

## **EAST DEVON DISTRICT COUNCIL**

### **Minutes of the meeting of Strategic Planning Committee held at Online via the zoom app on 8 February 2022**

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

The meeting started at 9.30am and ended at 4.00pm. The meeting was adjourned briefly at 11.00am and reconvened at 11.05am, adjourned at 12.55pm and reconvened at 1.30pm and briefly adjourned at 15.15pm and reconvened at 15.20pm.

#### **70 Public speaking**

Councillor David Valentine representing Gittisham Parish Council spoke about the working draft Local Plan and drew Members attention to the parish council's concerns about the potential allocations for residential development to the West of Honiton reference Gitti\_01 and Gitti\_05. He advised it would have a serious detrimental impact on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the village as the developments would encroach into the valley and would be within 400m from the village. He referenced the land owners presentation given to Strategic Planning Committee Members on 25 January where they focused on the proximity of the site being close to employment but highlighted in reality the proposed allocation was remote and a considerable distance from the town centre and other services and would have a negative impact on the highway infrastructure.

#### **71 Minutes of the previous meeting**

Members were happy to accept the minutes of the consultative Strategic Planning Committee meeting held on 11 January 2022.

#### **72 Declarations of interest**

Minute 75. Working draft of the proposed East Devon Local Plan 2020 to 2040. Councillor Eleanor Rylance, Personal, Broadclyst Parish Councillor.

Minute 75. Working draft of the proposed East Devon Local Plan 2020 to 2040. Councillor Jess Bailey, Personal, Devon County Councillor.

Minute 75. Working draft of the proposed East Devon Local Plan 2020 to 2040. Councillor Mike Howe, Personal, Bishops Clyst Parish Councillor.

Minute 75. Working draft of the proposed East Devon Local Plan 2020 to 2040. Councillor Olly Davey, Personal, Exmouth Town Councillor and a minor investor in co-cars which are based in Exeter.

Minute 75. Working draft of the proposed East Devon Local Plan 2020 to 2040. Councillor Paul Hayward, Personal, Employed as Clerk to All Saints and Chardstock Parish Councils and locum Deputy Clerk to Axminster Town Council.

Minute 75. Working draft of the proposed East Devon Local Plan 2020 to 2040. Councillor Philip Skinner, Personal, Plymtree Parish Councillor; Known to FWS Carter & Sons and the Stewart family. Also owns a piece of land in Talaton that is in the HELAA process and advised that during any discussion about Talaton he would like to be

removed to the virtual lobby and would not participate in the debate or take part in the vote.

Minute 75. Working draft of the proposed East Devon Local Plan 2020 to 2040. Councillor Sarah Chamberlain, Personal, Broadclyst Parish Councillor and Ward Member for Broadclyst.

73 **Matters of urgency**

There were no matters of urgency.

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

There were no confidential / exempt items.

75 **Working draft of the proposed East Devon Local Plan 2020 to 2040**

The Service Lead – Planning Strategy and Development Management directed Members to Chapter 15 – Ensuring access to open space and sporting recreation facilities on page 323 which would be the starting point for discussion.

Members noted that a report would be brought to committee on 22 February providing an update on the timetable for production of the Local Plan and the Service Lead – Planning Strategy and Development Management raised concerns that work was falling behind and that the Local Plan would not be ready for consultation in the early summer as previously envisaged.

In response to a question about the HELAA the Service Lead – Planning Strategy and Development Management advised that he hoped to bring a report to Members in March.

Chapter 15 – Ensuring access to open space and sporting and recreation facilities

82. Strategic Policy – Access to open space and recreation facilities

**Members advised that they support officers preferred option to:  
Insert policy that establishes a strategic approach to ensuring that new development is only provided or allowed where it can provide appropriate access to existing open space and/or will provide appropriate provision as part of the overall scheme being proposed. Policy is to provide a framework to support others in this chapter and throughout the plan and will:**

- **Highlight relevance of accessibility to open space;**
- **Require new provision where shortfalls exist; and**
- **Generally set a high standard for all developments in order for them to be acceptable.**

83. Policy – Retention of land and buildings for sport and recreation use

- Clarification sought on the final paragraph of option A as it appeared misleading. The Service Lead – Planning Strategy and Development Management confirmed that surplus land would not be lost and would be reused for alternative purposes;
- Support was expressed that loss of land would be protected or replaced if lost but highlighted that the policy did not specify that loss of land should be replaced in the same area;

- Suggestion to amend the wording to option A so that it involves the community and not just the developers;
- The wording in brackets (local to be defined) needs to be more specific;
- More definition is required for sport and recreation.

