will set out commentary and suggested options for the scope of the plan. Specifically whether it should cover all issues or only selected matters, for example strategic policies only, with more detailed policy matters to follow in subsequent plans or documents. It would also consider the vision for the plan and seek Members views on their key aspirations for what they want the plan to achieve for the district.”*

2 The proposed scope of the local plan

2.1 The scope of the local plan can, in simple terms, be seen as the issues and topics and matters that it may cover. In the issues and options consultation report, see: [issuesandoptionsreport-jan2021.pdf \(eastdevon.gov.uk\)](#) the Council set out in paragraph 2.2 that:

“We consider that it is best to produce a single local plan for East Devon covering all key planning matters rather than a series of separate plans. However, an alternative option might be to first produce a strategic plan covering core issues and then to produce one or more separate plans addressing additional less strategic matters or particular concerns in greater detail.”

2.2 Question 2 of the associated consultation questionnaire sought views on the appropriateness of this suggested approach. The on-line responses received show that 43% of respondents favoured producing one plan only and the same amount, 43%, favoured producing more than one plan. A small number of respondents, 10%, favoured an alternative and 5% did not answer the question. Note that all percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number.

2.3 Appendix 1 to this report provides a schedule of on-line comments received in respect of the alternative options for plan production, noting that not all respondents made comments (some just ticked a choice preference). Please note that comments are reproduced exactly as logged on to the questionnaire software. In some cases answers given to this question, by some respondents, may cross-reference to answers they gave to other questions. It has not been possible in this report to highlight the other question answer/s so in limited cases there may not be full relevant information displayed (such cases are, however, limited). This same comment/caveat applies to other reporting of feedback received – noted later on in this report.

2.4 The consultation exercise showed that there was no clear consensus on the question of whether to produce a single plan or multiple plans. However having considered the consultations responses and evaluated the issues highlighted in the table on the next page officer’s recommendation is to progress on the basis of producing a single local plan that covers all key relevant policy matters that fall to the council’s planning responsibilities. This is primarily because there are inherent links between the plan strategy and detailed policy requirements that can best be maintained in a single plan. A single plan is also simpler, cheaper and will not take significantly longer to produce. It should be noted that in taking this approach it does not preclude producing separate supplementary policy guidance on detailed policy matters, design codes or other guidance for specific development sites. Nor, very importantly, does it in any way prevent Neighbourhood Plans from coming forward.

2.5 In progressing work on a single local plan it does not prevent changing the approach at a later date, but in starting work on a single plan now it does give clarity over the preferred direction and potential work ahead. Furthermore, we would envisage starting by looking at strategic matters, this forms the thrust of the work plan for the next few months, and these strategic matters are relevant and applicable whether we ultimately produce a single plan or multiple plans.

2.6 In the table below we highlight some key possible positives and negatives associated with each approach and ask Members to consider these alongside the public comments appended to this report.

Some key issues associated with producing a single local plan	Some key issues associated with producing multiple plans
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would provide all policies in a single document and therefore should make it easier to use and promote consistency in decision making. • It should be easier to clearly establish links between strategic policies and local policies, given that they are developed, tested and examined alongside one another. • Demonstrating financial viability plan policy and the plan as a whole (a key plan test) should be simpler under a single plan. • It should be quite a lot cheaper in the long run as it would only involve single (as opposed to multiple) plan production and examination costs. • A single plan can be lengthy and at worst uninviting to the public, it may discourage public participation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It could be quicker to produce a strategic plan in the first instance, though longer in terms of subsequent detailed policies (i.e. longer to get full policy coverage). • Producing a speedy strategic plan first would allow for the council to firmly establish its overall 'big-picture' agenda and make large scale strategic choices. • Future Government changes to the planning system could place an onus on producing strategic plans, with many or all detailed policy concerns falling to national policy or guidance (i.e. we could avoid 'wasted' effort). • Initial plan production costs should be lower for a strategic plan only, but costs for subsequent plans, to gain full district policy coverage, would increase overall costs. • It may give flexibility to allow area or subject based plans to come forward at speed and could allow for specific issues to be dealt with in greater detail. • If detailed policy production happened at a later date it could lead to uncertainty in decision making before plans are in place.

3 The vision for the plan

- 3.1 Irrespective of whether we produce a strategic plan first followed by subsequent detailed plans, or whether we do a single plan only, it is important that we seek to establish an overall direction for the plan to take. This is about starting to think about some of the big and potentially challenging matters that it could be relevant for a plan to seek to potentially address.
- 3.2 At this stage it is not considered that it is necessary to have a defined vision established for the plan. However, it is desirable for thought to be given to what East Devon might or should be like in future years and how a new local plan may assist in getting to that point.

4 East Devon as it has evolved in recent years

- 4.1 In debate around potential change in the future it may be appropriate to cast eyes back to look at changes in East Devon in recent years.
- 4.2 The greatest changes in East Devon (at least in so far as development and building is concerned) have occurred at the West End of the District close to the city of Exeter. Planning work initiated by Devon County Council back in the 1970s and 1980s, under the then responsibility to produce a county Structure Plan, lay the starting foundations for the growth and development we are now seeing at the West End. Of course the growth agenda in this part of East Devon has now and continues to be promoted and evolve through work being done by this council working with a range of partners. It would probably be fair to say that many of the GESP priorities (as set out the GESP vision) align with much of the current and evolving thinking about planning for West End growth that has occurred and is committed to in the future. The future being relevant as there is still much committed growth that is to occur at the West End, including for example Cranbrook going from its current scale, under 3,000 homes, to a future scale of close to 8,000 homes, or Skypark and the Science Park being built out from their current partially developed states.
- 4.3 Away from the West End growth levels and changes in recent years, specifically to the built environment, have been more varied. Areas of more significant growth (specifically including comparative changes in built development – amount of development before compared to that after) have been greatest in housing terms in Axminster and Ottery St Mary. Employment development (specifically in terms of land developed) has been greatest at Hill Barton and Greendale business parks.
- 4.4 In much of East Devon built development growth levels have been considerably lower, an outcome not surprising given that Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty cover two thirds of the District whilst other natural and built heritage designations place constraints on scope for development.
- 4.5 Wider than (just) development related planning policies and initiatives have also brought about changes in East Devon in recent years. Significant work has gone into protecting key wildlife assets (specifically including the River Exe and the Pebblebed Heaths – though much of the ‘protection’ afforded mitigates development happening) and, for example, conserving and enhancing built heritage assets has been a key concern.
- 4.6 In thinking about a future vision for East Devon Members are invited to think about how much, in what ways and to what degree changes and patterns in the past are relevant to and should help shape the future of East Devon. There is, for example, a very simple question of whether we are happy to see the past carried forward into the future. On this basis, leaving what has happened and is already planned in the West End, a ‘passive’ plan might take the view that things in East Devon are pretty good (if not excellent) as they are and we don’t want to see any real changes. Indeed it would not be surprising if this were an opinion held (more or less) by many East Devon residents – though it’s much more doubtful if it’s the position that someone in poor quality housing or who is unemployed would take! Furthermore with the Government promoting growth, for example currently requiring an average of 928 homes per year are built in

East Devon, a 'let's not really change anything' approach to plan making would not seem tenable.

5 The role of the Council's Statement of Intent

5.1 The leaderships published statement of intent identifies a number of priorities that may help to inform a vision for the Local Plan. These are:

"Our vision is to achieve a positive difference to residents' lives and our environment in East Devon and this vision is integral to this Statement and will inform our Council Plan. We believe that EDDC can achieve this through four key themes:

- (1) A Greener East Devon, which prioritises climate change and our natural environment (Appendix 1)
- (2) Better Homes and Communities for all with a priority on the importance of good quality, affordable housing suitable in size and location. Poverty caused by the loss of employment, illness or disability is an increasing issue and will be a high priority for EDDC to tackle through all means available to us. (Appendix 2)
- (3) A Resilient Economy bringing prosperity to the district notwithstanding the current challenging circumstances (Appendix 3)
- (4) Services that matter to all of us (Appendix 4)"

5.2 From a planning perspective points 1 – 3 identify the 3 dimensions of sustainable development (Environment, Social, Economy). These will each need to be addressed through the plan however it is the specifics of what the plan seeks to achieve in each of these areas and how these are balanced which is the challenge for the Local Plan.

5.3 It is understood that a new Council Plan is being developed for publication in July but a vision for the local plan is a slightly separate and more planning and development focused statement. Some clarity over the key priorities for the plan at the earliest opportunity would help to inform the development of a strategy for the plan and help us keep to the set timetable for plan production.

6 Does the Greater Exeter Strategic Plan offer any help?

6.1 In thinking about the future, and as a starting point, there could be some value in looking back at the vision that was proposed in the Greater Exeter Strategic Plan (GESP) work. It should be borne in mind that the GESP vision was inherently strategic in nature given the scope of the plan envisaged and the scale of the area covered. It does however highlight a number of key issues that Members may see as key to Local Plan production. The proposed (but not progressed) GESP - Draft Policies and Site Options Consultation document, see: [Draft Policies and Site Options \(Cancelled\) - Greater Exeter Strategic Plan \(gesp.org.uk\)](#) set out the following vision on its page 16:

“The Plan

The Greater Exeter Strategic Plan makes the big, cross-boundary decisions about growth, infrastructure and environment in the Greater Exeter area looking many years ahead. The innovative planning and ambitious investment decisions taken together by the local authority partners aim to realise our potential by creating great places for all people to live full lives.

The Place

In 2040 we are a sustainable, accessible and networked city region of linked but distinct communities. Our economy is carbon neutral and productive. We invest in our citizens, celebrate the area’s beauty and continue to work together for mutual long term benefit. We fully utilise our unique south western city-town-country-coast environment and our growing academic and skills base for smart growth. We enable prosperous and healthy lives in high quality homes and increasingly self-sufficient communities with access to great greenspaces and high quality jobs linked by a reliable, sophisticated and sustainable transport system.

The Priorities

- *Greater efficiency - to be carbon neutral by 2040*
- *Greater ambition - hardwiring delivery in from the start*
- *Greater innovation - fast growth in cutting edge businesses including becoming the UK centre for data analytics, environmental futures, health innovation, smart transport and other digital future businesses*
- *Greater connectivity - gigabit ready communities with majority sustainable travel*
- *Greater prosperity - local wages rise to above the national average*
- *Greater places for people - providing the homes we need in high quality neighbourhoods with the right infrastructure in the right places*
- *Greater places for nature - rebuilding biodiversity and peoples’ access to it*
- *Greater education - nurturing, attracting and retaining a world class workforce*
- *Greater wellbeing - healthy active communities with a range of facilities and services”*

6.2 As drafted the GESP vision (and the proposed plan strategy and proposed plan policies that followed) was aiming to deliver quite substantial changes into the future. In this context it is probably reasonable to say that the GESP agenda was not about maintaining a status quo outcome (a state of a continuation of ‘things as they are’).

6.3 Members are asked to consider whether the GESP vision or something similar or indeed something else that promotes potentially big changes is appropriate and desirable for East Devon looking into the future. Further to this change is probably always inevitable (at least to some degree) and a local plan can play a role in seeking to direct and assist with change. Though as an alternative to actively prompting major changes (or at least major changes in many areas) a plan could be more modest in its aspirations for change and could actually be neutral in its approach. A neutral plan could leave it to other means and mechanisms to bring about change, and in so doing it could be a plan that has an onus on reacting to things that are happening rather than seeking to directly shape and inform them.