**Members advised that they support officers preferred option that:  
Proposed policy will establish that the loss of land and buildings that are currently or were previously used for sport and recreation will not be acceptable unless:  
Alternative provision of equal or greater community quality and benefit is delivered (to include additional provision the need for which is generated by any net additional building);**

**A development involving some site loss will result in overall net gains through existing facility enhancement;**

**In the local area (local to be defined) there is a net surplus of the general type of facility or space that is being lost (this will NOT be taken to be a specific sports pitch/space surplus but a generic space type reference e.g. grass area suitable for team sport).**

84. Policy – land and buildings for sport, recreation and open space areas in association with development.

- Support was expressed for option A with a suggestion to address missing facilities from previous developments; The Service Lead – Planning Strategy and Development Management advised that new developments are only required to mitigate their own impact;
- Clarification sought about how developers would contribute to sports facilities in areas that did not have any facilities. It was advised that a Section 106 Agreement would be used to deliver the facilities on site with a contribution from developers;
- Suggestion was made to include the use of artificial surfaces and pitches;
- There is a need to make sure developers deliver open spaces in a timely manner or for the public sector to deliver them; In response the Service Lead – Planning Strategy and Development Management advised he was happy to look into this but it would not necessarily be included in a policy in the Local Plan as it was a very detailed point but a supplementary planning document may be a way of addressing the issue.

**Members advised that they support officers preferred option to:  
Insert policy that establishes that new sporting and recreational facilities and open space will be required in association with and to match need generated by new development. Policy to major on new housing growth and from the Playing Pitch Strategy outputs and open space evidence/sports facility evidence we will quantify standards/levels of facility provision to be provided on-site (typically on larger development schemes) or contribution equivalents off-site.**

**Policy to include:**

**Requirements for space to accommodate - with actual space standard requirements to be defined:**

- Allotments
- Outdoor sports pitches
- Parks and recreation grounds
- Play space for children and youth
- Accessible semi-natural green space

- **Fixed sport facilities**

**The space standards may be varied (further work required) across urban and rural areas of East Devon or other sub-divisions. Need to determine contributions for paying for facilities not just land provision. Where flexibility may be appropriate – specifically to include where existing levels of provision are greater than need requirements. Look at ability to secure provision on non-residential developments. On sites allocated for development in the plan the provision should be accommodated within the actual allocated land.**

85. Policy – Location of facilities for sport and recreation, open spaces and allotments.

**Members advised that they supported officers preferred option to:  
Insert policy that establishes location and site considerations applicable to new facilities for sport and recreation use and open space.**

**Policy to include:**

- **Need for public accessibility, specifically including for non-car users;**
- **Making footpath/cycle links to and from other accessible open spaces;**
- **Avoiding adverse amenity or natural or built environment adverse impacts;**
- **Providing any buildings within or next to/close to the built form of settlements or development boundaries;**
- **Access to facilities by all.**

86. Policy – Avoiding the loss of allotments to other uses.

- Support was expressed for option A but it was difficult to believe there was an over-supply of allotments. There is a need to hold onto all the allotments
- Suggestion for an alternative word for 'better' in the first bullet point to ensure the land is as good as the land lost as well as the size;
- Concerns raised about 'new provision' as it takes years to establish a good allotment;

An amendment was proposed by Councillor Ben Ingham and seconded by Councillor Eleanor Rylance to remove the second bullet point to make it clear that allotments would not be removed and to include appropriate wording to replace 'better' in the first bullet point to ensure the land replaced is as good as the land lost.

The majority of Members were in support of the amendments.

**Members advised that they support officers preferred option to:  
Insert policy that establishes that planning permission for loss of allotments will not be allowed unless:**

- **A development proposal will create a new provision that is equal to or better than that being lost.**

87. Policy – Leisure and recreation developments.

**Members advised that they support officers preferred option to:  
Insert policy that establishes planning considerations in respect of leisure and recreation developments in the countryside.**

**To include:**

- **Expectations of low key and low impact uses;**
- **Expectations of most/all of the development not being buildings;**
- **Any buildings being small scale and sub-servient to the dominant open space uses of the site;**

- **Uses being compatible with countryside activities and settings;**
- **High environmental standards and expectations.**

**Suggestion is, therefore, for a quite restrictive policy approach.**

Chapter 16 – Our Outstanding historic environment.