7 Local plan Issues and option report objectives

7.1 A further way to look at and think about possible futures for East Devon is to re-look at the objectives set out in the local plan issues and options. There is also scope to relook at these in the context of GESP priorities, as noted earlier in this report, noting that there are a number of clear overlaps between the GESP priorities and our local plan issues report objectives.

7.2 The local plan issues and options report contained 10 proposed objectives, these are reproduced below.

Designing for health and well-being	Objective 1	To encourage healthy lifestyles and living environments for all East Devon residents.
Tackling the climate emergency	Objective 2	To ensure all new development moves the district towards delivering net-zero carbon emissions by 2040 and that we adapt to the impacts of climate change.
Meeting future housing needs	Objective 3	To provide high quality new homes to meet people's needs.
Supporting jobs and the economy	Objective 4	To support business investment and job creation opportunities within East Devon and support a resilient economy.
Promoting vibrant town centres	Objective 5	To promote the vitality of our town centres, encourage investment, greater flexibility and a wider range of activities to increase footfall and spend.
Designing beautiful and healthy spaces and buildings	Objective 6	To promote high quality beautiful development that is designed and constructed to meet 21 st century needs.
Our outstanding built heritage	Objective 7	To conserve and enhance our outstanding built heritage.
Our outstanding natural environment	Objective 8	To protect and enhance our outstanding natural environment and support an increase in biodiversity.
Promoting sustainable transport	Objective 9	To prioritise walking, cycling and public transport and make provision for charging electric vehicles, whilst reducing reliance on fossil fuelled vehicles.
Connections and infrastructure	Objective 10	To secure infrastructure needs at an appropriate time to support new development

7.3 These objectives received generally positive endorsement in the issues and options questionnaire responses. Results from Question 1 of the consultation show that 65% of respondents agreed with the objectives, 25% did not agree and 9% did not answer the question.

7.4 Appendix 2 to this report sets out comments made by respondents on the objectives. At this stage no attempt has been made to seek to assess representation text though from a superficial review it is clear that there are a number of high level matters noted in comments as well as responses that get into matters of some detail.

7.5 At a future date it will be relevant for committee to return to look at objectives in more detail. At this stage, however, it is useful to consider how in practical terms what they

may mean and how they could be carried forward and implemented in practice and in this context what they may imply or mean for a plan vision and how a plan therefore may (or may not) shape an East Devon of the future.

8 Bidding for and access to government grant aid and securing other funding

- 8.1 In terms of considering a vision for the plan and potential future outcomes it is relevant to note that much Government grant aiding and funding is linked to promoting growth agenda's and higher levels of development. The Government has a clear objective to promote and support development, most notably additional house building, and they do target funding to areas where higher levels of development are planned.
- 8.2 Committee may consider that it is relevant to take into account the potential for Government funding and access to monies when developing a vision for the local plan.
- 8.3 Further to Government funding developer contributions from development, and direct developer improvements to or delivery of infrastructure to accommodate their own schemes, can also be important means to secure positive planning outcomes. For example most of the affordable housing that is built comes forward as a proportion of open market housing schemes. If great importance is attached to securing more affordable housing then serious consideration should be given to whether housing numbers should go up to help achieve this outcome. On a separate front it can often be a case that developers need to provide new infrastructure to serve their development, and make it acceptable in planning terms, but in so doing that infrastructure may also have wider positive community benefits as well.
- 8.4 Developing a vision and thereafter having strategy and policy that follows from that has the potential to secure wider benefits and outcomes that may not otherwise be delivered or achieved.

9 Key challenges and questions for committee

- 9.1 In this paper we have sought to explore and set out some issues around what East Devon could be like in the future and how the plan may help us get there. It is not expected that this committee meeting will or should draw definitive conclusions but it would be desirable in terms of helping to inform plan preparation to get a strong steer on thinking and approaches to a vision, including what's most important and why, that we should be taking forward.
- 9.2 To assist with discussions, focus thoughts and encourage possible conclusions to be reached we have set out a series of questions that we consider would be valuable for committee to debate, these are set out below.
 - a) Do we want a plan that is bold, ambitious and challenging in its approach? If so what significant changes do Members want to see?
 - b) Alternatively are Members happy with things as they are and content to continue the path set by the previous Local Plan?

- c) Do we think that the GESP vision addresses matters or contains content that we should carry forward into a new local plan?
- d) Are there particular growth and development agendas that we should be following or avoiding – for example are there economic, environmental or social aspirations that the plan should be aiming to meet?
- e) Do the objectives in the issues and options report set out the right kind of thinking to inform a vision or understanding of a desirable future?
- f) Should other local plan objectives be identified or existing ones amended?
- g) If we had to prioritise matters in terms of plan outcomes – how should we go about it and how do we determine things that are of greatest importance? For example if we sought the highest and earliest outcomes in terms of zero carbon buildings it could significantly reduce ability to secure affordable housing delivery – should we and how might we prioritise one over the other?

Appendix 1 – Comments made by on-line response to Question 2 of the issues and options report consultation

The issues and options report contained the following question:

Question 2 – The scope of the local plan	
Do you think we should?	Tick one box only
Option 1 - Single Plan - Produce a single local plan covering all policy matters?	<input type="checkbox"/>
Option 2 – Multiple Plans - Produce a plan that deals with strategic matters (the bigger stuff) first and then subsequent plans that deal with more local concerns and detailed matters later?	<input type="checkbox"/>
Option 3 – Other - Do an alternative or neither of the above?	<input type="checkbox"/>
Please provide any further comments in the box below	

Option 1 comments - Respondents that ticked option 1 and who also provided comment, in their comments, said:

Keep it simple.
A single plan that covers all aspects and has inherent DESIGN principles and STANDARDS included, will mean it is a "one stop shop" for all interested parties.
These need to be integrated and local people LISTENED to. Too often residents get very upset and angry when 'consultations' appear to be form only.
Many of the plan policies are inter-related so it is essential that a holistic approach is used across all sectors of the plan so that policies can be integrated.
I believe a single plan has more impact and easier to review.
Multiple reports simply gives East Devon council staff the excuse to waste more time generating politically motivated reports
But see comments below about Neighbourhood Plans
I do think all too often when developers are building housing Estates they segregate the planning of houses through financial means. This means that all the low income families and up in the same place which creates pockets of poverty and occasionally Encourages or exacerbates a problem of antisocial behaviour. This design style of Estates, creates not only an element of home shame, but is not only visually attractive to be have such clunky design. It also does create further social segregation. A much more holistic process would be to chop and change the houses so that it seemed more fluidAnd welcoming to all.
Multiple plans can result in less cohesion
Further to my comments above, I thin a single strategic plan is essential that includes more localised sections to deal with particular needs etc.
Multiple plans will bring problems of consistency and confusion.
The important thing is to produce one plan and start acting on it rather than wasting valuable sub dividing it into several smaller plans. Too much time is wasted in Councils and Governments by dithering and ot actually doing anything.
the plan needs to be comprehensive and avoid confliting statements, this is best achieved in a single vison

A clear and specific plan makes it easy for all to access and leaves less room for misinterpretation.
Two years ago you held a vote for a development plan where the options were "Do you agree with the plan?" or "Do you not?" and I spoiled my paper because the choice was too polarised. Now, I think that a single plan will commit you to carrying out all of it. With many plans there is a danger that "the bigger stuff", unspecified, gets done and the other stuff runs out of budget, or just gets forgotten.
option 2 is a recipe for pushing through a few pieces of infrastructure without considering their ultimate effect. For example , they might drastically reduce or eliminate options for other policy matters.
A single Plan is best as it will promote the best commitment of all parties involved. If it is broken down into multiple Plans those Planners, Contractors, Businesses will be prevented from controlling the Council and diverging from the wishes of those living inn East Devon.
A single plan would help provide a district overview in the one document
Multiple plans require more work and potentially dilute effort. They will represent evolving thoughts rather than at a particular time - it's better to build on a single report than guess which follows the other. More likely to introduce delays, duplication, lack of clarity and contradictions
Otherwise plans might disagree or cover same matter twice
Best not to be too ambitious ...its been a touch year for everyone. It would good if something would 'just happen'. I believe this would be best achieved with a single plan. Just do it!
Multiple plans sound appealing in theory but in practice they are hard to manage effectively.
In reality I think this is the way government policy is heading, so there are advantages in getting an all-encompassing plan adopted relatively quickly. Otherwise the danger is that applications will be allowed on appeal in the absence of an up-to-date plan, and development in East Devon will be developer-led rather than plan-led.
There are quite enough different plan fragments floating around that planners have to take account of, without adding to the burden by breaking up one of the existing levels. Indeed, I would like to see the current Villages and Gypsies/Travellers plans subsumed into the new LP.
If you have more than one plan, people could get confused!
I think simplicity in planning is best.
Producing multiple plans runs the risk of losing sight of the main objectives.
Whilst the suite of development plan documents in an LDF is a good idea in principle, my view is that one comprehensive plan document that is internally consistent is far preferable. Ease of production and making amendments should not take precedence over having a clear expression of development plan policy.
I only agree with Option 1 if the Neighbourhood plans and local town councils have a proper say in the developments. Locals know about their area (flooding, social issues, traffic issues) as they live with them day in, day out therefore at the local level know better than beauracrates sat in their offices
Paragraph 17 of the NPPF clearly outlines the importance of strategic policies within plans. It highlights the importance of local planning authorities setting out their priorities for the development and land use. Strategic policies are key to setting out a clear vision for the development of the district. This comfort for landowners and developers can be undermined somewhat when there are numerous policy documents to review, increasing the risk of confusion and missed information. Our clients' agree with the Council's decision to adopt one single plan that clearly demonstrates the approach to planning matters for the district. This will give clarity to landowners and developers, rather than multiple plans.
Single Plan maintains focus and speed but both rural and built up areas need to be represented equally.
A Single Plan could have strategic policies and more local/detailed matters in other policies, as in the current Local Plan. The Cranbrook Masterplan could be incorporated as a section in the Local Plan.
Producing a single plan would presumably be less expensive than multiple plans but the option should be retained to look at parts in more detail as matters arise.

Employ all the latest online technical innovations for plan and map making and working online.
has to be cost effective, doing more than one plan must cost more!
A single plan should ensure that there are no conflicts between various policy objectives.
All the issues are interlinked
all of the objectives are inter linked, and dependent. One plan seems sensible.
The preparation of a single plan will ensure that key issues are addressed at this review stage and not delayed for future consideration. A single plan will also provide certainty in relation to decision making. If necessary additional guidance can be provided in the form of Supplementary Planning Documents once the new plan is adopted.
The whole thing needs to be cohesive, multiple plans might have less weight and hang together less well than a single plan will.
Option 2 would be a developers charter.
Must be a single plan as otherwise retaining the same criteria and equity throughout.
Paragraph 17 of the NPPF clearly outlines the importance of strategic policies within plans. It highlights the importance of local planning authorities setting out their priorities for the development and land use. Strategic policies are key to setting out a clear vision for the development of the district. This comfort for landowners and developers can be undermined somewhat when there are numerous policy documents to review, increasing the risk of confusion and missed information. Our clients' agree with the Council's decision to adopt one single plan that clearly demonstrates the approach to planning matters for the district. This will give clarity to landowners and developers, rather than multiple plans.
A single plan is satisfactory provided that it is comprehensive as regards all relevant issues.
The overarching plan needs to be totally integrated with internal consistency.
A single plan provides the best way to secure policies that are connected and coherent as a whole
East Devon is diverse in many respects. To ensure that diversity is recognised a single plan is required. Within that plan, consideration of the urban areas must always recognise the potential impact on the rural areas, in particular, encroachment of the urban into the rural requires constraint.
This has hung over communities for too long and needs addressing in the medium term.
I would rather wait for a considered, overall plan than option 2 or 3. Separately, on your local plan document, I think 2.5 would be a more representative statement with the insertion of 'older' between 'our' and 'residents' in line 1.
Local concerns should be covered by the bigger strategic view, if it has been well formulated.
Paragraph 17 of the NPPF clearly outlines the importance of strategic policies within plans. It highlights the importance of local planning authorities setting out their priorities for the development and land use. Strategic policies are key to setting out a clear vision for the development of the district. This comfort for landowners and developers can be undermined somewhat when there are numerous policy documents to review, increasing the risk of confusion and missed information. Our client agrees with the Council's decision to adopt one single plan that clearly demonstrates the approach to planning matters for the district. This will give clarity to landowners and developers, rather than multiple plans.
I always find it more beneficial and easier to locate if it is within one document to avoid confusion. Then you can use the search function within one webpage rather than having to switch between them.
I think a single plan will be able to give a consistent view across the district that people across the district can work to. NB - I think although the plan needs to co-operate with adjoining councils, we should stand our ground - no more GESP, and preserve what is good about East Devon - the countryside, biodiversity, a wonderful place for residents and visitors. I do NOT want us to become part of Exeter or their plans.
Although it might be a large document I believe it will be easier to maintain. if you have multiple plans they will potentially get out of step and may conflict therefore leading to debates about what plan takes precedence when issues arise.
One plan so that subsequent plans don't get ignored or set aside.

<p>Local Plans appear always to be overtaken by events - political and other . Consequently the production of tiered / multiple plans would probably never get to deliver the local / lower tiered stuff and would instead be stuck at the strategic level . Nevr good.</p>
<p>Multiple plans are too complex to comment on or understand.</p>
<p>A single plan is more likely to provide an integrated approach , as issues will affect each other- clearly, there is no point in developing housing if there are no jobs in the vicinity e.t.c.</p>
<p>this would provide maximum cohesion.</p>
<p>Because if you go with Option 2 then timing will be key for production of the detailed plans and it may be harder to align all the plans.</p>
<p>Including all objectives, strategic and more local policies and key detailed matters in a single plan makes it a comprehensive source of information that in our view will facilitate better understanding of and engagement with planning issues than multiple plans. However, if multiple documents are produced, they should be referenced in the main plan, which needs to include at minimum the objectives, policies and maps.</p>
<p>Although on balance we think a single plan is the best option, this is on the proviso it takes full account of all local concerns.</p>
<p>the idea of multiple plans is reasonable in theory, but I have seen over the years in other authorities that multiple plans can make it less clear for people, can get caught up in policy change and delays in the system, and good intentions do not always follow through to plan production.</p>
<p>Paragraph 17 of the NPPF clearly outlines the importance of strategic policies within plans. It highlights the importance of local planning authorities setting out their priorities for the development and land use. Strategic policies are key to setting out a clear vision for the development of the district. This comfort for landowners and developers can be undermined somewhat when there are numerous policy documents to review, increasing the risk of confusion and missed information. Our clients' agree with the Council's decision to adopt one single plan that clearly demonstrates the approach to planning matters for the district. This will give clarity to landowners and developers, rather than multiple plans.</p>
<p>To enable clear focus on getting defined policy achieved at all levels of the community</p>
<p>I am concerned that Option 2 would equate to 1 top level binding policy/plan and multiple sub plans given no more weight in law other than simple guidance to developers.</p>
<p>Paragraph 17 of the NPPF clearly outlines the importance of strategic policies within plans. It highlights the importance of local planning authorities setting out their priorities for the development and land use. Strategic policies are key to setting out a clear vision for the development of the district. This comfort for landowners and developers can be undermined somewhat when there are numerous policy documents to review, increasing the risk of confusion and missed information. Our client agrees with the Council's decision to adopt one single plan that clearly demonstrates the approach to planning matters for the district. This will give clarity to landowners and developers, rather than multiple plans.</p>
<p>This should be able to be updated as a whole or in part when it becomes out of date. For example housing numbers need to be updated regularly whereas issues such as conserving the natural and built environments have remained relatively static for years.</p>
<p>Paragraph 17 of the NPPF clearly outlines the importance of strategic policies within plans. It highlights the importance of local planning authorities setting out their priorities for the development and land use. Strategic policies are key to setting out a clear vision for the development of the district. This comfort for landowners and developers can be undermined somewhat when there are numerous policy documents to review, increasing the risk of confusion and missed information. Our clients agree with the Council's decision to adopt one single plan that clearly demonstrates the approach to planning matters for the district. This will give clarity to landowners and developers, rather than multiple plans.</p>

Paragraph 17 of the NPPF clearly outlines the importance of strategic policies within plans. It highlights the importance of local planning authorities setting out their priorities for the development and land use. Strategic policies are key to setting out a clear vision for the development of the district. This comfort for landowners and developers can be undermined somewhat when there are numerous policy documents to review, increasing the risk of confusion and missed information. Our clients agree with the Council's decision to adopt one single plan that clearly demonstrates the approach to planning matters for the district. This will give clarity to landowners and developers, rather than multiple plans.

There should also be an infrastructure delivery plan

One plan, provided it covers a long term view, will provide a more strategic approach.

Option 2 comments - Respondents that ticked Option 2 and who also provided comment, in their comments, said:

An overall plan to deal with strategic matters and National frameworks. In addition East Devon is a varied area with many different localities with their own set of concerns. Incorporation of Neighbourhood Plans both existing and emerging to deal with local matters will add detail for further subsequent plans.

Plans need to have consistency from central planning, however local plans should be absolutely paramount.

Whatever you do probably needs to be iterative and updated.

Need examples for this question. Don't understand what "the bigger stuff" and the smaller stuff might be?!

Beneath the overall plan there should be scope for specifics and variations at local levels.

I think a single plan would be too complex. Multiple plans would make it more efficient to respond to changes in our needs

There need to be the same rules for everyone, but there will be different situations that will need different plans

Strategic plans need strategic thinking. The smaller plans need to be addressed on a 1:1 basis as they affect all individuals in the location.

There should be a plan that covers large building companies and another that covers the general public

It would be helpful if a complete 'Top-Down' Report could be provided to show how each Neighbourhood - Parish (?) - Local - District - Regional Plan related to each other. I believe there is confusion at so many 'Plans' and 'Consultations' . . . added to which, there is a feeling that whatever the residents may say, they're views are ignored, so why bother ??!

There is a risk of losing important details with a single strategic plan.

Think even if option 1 is taken first, it would almost inevitably have to become option 2 when Neighbourhood Plans are taken into consideration.

Planning should be twofold: 1 - strategic planning outlining the objectives and ambitions of the areas, defining an overall strategy for East Devon; 2 - local planning based on the type of area that is represented rather than individual locality, for example rural areas, market town, village, AONB.

the quality of life to residence that already live in the area.

the roads , new school , new library , new shops ect

to create a local sustainable village or town to provide local jobs and affordable housing

it is easier to allocate work for subsequent plans to working groups, rather than take the whole council's time at every meeting.

A general 'apple pie and motherhood' report then more detailed reports for specific areas so West Hill not lumped in with Ottery St Mary or other unrelated areas and their needs

With a strategic plan being produced with more local plans coming forward to take account of local aspirations and better reflect existing neighbourhood plans to prevent uncertainty.

A plan needs to be slightly flexible. Very few foresaw the pandemic which has devastated many and has severely damaged the economy. However, there are core values that need to be addressed - preservation and improvement of current economy, preservation and improvement of current infrastructure, preservation of the historical, cultural, and environmental ethos, and the rebuilding of community, that must be the heart of any plan.
Usually there are local factors which affect planning permissions and related decisions.
makes more practical sense and gets the plan moving ahead quicker
Prefer to get the overall strategy agreed before we progress to the detail
Members felt that dividing the Plan up enabled local matters to be updated more easily and Option 2 allows residents to get involved in the detail and for the Neighbourhood Plan to be considered fully.
How long will it take to complete a single plan? I would be concerned that wrong decisions could be made in the meantime if it takes years.
The bigger and wider the plan, the less likely that private individuals will take part in the consultations
Maintaining some flexibility allows for responding to the unexpected.
I support multiple plans but not too many when it becomes difficult to cross check one with the other and where they start to contradict each other. Neighbourhood plans must still hold full weight.
I think to break the plan down will encourage more participation from the public. Everyone will have more interests and may not want to do questionnaires on subjects that don't concern them.
If a single plan can ensure the minutia is included then that is the way forward. If not then Multiple plans may be required as long as they join up somehow.
Locals must be able to clearly see the impact on them and easily able to respond.
I read the entire plan. It is very long. A series of targeted plans would be more digestible and encourage accessibility and participation.
As long as dealing with "more local concerns and detailed matters later" doesn't mean they get put on the back-burner and ultimately get forgotten.
Option 2 should enable incorporation of the Neighbourhood Plans that have been - and are continuing to be - prepared. It is vital, however, that if Option 2 is adopted in this way then the Neighbourhood Plans which inform the Local Plans need to be considered and respected at the time of preparation of the Strategic Plan.
Option 2 gives a more flexible approach. Local input must be sought in areas where there are particular problems to be addressed. Single issue plans may involve delay and confusion.
East Devon is very diverse from farming communities to small hamlets to villages to towns and a city a single plan would be idiotic.
Option two would allow for a strategic direction to be laid out (the why) but allow a more incremental and tactile approach which might stand a better chance of delivering more immediate impact and benefit by way of being supported by smaller plans (the what and the how) for particular issues and initiatives. Having smaller plans that ree up to the wider strategy would allow for more measurable progress to be made against them and quicker decision making.
This is clearly a huge and important undertaking. An overall plan seems an essential starting point but with specific 'addendums' featuring key issues like housing, transport, energy efficiency - to name a few!
Having one large plan covering all the items might not be the most useable format, whereas theme-based plans might be less weighty to use.
All towns should have a local plan agenda that can then marry up to an East Devon local plan. It would be far fairer and democratic and allow towns a sense of being in control and not just an ignored backwater playing homage to the whims of the elite.
Small towns & villages have completely different needs to Exeter and their voices need to be heard and not eclipsed or obliterated by the needs and ambitions of Exeter.
The scope is much too far reaching to be covered with a single plan.