88. Policy – Historic Environment

- Suggestion to change the wording ‘harm’ in the second paragraph to ‘adverse effect’ to read ‘cause no adverse effect to the historic environment;

**No alternatives were presented for this policy which is required to comply with Government Policy.**

89. Policy – Listed Buildings.

- Suggestion to include a local list of listed buildings; In response the Service Lead – Planning Strategy and Development Management advised this suggestion would be best placed in Policy 88;
- In planning terms there is a need to be mindful about energy efficiency and conservation of buildings. The Service Lead – Planning Strategy and Development Management acknowledged the importance and advised the policy wording would reflect this.

**No alternatives were presented for this policy which is required to comply with Government Policy.**

90. Policy – Conservation Areas.

- Clarification sought about the wording in the second paragraph in particular ‘substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a Conservation Area’. In response the Service Lead – Planning Strategy and Development Management could not give an example of this ever happening in his career and advised the policy reflected Government policy which was required.

**No alternatives were presented for this policy which is required to comply with Government Policy.**

91. Policy – Archaeology and Scheduled Monuments.

**No alternatives were presented for this policy which is required to comply with Government Policy.**

92. Policy – Historic landscapes, parks and gardens.

- Reference to ‘public benefit’ needs to be clearer to avoid harm to listed landscapes in terms of planning applications.

**Members advised that they support officers preferred option that:**

**This policy will require applications to conserve or enhance the special historic interest, character or setting of a park or garden on the Historic England Register of Historic Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England. Where harm to or loss of significance of any heritage asset is proposed, exceptional circumstances must be proven and justified as being in the public benefit. Applications will require a statement explaining the significance of the asset. In some circumstances planning conditions will require further survey, analysis and recording**

Chapter 17 – Ensuring we have community buildings and facilities.

93. Policy – New or extended community facilities

**Members advised that they support officers preferred option to:  
Insert policy that provides for expansion of or new provision of community spaces and buildings.**

**To include:**

- **Provision to be within or adjoining the built up areas or edges of a settlement and where a settlement has a Settlement Boundary to be within, adjacent to or close d well related to this boundary.**
- **Development to serve a local community and proportionate to the needs of that community.**
- **Encouragements (or requirement?) for sharing of facilities?**

94. Policy – Loss of community facilities.

**Members advised that they support officers preferred option to:  
Insert policy that seeks to resist loss of communal facilities unless they are clearly not needed, not used or surplus to requirements.**

Chapter 18 – Implementation and monitoring of the Local Plan

Members were happy to note chapter 18.

Chapter 19 – What happens next?

Members were happy to note chapter 19.

Councillor Jess Bailey highlighted that this section recommended the development of a second new town and raised concerns about the feasibility of the new town and the inconsistencies in the hierarchy of settlements. In response the Chair acknowledged that Members would need to discuss whether they would like a new town and reminded Members of the shortfall of sites proposed.

The Service Lead – Planning Strategy and Development Management advised he was in the process of commissioning consultants to assist with the feasibility of the different new community options and to assist with the infrastructure requirements, costs and constraints. He highlighted that some initial assessment work had already been completed which was provided in the report. In response Councillor Bailey advised that Members could not make a decision about the new town without having seen the feasibility work first. The Chair advised Members that at this early stage they just needed to give officers direction about whether they would like to give more emphasis on tiers 3 and 4 undertaking more development or whether to look towards a new town. Councillor Bailey again raised concerns about the lack of expertise to address the fundamental issues about the feasibility.

The Service Lead – Planning Strategy and Development Management reassured Members that officers were not making recommendations about a new community blindly. He advised that a lot of work had already been done through the GESP process for the new community and its infrastructure requirements. He acknowledged that lessons had been learned from Cranbrook and if Members were to look favourably at a new community models of delivery would be brought to Cabinet to undertake the additional commissioning work. He advised at this stage he was wanting a steer from Members about the new community proposal to factor into the work being done.

## Chapter 2 – Vision and objectives of the plan.

2.3 – Drawing directly from the Council Plan the Local Plan vision

**Members advised that they support officers preferred option:**

**To make a positive difference to residents' lives and our environment in East Devon. With three priorities:**

**Better Homes and Communities – for all with a priority on the importance of good quality, affordable housing suitable in size and location.**

**A Greener East Devon – which priorities issues arising from climate change and supports our natural environment.**

**A Resilient Economy – bringing prosperity to the district.**

2.6 – The objectives for the Local Plan

The Chair asked Members to consider the objectives and, if required, to propose any amendments.