Decisions should be made locally and therefore a central plan is not a suitable medium.
to enable local community plans to be considered.
Ensure local people are contacted and consulted before any new housing plans are passed.
Strategic plans (climate emergency, healthy lifestyle, biodiversity and waste), with other plans showing how they support these ends.
Strategic planning will enable best use of resources, experience, learning & finance for the benefit of East Devon as a whole, however due consideration must be to the unique characteristics of each local area in East Devon.
There needs to be one core Plan which is predicated on National Planning Guidance and which incorporates villages, towns and parish Neighbourhood Plans within an overall strategic document similar to the existing Neighbourhood plan with the maximum transfer of policies from the 2014 plan to avoid unnecessary change. This will help developers be comfortable that the maximum stability between plan periods is maintained.
Plans never survive first contact with the enemy. So if you make 1 big plan that will immediately get ruined on day 1, it is a really bad idea to think you can try and make 1 plan to cover everything, everywhere. Really dumb.
Gives scope for flexibility as technology progresses and economy changes
It may be able to provide more detail and cover more issues on multiple plans.
Option 2 seems to offer more flexibility to respond to changes
smaller chunks more easy to understand
One local plan will struggle to meet the needs and all criteria of relevance in any one area.
Option 2 would give the new Local Plan more flexibility meaning strategic matters could have a lifespan of fifteen years and the subsequent plans dealing with more local concerns and detailed matters could be updated every three to four years as required.
The overall strategy needs to be set out 1st (see key items above) then others can follow on.
Any plan which is developed needs to be overseen by an independent or government source. leaving any development to EDDC with just lead to fudge and stalling at every level.
subsequent or simultaneous plans should include leisure; culture; housing; neighbourhood plans
The issues which affect rural areas/villages do not pertain to towns
Multiple Plans – but make it clear that existing Local Neighbourhood Plans are included.
A single plan means that any updates that may be needed to specific components or elements of an all encompassing plan because of changes in legislation, budgetary constraints, compliance or other external factors mean that the whole plan has to be revised. It is far more practical to have an overall strategic plan with specific plans for each of the key elements. It is also easier to assign responsibilities to each specific plan with the owner for that plan reporting to the owner for the overall strategy - this ensures the same standards and disciplines are used throughout.
There are always layers of complexity at local level and differing opinions, hence the local plans, many will need updating as the demographics change and so do housing needs and infrastructure needs. Feed the local neighbourhood plans into the bigger picture.
It's normal in any planning process to outline overall objectives then drill down to the more detailed matter later. Having subsections allows these to be examined in detail and if necessary modified without needing to change the top level document.
Option 2 as long as the largest town does not get overlooked again in the milieu of local politics which seem to concentrate on other wealthier areas. Exmouth is key in ED, sandy beach and easy access, it is becoming an overflow for Exeter and brings with it anti social behaviour which is now leading to people leaving the area, or not being able to use the natural facilities available.
As long as the multiple plans are linked, these would give residents the opportunity to focus on objectives that are of particular interest.
LOCALISED PLANS CAN ENCOMPASS LOCAL ISSUES AT THAT LEVEL RATHER THAN A BROAD BRUSH APPROACH
basic concepts sound positive, to improve rather than exploit the region.

A higher level strategic plan should be completed first to set the overall priorities and boundaries and then local plans completed afterwards which address the specific needs of particular areas and address the different needs of urban and rural communities. For example: Parishes/villages in protected landscape areas such as AONB's; Coastal parishes/villages/towns; Parishes with trunk roads or motorways through them carrying heavy traffic volumes; Parishes which are effectively suburbs of towns or cities.
There is a need for urgency because, with the absence of an up-to-date Local Plan and a failure to have a 5-year bank of housing land available, developers would be free to determine where housing should go with little regard for the locally determined requirements. For this reason, it is suggested that having a core strategic set of policies in place quickly, backed up by a set of DPD's as time goes forward is probably the best option.
I think this would be more streamlined, and allow local place-specific consultation. It would also be more able to respond to changing circumstances.
Let's have the big picture clear first - there is a climate emergency happening in front of our eyes. That is the strategic imperative and from that all other policies flow eg new green jobs, green housing, will flow.
It is pointless going straight into too much detail until the overall strategy is agreed
space to small to comment
producing an overall single plan will take too long
In order to tackle climate change adequately, we need to produce far more granular detail than the old plan provided for. Allowing people to live near where they work, and to work near where they live, in houses that do not require huge amounts of energy to heat or keep dry, is crucial. More self builds, more Passiv house standard and renewable heating, more small scale development in villages for local young people to set up home.
This depends on the Plan's approach to the Historic Environment and if it does contain relevant objectives and policies for conservation and enjoyment of archaeology and historic landscape as well as historic buildings. There may be a need for a separate Archaeology/ Historic Environment Supplementary Planning Document.
More chance of progress
Subsequent detailed plans should be more dynamic and evolve otherwise they will be soon outdated.

Option 3 comments - Respondents that ticked Option 3 and who also provided comment, in their comments, said:

I don't fully understand why you are developing a new rather than revised LP when the current one is just 5 years old, and the government are considering a zonal approach in the future - surely better to review and wait and see?
fix the priorities as they do not match the views of the general public. Too much emphasis on PC stuff.
A single plan is unachievable, due to the timelines involved. I would propose the plan is broken down to manageable chunks that can be delivered either simultaneously by different departments or sequentially.
Neither of the above, East Devon is rural / agricultural and should remain mainly that.
option 2 in reverse
A single plan would need to be more sensitive to local issues. Not do the BIG plan ignoring local needs
Do more than endless planning - Seaton Seafront Enhancement was in the last plan but hasn't been delivered
Look for more Brown sites, and leave our beautiful Devon Countryside alone.
Just improve on what we have got, like improve the beaches, improve promenades, improve road surfaces, tackle overgrown bushes, do some weeding, cleaning etc
Local Plan too large for people to read and understand in a single document.

Again, you do not control what developers do in the area, therefore again this statement is null and void
Local matters need attending first.
Option 3 - Produce a plan that deals with the District-wide Strategy, policies and proposals, with more detail Inset Settlement Plans to cover the specific settlement policies and proposal within those areas.
Produce a plan to deal with supporting and make more sustainable existing villages as in the NPPF para 78 to promote sustainable development in rural areas housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities... where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby as in the case of Ebford and Clyst St George where we have in excess of 45 businesses within an 800 meter radius of both communities, School, Church, Darts village shopping centre, cricket ground children's play areas and more. These should be considered before developing large areas of open agricultural land.
The problem with creating a single plan, is that it takes longer to formulate and things are constantly changing, making it difficult to keep such a plan current and fit for purpose. There is also the potential issue of so many stakeholders with differing agendas and priorities to facilitate. The problem with creating multiple plans is that it is difficult to effectively manage timescales, priorities and costs, with local concerns often being watered down or totally neglected. Any plan MUST aim to get it right first time, and so preparation is key. IF the right stakeholders are engaged early on an Option 3 could entail coordinate parallel sets of plans, whereby local plans were created simultaneously to a master plan, ensuring that these fed into the master effectively. This would require strong effective management with the ability to be fluid to unforeseen changes caused by Social, Economic, Ecological and Political events, as well as any Legal, Ethical and Natural challenges.
I would like to see villages and towns produce their own plan, which then come together as a whole. I appreciate this would take time as committee decisions always do. The Multiple plan might work but one is always apprehensive that smaller local concerns would get lost in the whole and be forgotten.
Climate change should be a plan in it's own right as per Devon County Council and be part of that plan.
no comment.
The important thing is that the strategic plan and the subsidiary plans are properly meshed, so that the master plan clearly informs and shapes all the subsequent ones. That can presumably be done in either a single document or linked ones.
Whichever is chosen, it will be essential that (1) there is enough specific detail, not leaving too much open to interpretation and (2) that they are 'joined up' at all levels.
Happy with one main Plan, but there will be design guides and other ' little stuff' which may be in annexes. A New Town Option may need its own document!

No option selected but comments still made – some respondents did not tick any box but they still provided comment, in their comments, they said:

no comment see objective 10 section 12 questions
Provided that environmental concerns are paramount , either single or multiple plans can work .
The format of the existing Local Plan is preferred - a single Plan but one that also sets out more detailed guidance for the main towns.
The need to prioritise in the face of limited funding is key. East Devon has a strange shape, so there needs to be overall strategy on roads e.g. large vehicles (full size school coach) on lanes with passing places. Just because Cullompton is in mid Devon, cannot excuse the poor public transport from Honiton to get there or the state of the road.
No comments

Appendix 2 – Comments made by on-line response to Question 1 of the issues and options report consultation

The issues and options report contained the following question:

Question 1 - Local Plan Objectives

Do you think these are the right objectives for the new local plan, are there any further objectives that you would wish to see added or amendments made?

Question1Comment

I am essentially interested in Chapter 3 - Designing for Health and Wellbeing (as it affects residential care homes) and this section is very well considered in my opinion.

Chapter 5 - Housing which fails to mention design of 'Lifetime Homes' those that can be adapted into larger units if the owner chooses to extend or wants to work from home. (There should be initiatives for loft conversions providing there are no means of escape issues).

Chapter 6 - To promote high quality beautiful developments is all very well but what is generally built is poor quality without any local distinctiveness and lacking chimneys which are an essential feature of our sky line. Maybe chimneys are now redundant with electric heating schemes but these could be considered in historic areas. You don't mention the excellent work produced by Cabe in the Building for Life 12 (principles for delivering good design) which appears in the NPPF.

Chapter 9 - Our outstanding heritage - meaning of non-designated?

The objectives are a little 'thin' on a focus on the needs of local people - and their involvement in the plan's preparation so that it is 'their plan' and not simply one imposed on them. To that extent, extant neighbourhood plans have taken a lot of local investment and must of necessity be accorded a very high standing in any new plan proposals not least because they provide a wealth of local knowledge and expectations.

Climate change should be top of the list

Yes these objectives are broad enough.

The most fundamental aspect of this plan should be inherent DESIGN principles and STANDARDS, that reflect the desires to enhance health and well being; tackle the climate and biodiversity emergencies and other priorities

These DESIGN principles/ standards should be overtly clear for all, whether citizen, councillor, planner or DEVELOPER meaning that development applications come forward based on these STANDARDS so that " beautiful places and buildings can be planned at the outset through the local plan rather than relying on subsequent master planning or individual planning applications. " (Chapter8 (8.5)

Rather vague and I worry that they will be ignored when the reality of the economy hit

I think an objective should be to focus as much development as possible on brownfield sites, and also within existing BUAB's

Objective 3, should limit housing to within existing boundaries of villages and towns, no further expansion outside of the existing footprint

Development should only be allowed where there is existing infrastructure in place for any new occupants

Retain youth
Control building

This planet cannot comfortably sustain more and more people with their associated needs for infrastructure and housing. Taking the natural environment away from wild life for our needs will, inevitably, end in extremely uncomfortable circumstances whereby such events as pandemics originating from crossover of animal viruses will become more common. Furthermore, our children's right to be left a sustainable natural environment must not be denied them by our generation's greed for gobbling up the natural environment.

Consideration should be given to maintaining/increasing the "vitality" of the many small villages/hamlets across East Devon.

Ob 3; should read "To provide high quality new homes to meet local people's needs
Ob 5 :delete "to increase footfall and spend" The aims are a "a healthy town centre economy, convenient access to local services and an attractive town centre environment
Ob 10; should be broader, not just focusing on Infrastructure in new development, but looking at connectivity across the district Replace with " To ensure that residents and businesses in both existing and new developments have the connectivity they need"
Add Objective; One which relates to local employment and services

Yes, the right objectives, with a few additions please!

Ob.2: Not giving planning permission to build on any traditionally natural flood plain. Aim to ensure net zero before 2040.

Ob.3: Utilise existing empty property and incentivise the public to do this and down size when possible, therefore freeing up family accommodation.

Ob.4: Giving priority to Eco business and helping existing businesses trying to be more eco friendly. Ensure local hubs small business start ups and low rent, to encourage entrepreneurship. Reduce business rates, otherwise we will have ghost towns. Up taxes on non eco friendly businesses and services.

Ob.9: Reduce the cost of public transport for users, otherwise it is just easier and cheaper to take use the car.

objective 3 - housing - no more retirement blocks of flats, we are now over run with these - what we need is small housing for our young people either to rent, buy, or part buy, rent - when we see affordable housing at £250.000 like Plumb Park etc, many of our local young do not earn enough money to get a mortgage - EDDC has sadly never addressed this issue in the 50 years I have lived in Exmouth

Under 'Health and Wellbeing, provision should be made for the spiritual lives of people: places of worship, etc.. (Possibly shared with community centre facilities, etc..)

However I would like to see more of an integration between Objection 3 and 10. Meeting future housing needs needs to be linked with Connections and Infrastructure. Without the adequate infrastructure any development needs to be severely restricted.

Why are you putting so much emphasis onto an imaginary issue - Climate Emergency, this is simply a political policy being introduced into what should be non political local affairs

The proposed set of objectives is confusing in its order. It would be clearer to lead with those that express what the plan is essentially there to provide space for; the "What's", Objectives 3 (housing), 4 (jobs), 5 (services) and 10 (infrastructure). Then follow with the supporting objectives that express the manner in which it is hoped the substantial objectives should be achieved; the "Hows", Objectives 1 (well-being), 2 (zero carbon), 6 (design quality), 7 (conservation), 8(environment protection), 9 (sustainability). I would also suggest a further "How" - Objective 10 "Protecting established communities from the adverse impacts of new development including increased flood risk, traffic nuisance and danger, environmental degradation and overloading of existing services and infrastructures"

Yes. But I also believe that you should create some opportunities for young people, to design and think about planning. if you want to keep young talent to stay in the area then invest in the futures of our amazing Exeter College and Tiverton College students by providing opportunities in which they can take part in shaping the world, environment, locality in which they live. This can

be done through design competitions in partnership with certain design lead courses as well as open brief put out to young professionals and architecture agencies in Devon.
The priority is wrong, too much money is wasted on local climate emergency activities when this needs to be led by national government. The saved resources need to be spent on housing and amenities for local people as priority.
Disagree with number 9. Prioritise parking and do not penalise car users
Greater diversity to minority groups of people
no comment see objective 10 section 12 questions
With emphasis on Nature and Climate Change!
There should be no ribbon development in East Devon. It has ruined Torbay and other parts of the UK. Villages should be left as villages - good communities, small and self supporting. Joining up villages, towns/cities is not a good or viable option as people will not want to live in such large groups.
There are people in the area who want to live off grid and be self sustainable and this would not only release housing for other people it will also be more environmentally friendly and help environmental issues but these people seem to be snubbed by the planners this needs to change people should have the right to go off grid and enjoy the things they own
I think they are a good list of objectives and I think numbers 9 and 10 are more strategic and should be given a higher rating, I suggest becoming 3 and 4 with the remainder moving down two levels.
No direct reference to promoting the Tourism Industry.
In light of the recent approval for a gas fired power station in Exmouth, and an attempted application at Woodbury, there needs to be an objective concerning power generation including renewables.
Infrastructure and lack of amenities need to be addressed. Exmouth requires more supermarkets to accommodate the increase in people living in the town. Tesco has the monopoly and charges higher prices because of no competition
Sustainability, regeneration and conservation
More facilities and funding for youth projects
East Devon needs to retain its special appeal and not become an overloaded housing development. This is an area whereby people choose to live because of its current ambiance.
There is so much housing development in close proximity- there is no need to expand in this area. This would only satisfy the local land owners not consider the current local communities.
Transport
The environment.
I think there is a conflict between high quality and beautiful developments and meeting local housing needs which have to be affordable to locals
At least 6 years ago Councillor Bruce de Sarum came to a meeting of Foxholes Residents' Association, touting his involvement in the preparation of your last Local Plan. I cannot see that the resulting current plan makes any difference to the way that gullible councillors, stupid planners and greedy developers either collude with or employ 'smart alec' planning advisors (often ex planning officers) to gain permission to 'run rings round' and to 'work the system' in order to do whatever they like. Until the Government change the Planning Laws in a meaningful way to provide good common sense, but most importantly, ENFORCIBLE development in this country, your efforts on this new plan are a waste of everyone's time and my portion of your Council Tax. PLEASE APPLY THIS COMMENT TO ALL YOUR QUESTIONS. Please do not just disregard my opinion as frivolous and unimportant. These are my honestly held beliefs.
I agree with the objectives, but would ask council to look more deeply into the sustainability of new houses, in terms of solar panels, grey water capture etc.
Brighten up the tired seafront areas and encourage investment therein

<p>I believe its important to retain the facilities and environment the east Devon offers. Significant develops like Cranbrook and West Clyst do not retain the East Devon environment or facilities that people desire.</p>
<p>That ANY housing built should have solar panels and rainwater collection built as standard. The houses should be insulated using recyclables.</p> <p>And you have the goals in the wrong order. What separated East Devon is that it's beautiful countryside. The more we build, the less that the case. Yes, to improving access for eco tourism, healthy activities. Yes, to bigging up our current, beautiful heritage. Yes to finding more of it! Yes, to protecting flood-plains, woods, marshes, heathland. Yes, to bigging up the small businesses that supply the communities in East Devon.</p> <p>Before we can can build more houses we need to secure our community services - hospitals, gp surgeries, fire departments, etc.</p>
<p>I think the road system around our neighbour Exeter proves that just increasing road capacity only increases car journeys and light railway might be an alternative</p>
<p>It is vital to have a comprehensive Plan for all these objectives as they are likely to affect the lives of all living in East Devon. Also the Council will have better control on it development.</p>
<p>Traffic volume and road safety</p>
<p>There is a limit to what a Dictrict Council can achieve but the emphasis on environmental issues is still crucial and is the key to several of the other objectives.</p>
<p>10 objectives represent a substantial body of work to deliver. Any additional objectives will dilute the effort</p> <p>Objective 6 is very subjective. It would be better to be more objective in the wording</p>
<p>They are excellent objectives - the implementation is the key and being BOLD enough to do them justice</p>
<p>Need to maintain 'Devon look and feel' for the region not letting it become a clone of others regions.</p> <p>Also need to fulfil promises made in previous developments and plans - eg the green wedge to the east of Cranbrook</p>
<p>Sounds good but need deal with practicalities, Egs is housing affordable?</p>
<p>It broadly covers all areas necessary for 21st century living, health, housing, businesses, environment (including climate), infrastructure and investment. Where it says 'To provide high quality new homes to meet people's needs.'... I would like this to say 'To provide high quality affordable new homes to meet people's needs especially families with children'.</p>
<p>We welcome that tackling the climate emergency and protecting & enhancing the natural environment are key objectives. We highlight the importance of responding to the climate and ecological crises in an integrated way.</p>
<p>I am only interested in the environment issue at present, and as I have mentioned previously I believe Hydrogen fuel is the long term answer to a better air quality. Battery power has limitations that will not with current technology provide sufficient benifits. Speaking as a retired engineer from my experience.</p>
<p>Members are broadly supportive of the objectives but feel that they closely mirror the white paper (Planning for the Future) and had the following comments:</p> <p>Objective 3: should include the words "safe" and "for rent and purchase"</p> <p>Objective 5: what does greater flexibility mean? Does this imply that use classes will be undermined?</p> <p>Objective 6: "beautiful" is very subjective. Also how does this fit with meeting the needs of the community?</p> <p>Objective 8: the scope should be expanded to include the words "protect and conserve"</p> <p>Objective 9: "promote" is a better word than prioritise. Members wondered how this can be achieved in rural parishes with little/ no public transport and how the reduction in reliance on fossil fuelled vehicles fits with Devon County Council's objectives as well as that of the current public transport stakeholders?</p>

Objective 10: should be broadened to include "and correct infrastructure deficiencies of the past."
Do the objectives and scope address Hierarchy of needs?
Generally agree, but more should be done to discourage car use---park and ride eg. And the seafront should be reconfigured in Exmouth to give pedestrians and cyclists priority over cars. So more sustainable and environmental planning.
Have the objectives been listed in order of priority? If they have I don't agree with that order. However, that is probably not too important at this stage.
Less restrictions for self-builders looking to build out of the BUAB
To protect the existing infrastructure of the district from the inevitable effects of climate change and the extreme weather events that will increasingly occur.
Far too costly, unachievable and there are greater priorities.
There is no mention of community/communities or cultural aspects of the area. The pandemic has raised awareness of the need for a strong community to support individuals and organisations stay healthy, sustainable, supporting public services and voluntary organisations. We have been lucky in "normal" times to have a strong cultural economy which contributes to wellbeing of residents and which promotes tourism and day visits.
Policies required for Spatial targeting of development & Environmental land Management, as per Agriculture Act 2020, and Environment Bill & 25 yr Government strategies
I support the objectives but In terms of development, we need to demand standards, not merely promote or encourage. We must move away from being fobbed off by 'feasibility' part way through development. Outline planning should be given cautiously as this is where the slippery slope into poor end result begins. Feasibility plans need to go in early.
More social housing on developments , Less room for developers to get out of providing this, Less affordable housing as this is not affordable more than initial purchase
Due to East Devon location it is becoming a place where more and people wish to live. Corvid and working from home will compound this so environment, housing and infrastructure are vital.
AIDS to crossing major roads with slowing traffic or pedestrian lights. A376 in particular at Clyst St George.
Glad to see an objective related to tackling the climate emergency! Also pleased at the increased emphasis on building higher-quality properties in attractive settings rather than driving for house numbers at all costs.
Objective 6: Beauty is in the eye of the beholder. When considering development that is sustainable and affordable east Devon has to consider superb design not beauty. Design is key, well designed modular housing can look fantastic against a backdrop of trees or parks/lakes. Look to Scandanavian countries to bring Devon a very modern look which can live in harmony alongside the old.
Focus on connecting local domestic buyers and suppliers/producers to reduce food miles, increase quality and choice, and drive down costs. This builds a vibrant local economy and the Devon brand.
Objectives 8 & 9 could be higher up the list - reading objective 1 as "healthy lifestyles on a healthy planet" makes it a good over-arching aim
More help should be given to local residents in the form of affordable housing and homes to rent
Please commit to actions not just words. These are all worthy objectives but I don't see much action happening to deliver them.
Re Objective 9 I agree with the the objective of reducing reliance on fossil fuels, but this does not automatically create a need to provide charging for electric vehicles. The whole transport strategy needs to be considered as a whole system which may not need to spend huge sums of money, use of 3rd world cheap labour for mining natural resources (producing copper for large capacity cables, for example) and plastic the cable and its infrastructure. Better public transport; use of shared or dial-up driverless transport which will come about in thye future will reduce the need for individuals' cars in the local shopping and town centres - indeed the use of personal vehicles could be discouraged not encouraged..