The following objectives were proposed:

- To provide an updated mission statement to lift up and inspire to include the following words 'a balanced and harmonious relationship between people, communities, settlements, the environment and economic prosperity';
- Inclusion of sport and health and wellbeing provision;
- Regional growth;
- Would like to see a reference to supporting sustainable and thriving villages;
- Replace town centres with communities;
- Housing should be included in objective no.5 to increase the vitality of our town centres;
- Would like to see reference to the farming communities and open countryside as there is a lack of attention to our farmers and food production;
- There is a need to protect our Devon County Show as it is important to East Devon and Devon.

An amendment was proposed by Councillor Olly Davey and seconded by Councillor Eleanor Rylance to include a further objective - Supporting sustainable and thriving villages;

The majority of Members were in support of the amendment.

## Chapter 3 – The spatial strategy of the plan.

- The main priority is to consider whether there is going to be a new community;
- Disagreement about the proposed tiers; do not agree with Beer being in tier 4 as it is a coastal town. In response the Service Lead – Planning Strategy and Development Management advised that Members had discussed the settlement hierarchy at two previous meetings and it had fundamentally been agreed with a view to only revisiting it in the future in light of the consultation responses and any new evidence.

In light of the comments the Chair proposed to look at Policy 9. Strategic Policy – Development of a second new town east of Exeter.

The majority of Members were in support of the Chair's proposal.

## Chapter 5 – Future growth and development on the western side of East Devon

#### 9. Strategic Policy – Development of a second new town east of Exeter

- Several Members raised concerns that they were being asked to make a decision on something fundamental to the future of East Devon without having the necessary information including the GESP work, a report on all the different options and a full report about the new community. In response the Chair advised that at this stage officers were only wanting a steer on what Members would like and reassured Members that if it was not viable officers would look at other options;
- Concerns raised about the lack of information for Members to make an informed decision. In response the Chair advised that the initial work undertaken could be found in the GESP documentation and reassured Members that there would be a 10 year lead up time.
- A new community could have implications for our climate emergency strategy and it is essential to get this right so that housing is put where employment is;
- The decision about a new community is fundamental to everything else in the Local Plan and more information is needed to make this decision as the transport infrastructure needs to be considered and the new community would be dependent upon cars and there is no employment opportunities nearby. The Service Lead – Planning Strategy and Development Management accepted that evidence was still being gathered about the infrastructure requirements and reassured Members that lessons had been learned from Cranbrook but emphasised the need to meet the housing needs for the district and reminded Members about the shortfall of housing sites amounting to 900 homes.
- The proposed 2,500 homes is not viable to bring in the required infrastructure;
- Concerns raised about the 10 year lead in period with the potential for houses to be brought in a lot quicker once the land had been allocated. In response the Service Lead – Planning Strategy and Development Management advised that the lead in time for a new community is different as all the issues raised by Members would need to be planned out even before a spade goes into the ground.
- It was highlighted that the provision of a vital relief road for Axminster had been removed from the future Local Plan as it was not deliverable and in clouding this was a means to address the housing shortfall;
- The new community is needed as well as other area to improve and enhance all other sustainable locations;
- There is a mismatch between the call for sites and the hierarchy of settlements

Councillor Jess Bailey proposed the following motion which was seconded by Councillor Philip Skinner:

1. A detailed report be provided to Committee on a new town and the infrastructure provision;
2. If the HELAA has been done then to consider the proposed sites in light of the HELAA;
3. The need for a targeted call for sites to accord with the hierarchy of settlements.

The Service Lead – Planning Strategy and Development Management said he had no expectations for a definitive decision about a new community but was looking for a steer about whether Members were keen for officers to pursue this option. He advised he was happy to bring forward further reports on a new community based on evidence and to provide a timeline and reminded Members of the stark alternative of allocating developments in quite sensitive locations which could equally have impact on infrastructure. He advised there were no easy options.



In response to the motion for a further call for sites he advised that Members would need to go through the options starting on page 21 to come to a conclusion about targeted areas. He further advised that the call for sites was an open invitation and anticipated whether a further targeted call for sites without a materially different scope would bring different sites forward or just a repeat of what had previously been done that involved a huge amount of time and resources assessing the sites and going through the HELAA process.