Reduce the number of 2nd homes in ED by preventing new sales for 2nd homes and applying extra charges to current owners.

No reference is made to solving the existing traffic congestion which seriously affects this parish. There is a desperate need to improve road networks, particularly in the East Devon 'west end'. Objective 9 will not improve traffic flows!

I object strongly to further planned building on our countryside green sites. You have over delivered by 37 percent over the last three years and 33 percent over the past five years. The planning of Cranbrook is a disgrace, have you driven around at the weekend? there are cars parked everywhere, badly parked preventing emergency vehicles from getting through. Extra houses have been built by the greed of the Contractors, with no thought except for themselves. The thought about Climate change completely ignored. I know we need affordable housing, but to encroach on more green belt in this area is ludicrous.

We would like to see this expanded, or an additional objective created, so that the objective is to not only encourage but to provide a safe and secure environment with low crime with the necessary police infrastructure in place to help police, and facilitate, a healthy lifestyle which can be enjoyed free from crime and the fear of crime. The local plan needs to acknowledge the importance of policing and police infrastructure in achieving this objective.

It is clear that a safe and secure environment, free from crime and fear of crime, is key to health and wellbeing; this can be achieved by proportionate investment in the necessary police infrastructure.

We would like to see objective 10 and paragraph 12.1 amended to include police infrastructure.

Coastal erosion

Objective 2 sets out to deliver net zero carbon emissions by 2040. This is in 20 years time and a lot of damage can be done between now and then. I wonder if this can be brought forward and more immediate preventative measures put in place? Committing to using property developers that build more sustainably and recycle materials and waste generated from all the new homes being built.

Objective 8- could be expanded to include no development on green belt sites and planting of new trees to compensate for the additional housing.

Your website is very difficult. You should stick to what we have got and improve that first before moving on./

The VGS consider all the objectives to be 'right'; however, others could be added to the LP:
1) 'Agriculture' is only referred to as forming part of the 'traditional economy'; however, supporting an actively sustainable agricultural system should become a key objective, as outlined in the the government's recent 'Path to Sustainable Farming' which considers biodiversity, local food production and distribution, and support for small-scale traditional family farms: <https://tinyurl.com/yrayctsf>
2) 'Young people' are scarcely mentioned and 'future generations' only once; issues such as 'more housing' or 'climate change' only imply a concern with the next generation; rather, the interests of young people and real long-termism should be made a key objective, on the lines of the Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015: <https://tinyurl.com/6ar7m7cp>

Transport links and infrastructure. As an example if you wish for example Ottery St Mary to thrive as a town it needs a Bi-pass road circling the town to take away through traffic and allow the town centre to be pedestrianised . This would attract businesses to the centre, provide a focal point for town events and improve the carbon footprint of the town centre.

Climate change needs to take a backseat in light of the difficult financial times out country faces and that couples up with the great need to support the high street, small and local businesses. Much more is needed to be done with regards to our heritage including enforcement on those who do not sufficiently maintain such structures/buildings. Housing is a priority but needs to be designated more towards brownfield sites as open countryside is fast becoming a rare commodity

Objective 3:

The majority of new homes should be for local people & robust research should be carried out to understand the needs of everyone and not just jump on the bandwagon of affordable housing. There are older people in the East Devon who would like to step down to easy care/supported living in the villages they have lived in all of their lives and yet is only executive homes or un/affordable housing that are built.

Today houses are built without infra structure or community facilities. Second homes destroy communities and do little to contribute to the local economy. East Devon should become a great place to live and work and not a theme park for holiday makers and second home owners.

Objective 4.

It would be great to see better paid year round jobs for local people. You also need to provide training so that those who were born here can obtain better paid jobs and remain in the area. If you keep increasing the population you will lose what people love best.

no comment

1. There is nothing about enhancing the local existing community. New developments should be at a pace to enhance the local community rather than replace. In Ottery the present LDP has seen 550 new homes built/approved between 2015 and 2021. This has increased the population by around 20% in less than 5 years (in fact a bigger increase in Ottery than in the preceding 110 years). What makes Devon towns are the character of their communities - their differences.

Recent development fails to take this into consideration and is leading to homogenised towns. If the character of the town changes so does its cultural uniqueness/diversity

2. Shouldnt the objective be the order in which things are done. At present housing is thrust into towns when there is inadequate resources (school places, doctors surgeries, water supply, sewage capacity, road ways, parking for residents who live in older buildings which give the town its character). Towns are becoming commuter towns for mainly Exeter

Development needs more control keep the hedge rows and trees, you can't keep taking away the homes of wild life. The UK has the highest wildlife extinction level of the whole of Europe, I want to see councils showing genuine concern before it is to late!

The planet before profit!

The objectives are very high level soundbites. This is usually difficult to translate in to meaningful practical actions. Each point should have subsections with how it is possible to acheive the objectives and what impact this is going to have on the lives of the local community.

Our client supports the objectives laid out in paragraph 2.1 and believe their reasoning to be "sound", in-line with the NPPF.

Nevertheless, the importance of delivering new homes to meet and ambitiously surpass the housing requirements of the District should be an objective. In doing so, the district will be able to improve affordability, providing housing to those in the greatest need, create jobs and boost the economy. This objective should of course be cognisant of viability, ensuring that policy requirements create a platform for financially viable development.

It is unrealistic to expect cycling and walking to be a major means of travel in a country area. Distances are too great. It is also foolish to provide affordable housing in villages that force people to run two cars that they cannot afford. Affordable housing is needed, but should be built near centres of employment and shopping centres.

The objectives are not, in my opinion, of equal importance. I am in full agreement with objectives 1, 2, 8, 9 and 10. Whilst the others are important, they should not complete on a the same playing field as those five, and should be progressed in such a way as to support these five.

As part of the sustainable transport and in particular public transport more should be done to make buses in towns electric.

Objective 1, 3 & 4 need to give clarity about how the needs of people with disabilities including those with Learning disability will be met to ensure equitable access & opportunity.

If the objectives are in order of priority then I think the objective for protecting our natural environment should be listed in at least the top three and arguably top given it's importance to all species.

I would like to see more information regarding improvements to road for pedestrians, particularly on roads that have a high percentage of traffic. The main road leading from the Exmouth

roundabout to Budeilgh High Street is a major concern as there is little provision for footpaths so pedestrians have to zig-zag across the road from one pathway to another. The increase in traffic over the last few years has been enormous and if the Plan as stated goes ahead, I can only see there being more traffic. We have seen this already since Evans Fields has been developed on the outskirts of Knowle Village - which could become an area where further housing could be developed. It is also clear that many vehicles do not observe the 30 m.p.h., limit as they approach the T junction at Knowle Village and some totally ignore the 30 m.p.h. light that flashes on the main road. Could something also be done about the T-junction at Knowle Village - the noise of vehicle horns is extremely worrying.

There need to be very clear quotas for disabled access and affordable housing on all potential sites both in Rural and Town areas. There needs to be a clause about viability assessments being based on existing land values if agricultural land is to be used for housing or commercial development and there needs to be a clear allocation of small and large business units to specific zones including Honiton and Dunkeswel. There needs to be very clear design principles and community quality of life design policies built into the new plan

I would like to see investment to increase tourism in East Devon all year around, rather than just over the traditional peak months. I would like to see Sidmouth and Seaton developed into watersport destinations.

Please refer to my answer to chapter 14

Infrastructure and public transport

They are just management speak words on a page. Anyone can write them, very few can follow through.

Health and wellbeing are important as well as zero carbon. Vitality of our towns could be helped by using all of the empty floors of buildings above shops to bring more people to live in towns. NO NEW DEVELOPMENTS are needed particularly on greenfield sites. Re-use brownfield sites. Affordable housing is not necessary.

no

Generally excellent objectives, but I think there ought to be provision to ensure that habitat & biodiversity loss do not occur as a result of following the other objectives.

Security from criminals and from terrorists. Safety for children from pedophiles.

I would give conserving the natural environment a higher priority

Large scale development needs to be considered along side available hospital beds and facilities. The pandemic highlighted Devon would have been in serious trouble if COVID had hit us hard, due to over development without comparable beds in hospital

that's enough to handle

A scheme where lower priced properties, usually in or on the outskirts of towns are purchased by Councils and improved, instead of perpetual 'new builds' would not only provide alternatives to new build affordable housing, but would speed up housing needs as these properties already exist, usually in areas where employment exists. Improvement of these types of property would enhance the local area and add a much needed boost to the housing market. There seems to be a trend of CLT's claiming a need for affordable housing in rural areas with no infrastructure or employment prospects, which is not in keeping with the objectives of a sustainable development.

What a wast of time. You can not control what developers do, and yet this is trying to set out that you are doing all the buildings in the area which is false therefore this statement is a waste of time

To allow for affordable housing solutions to enable local families to remain in the area. To consider a balanced housing stock for a wide mix of households

nice objectives but several are pipe dreams. In past 5 years employment is still dire, public transport not fit for purpose and proposals to reduce reliance on the car obviously not coming from those attempting to live in the area. Need for more housing now decreasing.

The objectives for the Local Plan are a mixture visions, aims, desires and aspirations without any clear rational or structure for their selection. The Local Plan needs to make a clear distinction between:

- The Vision for the future
- High Level Aims

Objectives

It is critical for the Vision, Aims and Objectives to be clearly stated so they can be used as a benchmark to ensure appropriate planning and land use policies and proposals are included in the Plan. The Local Plan should set out Objectives that seek to:

A - Conserve and Enhance East Devon's Environment

B - Prudent use of Resources

C - Community Self Sufficiency

D - Meeting the need for Housing

E - Dynamic and Healthy Economy

F - Sustainable Transport Networks

G - Meeting the need for Infrastructure

The suggested "List of Objectives" are set out in the pdf attached to this response.

Rejuvenation of high streets and town centres is also essential

I agree all the given objectives. I think you are missing an objective related to pollution and recycling. While CO2 emissions and habitat loss are major causes of concern, we often overlook the impact of plastics, chemicals and other human generated waste. I would like to see an objective specifically aimed at reducing / eliminating locally generated waste.

In objective 5 there could also be reference to charities social enterprises voluntary and community groups,

Support people to be able to buy and live in existing property in East Devon. Many properties are snapped up as second homes/holiday lets - it is difficult for first/second-time buyers to buy, move, and live in East Devon (new homes alone will not solve this). Objective 8 - we should strive to increase biodiversity with measurable outcomes, not just 'support it'.

It's not clear whether these objectives are in any order of priority. Since there are inevitable conflicts, surely they need to be? Objectives 8 & 9 should be very high priority.

It has been glaringly obvious for several years that the A376 needs to be upgraded for productivity and safety reasons. Despite the population growth of Exmouth and some other nearby settlements nothing has been done for many many years. Is the council unaware that productivity is one of the UK's major economic problems and that infrastructure improvements are known to make significant improvements to these improvements.

"Climate change" should not be a major priority for a local district council.

I applaud the ethos the plan is based upon

Plan for younger generations to live and work in East Devon and in particular rural areas to balance the age demographic of the population and ensure healthy vibrant rural communities for the future.