The Chair sought clarification from the proposer whether they did want to move forward on any of the growth strategy until further information had been provided. Councillor Bailey confirmed she was happy to wait.

Clarification sought about the outcome of the decision to not move forward with any of the growth strategy. The Chair advised he would need a discussion with the Service Lead – Planning Strategy and Development Management but believed it would not be possible to progress further and the meeting would end.

The Chief Executive suggested that the Committee adjourn for lunch to analyse the main proposal emphasising that the implications could result in the delay of the consultation of the Local Plan by a further six months.

The meeting was adjourned at 12.55pm and reconvened at 1.30pm.

The proposer, Councillor Jess Bailey, advised that she did not want to stop the meeting because of the targeted call for sites and questioned why a call for sites would cause a delay of six months if this was done in tandem with other ongoing work. She advised the purpose of the call for sites was to focus on settlements which were reasonably sustainable as the previous call for sites did not match up with the hierarchy settlements. In response the Chief Executive advised as the proposer she had an obligation to the Committee to advise where the targeted call for sites should be as one had already been done.

Councillor Skinner withdrew from being a seconder for Councillor Bailey's motion and proposed that:

1. A detailed report be provided to Committee on a new town and the infrastructure provision;
2. If the HELAA has been done then to consider the proposed sites in light of the HELAA;

Councillor Skinner's motion was seconded by Councillor Ben Ingham.

Members were in support of the proposal with 8 votes in support, no votes against and no abstentions.

### Chapter 3 – The spatial strategy of the plan.

#### 1. Strategic Policy – Settlement hierarchy

- Westclyst is not a separate settlement, it is part of Broadclyst;
- A lot of potential sites in rural communities can make up the shortfall of houses;

- Would like to see some modest development in some of the tier 4 settlements which would no longer be unsustainable once good cycle routes are put in with better public transport;
- Some Members disagreed with the tier 4 settlements;
- Villages such as Awliscombe, Yarcombe and Upton which do have modest services could deliver a small number of houses but are being discounted;
- Concerns raised about the inclusion of Chardstock in tier 4 as it is unsustainable and should be removed. Reference was made to Beer which was also in tier 4 and the difference between them was so vast it makes a mockery of the hierarchy settlement system;
- The only alternative was to consider tier 3;
- It was suggested that tier 4 had been influenced by the number of sites that had come forward;
- There is a need to look at tier 4 again and possibly move some villages into tier 3

In response to the concerns raised by Members the Service Lead – Planning Strategy and Development Officer reminded Members of the methodology used in the production of the settlement hierarchy including the role and function study that was brought to Members on two occasions last year which determined each tier by employment, facilities and services. He referenced Beer as this had been the focus of several Members and advised the reason it was put in tier 4 was not because of the constraints to development at Beer but because it has no strategic level facilities and services such as no train station, no secondary school or hospital. He also advised the Committee that Members had endorsed the findings of the role and function of settlements last year.

Further discussion covered:

- Some villages want a little growth;
- Villages need comfort about small amounts of growth but are unsure how this can be achieved.

**Members advised they preferred option C:**

**Identify a higher number of settlements in Tier Four.**

**Other settlements have fewer jobs and facilities, and accepting the principle of development at these other settlements would not be fully consistent with national policy stating that significant development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes.**

2. Strategic Policy – Overarching strategy for the distribution of development.

- Moderate growth needs to be a percentage so that it is no more than a certain percentage; The Service Lead – Planning Strategy and Development Management advised it could not be a percentage as some settlements would have more constraints than others;
- Do not agree with bullet point 5 as not in favour of limited development under exceptional circumstances;
- Clarification sought about ‘exceptional circumstances’. In response the Service Lead – Planning Strategy and Development Management advised it was a fundamental issue about how to facilitate growth in hamlets and villages when some want a small amount and others do not and that is why the word ‘exceptional’ was included to give opportunity for community led developments;
- Bullet point 3 is unsustainable for Exmouth;
- Suggestion that bullet point 5 should end with ‘as approved in their local plans’;

**Members advised that they support officers preferred option that:**

**This proposed strategic policy will set out an overarching picture of development in East Devon that will establish, over and above existing commitments:**

- **A concentration of new development on the western side of East Devon to include an additional new town (an further new town in addition to Cranbrook);**
- **Major strategic developments close to the city of Exeter;**
- **Moderate levels of development at the principal and main centres of East Devon;**
- **Modest growth at service and local centres; and**
- **Limited development, under exceptional circumstances, in smaller villages, hamlets and the countryside.**

### 3.28 Location-specific options for addressing the current housing gap

- Option E is incorrect as it suggests that land to the east of Axminster should no longer be included in the Local Plan as there is no funding for a relief road. Land to the east of Axminster should be included;
- Support expressed for Option F to avoid jeopardising the Climate Emergency agenda the Council had signed up to;
- The options listed will amount to thousands of houses which is a complete outrage;
- Clarification sought on the number of windfall homes expected annually. The Service Lead – Planning Strategy and Development Management advised it was just under 150 homes per year which equated to 2,968 over a 20 year period;
- There is a need to be less restrictive in the AONB areas;
- In favour of a hybrid approach of options C & G as it was felt the smaller villages and hamlets would be able to take small levels of development over a period of time;
- In favour of a combination of options A, C & G;
- In favour of a combination of A and C to spread growth more evenly across the district;
- There is still a need to consider housing in areas where there are constraints to meet housing demand;
- In favour of a combination of A, C & I to spread development across the entire district;
- Strongly against option A as it mean a lot of houses would be dumped in those areas;

Councillor Kevin Blakey proposed options A (Allocate more of the fair or better performing sites in tier 4 and above), C (Look to villages below tier 4 for growth), G (Search for extra sites) & I (Be less restrictive to development in the AONB's) which was seconded by Councillor Dan Ledger.

The proposed motion fell with 5 votes against, 4 votes in support and no abstentions.

Councillor Ben Ingham proposed options C (Look to villages below tier 4 for growth), G (Search for extra sites) & I (Be less restrictive to development in the AONB's) which was seconded by Councillor Jess Bailey

Members were in support of the proposed motion with 8 votes in support, 1 vote against and 1 abstention.

### 3. Strategic Policy – Housing to address needs

**Members advised that they support officers preferred option that:**

**This proposed strategic policy will express the Council's commitment towards achieving housing mix and high quality homes in East Devon and it will:**

- **Set out the Council's support for delivery of a wide choice of decent, high quality homes in East Devon which meet needs for housing**
- **Emphasise housing's role in creating sustainable, inclusive, mixed communities**
- **Encompass market housing for rent and home ownership**
- **Make clear that a mix of housing sizes, types and tenure appropriate to the area, and supported by local housing evidence, should be provided, to ensure that there is a range of housing, broadening choice and meeting specialist needs**
- **Address categories of need expected in the plan period**
- **Highlight which identified needs the plan focuses on, such as:**
  - **Housing to meet affordable housing needs**
  - **Housing suitable for households with specific needs**
  - **Homes to redress an imbalance in the existing housing stock o Dwellings suited to households with: younger people; working families; and older people who wish to retain independent living**
  - **Plots for custom/self-builders**
  - **Co-housing and communal accommodation**
  - **Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople accommodation**

#### **4. Strategic Policy – Levels of future housing development**

- **There is a need to include rural self-builds in rural exception sites to meet housing requirements;**
- **There is a need to encourage self-builds to introduce some unique properties;**

**Members advised that they support officers preferred option that the:**

**Policy will identify the following for the whole plan area and plan period:**

- **The minimum total net housing provision based on the Local Housing Need Assessment (LHNA) for East Devon [18,360]**
- **The annual provision rates – these may be stepped (i.e. not a flat rate)**
- **The total affordable housing provision and total market housing provision**
- **The proportional mix of types of affordable housing including the proportion of supply from Social Rent, from 'First Homes' and from Affordable Home Ownership**
- **The sources of housing supply to meet provision**
- **The forecast supply (with an illustrated housing trajectory) incorporating a degree of supply flexibility (aiming for 10% above requirement i.e. about 20,200]**
- **The proportion of supply to be met on small sites (sites less than 1Hectare or less than 30 dwellings)**
- **The approach to monitoring development, including demonstration of a 5 year housing land supply**

**Policy should set out the housing provision requirements for designated neighbourhood areas. Otherwise, the local plan's Reasoned Justification will explain why the local plan is not setting out a housing requirement for Neighbourhood Plans.**

**Where it is not possible to provide a requirement figure for a neighbourhood area, the LPA provides an indicative figure, if requested to do so by the neighbourhood planning body**