These are all good general aims - but think EDDC should concentrate on objectives 3, 4 5 and 10.

Only build where the area has resources to support the additional population

There is a need to prioritise these objectives at some point.

The plans in relation to the economy and housing etc are totally inadequate. On every endeavour dealing with the EDDC is so difficult as there overriding remit is to prevent and stall all and any development they have the capability of doing this too which does not fall into their aim of keeping any development to an absolute minimum as required by law and letting all the surrounding areas take the strain. It is clearly visible in everything they do and as a show of this they recently pulled out of the area development plan which the other areas were involved in, which means they lose funding and other incentive but this is irrelevant as they are not interested in funding and development.

I think an additional objective relating to established communities: Protecting these communities from adverse impacts of new development for example in our current climate flood risk, increased traffic nuisance and added danger on the narrow lanes, overloading of existing services and infrastructure.

Yes - fine

The date in Objective 2 should be reduced to 2030 in line with the wishes of the Devon Interim Carbon Plan. Objective 3 should include the refurbishment of existing dwellings to reduce reliance on new build, which is NOT carbon friendly, and more brownfield development should be encouraged. Objective 10: new infrastructure, particularly roads, should be minimal to discourage vehicle use.

In accordance with the NPPF the presumption in favour of sustainable development should be a fundamental aspect of the plan's focus. This will ensure that new development is located in sustainable places, in close proximity to complementary uses (i.e houses close to jobs, shops and community infrastructure) with the least environmental impact. Whilst climate change, design and the environmental are important issues to consider the plan should fundamentally identify and provide for objectively assessed needs (NPPG Paragraph: 036 Reference ID: 61-036-20190723).

Linked to the 'presumption' the inter relationship between East Devon and Exeter should also be included as a fundamental issue. The concentration of jobs, facilities and services in Exeter cannot be overlooked. Locating development near to Exeter is likely to result in the most sustainable form of development, subject to relevant environmental constraints and designations.

There should be a specific objective to support retail and related services in villages

An additional Objective: Protecting established communities from the adverse impacts of new development including increased flood risk, traffic nuisance and danger, environmental degradation and overloading of existing services and infrastructures.

My only comments are, having spent several years now since living in Whimble making my own objections to planning proposals, making my own remarks and attending planning meetings, so far absolutely zero, absolutely nothing of what I have said, suggested or offered as an opinion has been taken into consideration or made any difference. I absolutely believe in my heart that this is purely a paper exercise. I have no belief or evidence to suggest the east Devon district Council will give any consideration whatsoever to any personal individuals remarks. Therefore in my opinion there is no point whatsoever in completing this document because I do not believe that the Council are going to pay any attention to it whatsoever. You are offering this opportunity to make our comments out of obligation but in my opinion you have absolutely no intention whatsoever to listen to what the individual residents request, or desire. It is incredibly sad and disappointing.

Objective 2 - please expand to include encouraging renewable energy and its infrastructure
Objective 3 - please add 'in the right places'

There is no clear plan to support rural communities to keep them as vibrant communities in their own right.

All houses built should be of low energy, low carbon design.
A programme of retro fitting heritage housing stocks to be more energy efficient.
Encouragement for rainwater collection projects.
Some areas where very dense growth of trees and plants can be achieved

Reduce development. Preserve our rural landscape.

Maintaining the existing character of Devon's towns and villages (not trying to stop all development, but future development should be sensitive and in character with existing styles, size/proportions, of individual homes etc.

More cycle paths.
Ottery at Mary to Sidmouth
Sidbury to Sidford
Kilmington to Seaton Sea Front
Propper designated cycle paths no roads.
Every new road built should have a cycle path.

Objective 3 needs to be more of a focus on housing needs for local residents.
If Consultation is key, then include it as an objective and also add: Respect and take into account Local Neighbourhood Plans.

Develop more villages to make them more sustainable encourage housing ,business development therefore encouraging the retention of generated monies for the benefit of the local community to enhance the vitality and facilities of the village community
I think environmental considerations should be at the for front.
Large scale areas for recreation must be included. Large scale areas for biodiversity Problem of second homes
Most of the objectives are so self-evident as to hardly need stating. No-one in their right mind would argue for the contrary.
Education needs more prominence. A radical solution is required to the affordable home problem that a substantial percentage of our residents have.
Would support these objectives but feel that current infrastructure particularly a community resource such as The Beehive, Charity no 1162412, which belongs to East Devon residents, should be supported financially. This would help sustain the charity and enable more support for the community health & wellbeing and add to the economic and cultural/tourism offer for the region. Can you include building upon and increasing the offer of current infrastructure ?I'm sure this would be a cost effective approach.
Address the planning implications of the Covid pandemic eg retail/town centres, employment and transport issues - both current and anticipated (para. 2.6)
Provide more Electric Vehicle public Charging points, both on street and in Car Parks, but without a charge being made to use them at the latter.
Objective 6. Sadly the word 'beautiful' does not spring to mind when I see some of the appalling designs of housing which have been approved and built. Some even in the Conservation Area of Budleigh Salterton.
Several of our rivers in East Devon are degraded and polluted. They need to be upgraded and then protected as part of the environmental objectives.
Little/no involvement of the public - other than where there is a valid neighbourhood plan which must be respected fully.
More protection for green corridors between Exeter and the nearby villages, to prevent the likes of Broadclyst merging with either the city or Cranbrook
Think of the younger generation , support them with more local opportunity
I couldn't see any plans for promoting affordable housing/addressing local housing needs. we live in an area where house prices are not matched with salaries and there is an abundance of second homes.
I do not think that land at The Grange field Rockbeare or around Cobden towards Whimple should be built on. Villages are being swallowed up by Cranbrook
For both residents and visitors to the area greater introduction of connected cycle paths for both leisure and commuting. I would love to cycle to work but the lanes and roads I would use have high volumes of car, lorry and bus traffic it would be unsafe.
Community Care or Care in the Community. Supporting/funding the use of solar, wind and other alternative energy provisions to existing buildings.
Heritage: to preserve the heritage of Exmouth; the villages within and the history which has led this to be a visitor town. To preserve the open spaces, i.e., the Maer valley as it is. To preserve with English Hertiage and NT the ancient lanes of Gore and Castle. In short to limit the amount of building in and around Exmouth which has become too large and with too many 'sink' estates.
Exmouth: now is too large, too many estates. We must have a mission to use all available empty buildings for housing and limit second homes here which fuels the high cost of housing. Help for real local people should be available to help get on the housing ladder or rent at reasonable cost. Other towns must now take more of the building quota.
Anti social behaviour: which comes from the sink estates and from those visiting, mostly local to

<p>other parts of ED and Exeter and other towns. We need to come down hard on all types of anti social behaviour; littering, dog fouling, bad behaviour etc.</p>
<p>Our client supports the objectives laid out in paragraph 2.1 and believe their reasoning to be “sound”, in-line with the NPPF as mentioned above.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the importance of delivering new homes to meet and ambitiously surpass the housing requirements of the District should be an objective. In doing so, the district will be able to improve affordability, providing housing to those in the greatest need, create jobs and boost the economy. This objective should of course be cognisant of viability, ensuring that policy requirements create a platform for financially viable development.</p>
<p>The objectives in themselves are “right” as principles, in that most people won’t disagree with the broad sentiment. The key issues however are “how” will these be achieved, particularly when some of them may conflict eg objective 3 (meeting future housing needs) while still conserving and enhancing our built heritage and natural environment (objectives 7 and 8). This includes protecting established communities from the worst impacts of development.</p>
<p>Objective 3 - I would like this to specify more affordable and/or social housing. And Objective 7 - to Use derelict sites for infill housing and to encourage those who own heritage sites that have been derelict for years to do something to correct those particular eyesores.</p>
<p>Objective 2, Tackling the climate emergency: Target date should be more ambitious, i.e. 2030. Need to allow people the right to build, adhering to guidance.</p>
<p>Objective 2 - I would like to understand if local government can set its own higher standard for any new construction. Current planning seems to allow vast estates to be thrown up with a relatively poor standard particularly in terms of sustainability. Why can developers not be forced to include more insulation, ground source pumps, solar panels etc instead of conventional approaches.</p> <p>Objective 3 - How can the council control/limit 2nd home ownership which drives prices up and prices locals from the market. More affordable and social housing should be incorporated in any new developments - not just a token gesture.</p> <p>Objective 7 - Many older properties are structurally sound, but could benefit from investment to bring up to a higher standard of sustainability and to reduce emissions.</p> <p>Objective 9 - I totally support sustainable local transport, the plan should also consider the importance of Exeter airport to local tourism and business. The loss of Flybe was a major blow to the area.</p>
<p>We particularly note Objective 7 (To conserve and enhance our outstanding built heritage), and Objective 8 (To protect and enhance our outstanding natural environment and support an increase in biodiversity). With respect to Objective 7 - we endorse the conservation of our built heritage. However, we find the words 'and enhance' lacks clarity in the context of conservation – 'enhance' implies an alteration that maybe in conflict with conservation.</p>
<p>Protection of green wedges between communities and important landscape features in smaller settlements. Imposing designs on developers to avoid generic house builds within communities to avoid the emergence of a loss of identity.</p>
<p>Objective 3 should recognise that urban and rural housing needs are different and be restated as: “To provide high quality homes to meet people needin both urban and rural areas”.</p> <p>Objective 10 talks about “Connections”. It’s not clear what this means and we suggest the word should be Connectivity. Only infrastructure is mentioned in the objective. It should read: “Objective 10: Connectivity and Infrastructure: To secure infrastructure and connectivity needs at an appropriate time to support new development”</p>
<p>support objective 1 and objective 6. synergy with Active Environments - one of the 5 key issues in our New Strategy ‘Uniting The Movement’ is a 10-year vision to transform lives and communities through sport and physical activity. We believe and will advocated sport and physical activity has a big role to play in improving the physical and mental health of the nation, supporting the economy, reconnecting communities and rebuilding a stronger society for all.</p>
<p>There needs to be more recognition, service and investment in the small villages of the area - these are too often left till last when there is no money left in the bank.</p>

<p>I have raised a specific issue in relation to Objective 3: Meeting Future Housing Needs(see below). However, the objectives are sensible and Toray specifically supports Objective 2 Tackling the Climate Emergency.</p>
<p>The list of objectives is extensive, but the trick is to balance the attempts to meet one objective rather than another. Our experience is that the main objective is always to meet targets of house-building at the expense of all other objectives</p> <p>Objective 1 could be achieved under the other objective headings; it would be difficult to prove and achieve in isolation for all residents in East Devon. This objective is all about good "Design" which is covered under objective 6. It is Important that planning is seen by all residents in East Devon as more than housing and employment and that these objectives do not lead and determine the Plan and lip-service is paid to the other objectives.</p>
<p>The objectives are supported but it would help at this point to refer explicitly in some form to the need to secure and encourage social sustainability and connectivity. The issue is picked up later in Chapter 3 but given its strategic importance, it should really included in the headline objectives. For example, Objective 1 could be usefully expanded to "healthy lifestyles, living environments and supportive social connections for all East Devon residents".</p>
<p>Protecting the sustainability of East Devon villages and the local communities</p>
<p>Nevertheless, the importance of delivering new homes to meet and ambitiously surpass the housing requirements of the District should be an objective. In doing so, the district will be able to improve affordability, providing housing to those in the greatest need, create jobs and boost the economy. This objective should of course be cognisant of viability, ensuring that policy requirements create a platform for financially viable development.</p> <p>Furthermore, alongside an objective focusing specifically on housing deliver, another is needed to address the delivery of employment/commercial space within the district. If East Devon District Council wants to create an area where people not only want to live, but businesses want to locate themselves, they must ensure the delivery of an adequate amount of innovate employment/commercial space, in a timely manner.</p>
<p>Improve and support Biodiversity, reduce pollution, support renewable energy, encourage demonstration of enhanced public access to and within the marine area, infrastructure between the terrestrial and marine environment.</p>
<p>We should include an objective to support the arts in East Devon.</p> <p>Development of housing should be the MINIMUM to meet people's needs - not to satisfy the profit developers want to make.</p> <p>Further to the pandemic, working practices are changing to more home-working, so improved broadband is a suggested objective for the district.</p>
<p>But suggest consider the following -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Promote opportunities for leisure activity 2. Promote access to open spaces for exercise 3. Take prompt and appropriate action to prevent ingress of the sea to communities (particularly in view of climate change), such as at Sidmouth
<p>I'm pleased to see the Climate emergency & Health & Wellbeing are at the front.</p>
<p>I would delete Objective 3 and give Objective 8 and 9 higher priority</p>
<p>Less emphasis on green issues and huge emphasis on providing enough homes for young people in Devon</p>
<p>The issue of sustainability is glaringly missing. Growth for the sake of it is ultimately pointless and damages all of you objectives.</p>
<p>The climate emergency is an emergency, measures need to be taken in the next 10years ie by 2030 not 2040. Major and irreversible change affecting East Devon will have already happened by 2040.</p>
<p>Existing people on assessed as being in need of council managed social housing should be prioritised in the provision of new housing. There is no excuse for people being on local housing lists in the Exeter/East Devon area in view of the extensive house building which has recently taken place.</p>

Protection of farm land and rural villages. Protection of countryside from housing development and general damage by roads or building.
Given the gravity of climate change and environmental concerns, a ten year plan would be more appropriate.
How about: Relief Of Poverty - Objective ? - To provide the support, opportunities and resources to enable people to climb out of poverty Support of the Vulnerable - Objective ? - To identify and support vulnerable residents of East Devon a) who need significant support and encouragement before they can even begin to access all the opportunities provided by this plan, and/or b) who will always need significant support because of their physical, mental or other needs
Yes, but so not necessarily agree the order
Recreation and biodiversity
I think something explicit needs adding about recycling household rubbish - improving the amount that is both collected and actually recycled and reducing the amount of landfill waste disposal. I don't think objectives 1 and 8 are enough to cover this.
Stop overbuild! Provide far more parking per house. People don't use garages for cars, but for storage as modern houses have no room inside for storage. Houses advertised as 4 bedroom a joke! 2 bedrooms with 2 dressing rooms more like! Usually 2 cars are owned per house minimum, let alone visitors! Roads are so narrow, then cars are parked on footpaths, no chance of east access for emergency vehicles.
...meet ' people's needs' or 'residents needs'?
Objective 2 = Climate change = reduce date to 2030 Objective 3 = Housing needs = Remove "industry" from town centre and develop housing (I.e Hales yard to Daisymount and replace with cottage housing similar to Poundbury, Dorchester including local 'village Shop'. make spine road to create oneway system with Mill Street Objective 3 = Housing needs = Remove Bradfords to Heath Park and replace with Garden village with open green spaces Objective 4 - Job creation = Introduce "artistic and creative" atmosphere with studio shops Objective 5 = Town Centre = (a) Reduce high street width to twoway in curved format (b) Pedestrian width to include trees and street furnitue and cafe culture (c) Remove traffic light sysem and introduce 'belisher beacons (d) Designated Performance areas
Additional comment possibly under objective 1: "To encourage the creation of wealthy and sustainable COMMUNITIES".
Broadly, the objectives need to address the impact of the global pandemic and Brexit. We are too reliant on tourism and importing fruit, veg, and even trees from the EU. We have an opportunity to develop our agricultural skills to supplying the UK, while improving our own resilience at the same time. The adverse impact of tourism with second homes, traffic, stressing our limited health care resources have really got our attention.
These objectives are right but I'm concerned about how they will be met without damaging the natural environment or the already established local communities.
No you need more & wider objectives - this is too focused on housing provision.
In our view, support for an increase in biodiversity is not sufficient and the Council needs to act positively to conserve and enhance nature. RSPB considers an equal level of commitment to restoring biodiversity in tackling the Nature and Climate Emergency is necessary. We recommend Objective 8 is strengthened to "To protect, restore and enhance our outstanding natural environment and biodiversity". This including ensuring all developments adhere to the mitigation hierarchy (avoid harm as a priority, mitigate where not possible, compensate as a last resort), and deliver biodiversity net gain (BNG). In achieving this, Council policy and decisions should ensure designated sites and species are protected, that biodiversity offsetting is not used when development would destroy irreplaceable habitats, and that BNG contributes to delivery of

local nature recovery strategy priorities and objectives. BNG will be required from all new developments once the Environment Bill is law.
The NHS would like to confirm that Objective 10 would cover provision for accessible and sustainable healthcare.
We believe that objective 8 is of the utmost importance. Indeed this objective is vital for achieving objectives 1 and 2.
Yes, I would like to see the new local plan articulated primarily around the need to tackle climate change. The old local plan was distressingly quiet on environmental damage and climate change, and put the emphasis on the delivery of houses, rather than on the quality of the houses and communities this plan produced.
Our client supports the objectives laid out in paragraph 2.1 and believe their reasoning to be "sound", in-line with the NPPF as mentioned above. Nevertheless, the importance of delivering new homes to meet and ambitiously surpass the housing requirements of the District should be an objective. In doing so, the district will be able to improve affordability, providing housing to those in the greatest need, create jobs and boost the economy. This objective should of course be cognisant of viability, ensuring that policy requirements create a platform for financially viable development.
NPPF (185) requires a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment. Objective 7 therefore needs to be broadened to cover the whole of East Devon's outstanding Historic Environment, not just its Built Heritage. Archaeology and historic landscape are otherwise excluded from this objective. This would balance Objective 8 on the Natural Environment - much of which is historic/cultural as well as 'natural'.
Local community knowledge should play a greater part in planning for sustainability. More emphasis on promoting a green economy. Housing design should be more flexible, to suit households' evolving needs over time.
Always a contentious start; are the objectives in the right order of priority and would this ordering have "put off" those who wished to have their say?
My initial thoughts are that these are largely the right objectives. However, if these are in a priority order of 1 - 10, I am not sure that this is right, however perhaps that is one of the purposes of this consultation. I would also like to see the addition of collaborative "place shaping". While this would draw on elements from most if not all of the other objectives, its focus is more based on giving communities resilience and vibrancy, beyond (but including, of course,) just the highstreet. This would help define and assert the individual characters of the various towns and villages across the district (perhaps giving extra weight to neighbourhood plans) and help shape and define the identity of East Devon as a whole. In short, give the district a strategy for growth that is focused on what our communities need and want, and define the USP of East Devon.
Our client supports the objectives laid out in paragraph 2.1 and believe their reasoning to be "sound", in-line with the NPPF as mentioned above. The objectives; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Objective 1: Designing for health and wellbeing · Objective 2: Tackling the climate change emergency · Objective 3: Supporting jobs and the economy · Objective 5: Promoting vibrant town centres · Objective 6: Designing beautiful and healthy spaces and buildings · Objective 7: Our outstanding built heritage · Objective 8: Our outstanding natural environment · Objective 9: Promoting sustainable transport · Objective 10: Connections and Infrastructure Nevertheless, the importance of delivering new homes to meet and ambitiously surpass the housing requirements of the District should be an objective. In doing so, the district will be able

<p>to improve affordability, providing housing to those in the greatest need, create jobs and boost the economy. This objective should of course be cognisant of viability, ensuring that policy requ</p>
<p>It is important, in the drive for alternative forms of transport to the private car, not to forget that the East Devon area has a large rural environment with relatively poor accessibility by public transport and infrastructure (including fast internet access). Many of these areas have an older population for whom cycling and walking are not viable options for day to day living. These area depend on good access to their market towns and the use of private transport.</p>
<p>To provide nature corridors for wildlife. This has a huge potential to aid our diversity. Even small patches of wilderness will help. For this reason, I would not support infilling.</p>
<p>We feel that Objective 7 should reflect the wider historic environment, including archaeology, not just historic buildings. The National Planning Policy Framework refers to the Historic Environment. If Objective 7 is not widened then there should be a separate Objective to cover conservation, access and enjoyment of archaeological sites and monuments and historic landscapes.</p> <p>Objective 1 (Section 3.5) should include access to the historic environment and landscape as well as the natural environment for health and wellbeing.</p>
<p>Our clients support the objectives laid out in paragraph 2.1 and believe their reasoning to be “sound”, in-line with the NPPF as mentioned above.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the importance of delivering new homes to meet and ambitiously surpass the housing requirements of the District should be an objective. In doing so, the district will be able to improve affordability, providing housing to those in the greatest need, create jobs and boost the economy. This objective should of course be cognisant of viability, ensuring that policy requ</p>
<p>Our clients support the objectives laid out in paragraph 2.1 and believe their reasoning to be “sound”, in-line with the NPPF as mentioned above. Nevertheless, the importance of delivering new homes to meet and ambitiously surpass the housing requirements of the District should be an objective. In doing so, the district will be able to improve affordability, providing housing to those in the greatest need, create jobs and boost the economy. This objective should of course be cognisant of viability, ensuring that policy requirements create a platform for financially viable development.</p>
<p>An additional Objective: Protecting established communities from the adverse impacts of new development including increased flood risk, traffic nuisance and danger, environmental degradation and overloading of existing services and infrastructures.</p>
<p>Currently there is no reference to meeting the community, cultural and social needs of the community. We would note paragraph 8 of the NPPF states the planning system has a social objective to support communities’ health, social and cultural well-being, and paragraph 20 seeks strategic policies which make provision for community facilities including cultural infrastructure. We recommend insertion of an additional objective to support, provide and protect such uses for the benefit of the community.</p>
<p>An additional Objective: Protecting established communities from the adverse impacts of new development including increased flood risk, traffic nuisance and danger, environmental degradation and overloading of existing services and infrastructures.</p>
<p>Tipton St John needs a school in the village that is climate and flood resilient!</p>
<p>I don’t agree with building any more houses and retail parks, but Climate Change should be extremely high on the agenda.</p>
<p>There should be a specific social housing objective delivered by</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) EDDC buying land deevolving and selling houses purely or predominantly for Social Housing 2) a requirement that a proportion of the land on any major development is transferred to EDDC sufficient to build 25% of the total number of dwellings. On this land EDDC would then build and sell the target number of social housing. There are too many examples where developers end up committing to a much lower % of social housing than their original commitment e.g. Goodmores Farm (final 5% vs >20% in outline permission.) resulting in significant overall delivery of the Social Housing target.