4. Preferred option for the approach to economic growth

**Members advised that they support officers preferred option that:**

**The suite of plan policies support development consistent with a resilient, inclusive, green economy, delivering growth and prosperity for the benefit of everybody in the District. They are orientated to meeting the needs for growth and change in East Devon and to ensuring the highest quality development outcomes. This preferred option for economic growth reflects the direction of travel towards delivering productivity through clean and inclusive growth promoted by the Heart of the South West Local Industrial Strategy**

5. Strategic Policy – Employment provision and distribution strategy

**No alternatives were presented for this policy which is required to comply with Government Policy.**

6. Strategic Policy – Development inside settlement boundaries.

- Preference for option A;
- Clarification sought on neighbourhood plans and local plans and which takes priority. In response the Service Lead – Planning Strategy and Development Management advised the steer from Members on the spatial strategy for growth would help to begin discussions with neighbourhood planning groups about what they are looking to pursue and potential alignment between emerging neighbourhood plans and the local plan;
- Several Members were not in favour of tight boundaries around settlements as this could potentially leave no land for development.
- The Service Lead – Planning Strategy and Development Management advised that from previous discussions with neighbourhood planning groups they had preferred to remain with tight boundaries but with the possibility of exception sites. He further advised many were nervous about a criteria based approach as it was felt developers would find loopholes to exploit and they were also not keen for a one size fits all category.
- Members noted that the consequences of looser boundaries would make it difficult to protect the character and appearance of areas within those settlements.

**Members advised that they support officers preferred option that the:**

**Proposed policy will explain that Settlement Boundaries will be defined on the policies map around the Tier 1 to 4 settlements and that these boundaries will establish the types and forms of development that will be permitted within them and broad standards and approaches to development (see also separate policy for development outside boundaries).**

**Policy will also explain that a Neighbourhood Plan may specifically allocate sites and/or include criteria based or other policies for promoting development/land uses beyond settlement boundaries. Such ‘outside of boundaries’ policy provision must be justified and be shown to deliver objectives around promoting sustainable development and may supersede relevant constraint considerations set out in this and other local plan policies.**

7. Strategic Policy – Development adjacent to the outside edge of settlement boundaries.

- Support expressed for option B;

- Some Members did not support option A as it did not give a definitive level of growth that would be permitted;
- Support for option A as it had worked before and parish councils understand it;
- The Service Lead – Planning Strategy & Planning Development referred to a topic paper brought to Members last year about settlement boundaries which explained about how the Planning Inspectors were increasingly looking at developments outside the built up area boundary if they considered it sustainable. He explained that a policy that sought to define levels of growth beyond settlement boundaries could help to give clarity on this issue.

**Members advised that they were in support of option C that:**

**We could choose not to have a policy of enabling development on the outside edge of settlement boundaries (except under the ‘Development Outside Settlement Boundaries’ policy). If this approach is taken the settlement boundaries could be drawn more ‘loosely’ to provide development opportunities on smaller sites around the settlement. This would help to provide a supply of smaller sites that would be too small to consider specifically allocating for development. This option is rejected because it does not differentiate between the types of development we want to encourage on the outside edges of settlements.**

8. Policy – Development beyond settlement boundaries.

**Members advised that they support officers preferred option that the:**

**Proposed policy will set out that development beyond Settlement Boundaries will be far more restricted and only permitted where it is in accordance with a specific Local or Neighbourhood Plan policy that explicitly permits such development and where it would not harm the distinctive landscape, amenity and environmental qualities within which it is located. This will be a key strategic policy that seeks to accommodate development with locations that will promote objectives of sustainable development.**

Chapter 4 – How we have assessed the potential suitability of sites for development.

Members were happy to note chapter 4.

### **Attendance List**

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

D Ledger (Chair)

O Davey (Vice-Chair)

P Arnott

J Bailey

K Blakey

S Chamberlain

P Hayward

M Howe

B Ingham

A Moulding

G Pratt

E Rylance

P Skinner

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

M Chapman

P Faithfull  
N Hookway  
V Johns  
G Jung  
R Lawrence  
H Parr  
M Rixson  
J Rowland  
E Wragg

**Officers in attendance (for some or all the meeting)**

Ed Freeman, Service Lead Planning Strategy and Development Management  
Mark Williams, Chief Executive  
Shirley Shaw, Planning Barrister  
Debbie Meakin, Democratic Services Officer  
Nicola Cooper, Solicitor  
Wendy Harris, Democratic Services Officer  
Matthew Dickins, Planning Policy Manager

Chairman .....

Date: .....