

# **Local Plan Member Working Group – Note of Discussions**

## **Exmouth and surrounds – 26 July 2024**

### **District Councillors:**

Cllr Todd Olive (Working Party Member)

Cllr Mike Howe (Working Party Member)

Cllr Olly Davey (Working Party Member and Exmouth Town)

Cllr Brian Bailey (Working Party Member and Exmouth Littleham)

Cllr Geoff Jung (Woodbury and Lympstone)

Cllr Ben Ingham (Woodbury and Lympstone)

Cllr Charlotte Fitzgerald (Budleigh and Raleigh)

Cllr Melanie Martin (Budleigh and Raleigh)

Cllr Joe Whibley (Exmouth Town)

Cllr Tim Dumper (Exmouth Halsdon)

Cllr Andrew Toye (Exmouth Halsdon)

Cllr Ann Hall (Exmouth Littleham)

Cllr Maddy Chapman (Exmouth Brixington)

Cllr Cherry Nicholas (Exmouth Brixington)

### **Parish Council representatives**

Cllr Ken Perry (Woodbury)

Cllr Derek Wendsley (East Budleigh)

Cllr Richard Witherby (Otterton)

Cllr Chris Pond (Colaton Raleigh)

Cllr Sue Francis (Lympstone Parish)

Lisa Bowman (Exmouth Town Council)

Cllr Mark Hillier (Mayor Budleigh Salterton)

**Officers** – Ed Freeman, Andrew Wood, Matthew Dickins,

**Apologies** – Cllr Paul Arnott, Cllr Dan Ledger

Issues/ Site Ref	Comments	Additional Attendees
<b>East Budleigh</b>		
General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General acceptance for qualified levels of development at the village.</li> </ul>	
Ebud_01	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whilst some previous concerns about the site there was general qualified acceptance/support for development.</li> <li>• Access to the site should be from Frogmore Road.</li> <li>• Significance of nearby listed Syon House noted.</li> <li>• Noted that road junctions (crossroad) in the village saw congestion and was busy – need for pedestrian safety measures in association with development.</li> <li>• Importance of hedgerow frontage of site noted.</li> </ul>	
Ebud_02	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreement with rejection of this site for allocation/development.</li> </ul>	
Ebud_03	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreement with rejection of this site for allocation/development.</li> </ul>	
<b>Otterton</b>		
General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General agreement with officer recommendations.</li> </ul>	
Otto_01	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seen as (larger scale) infilling opportunity in the village.</li> <li>• Water run-off concerns highlighted in respect of the site noting sloping nature and flooding vulnerability of nearby properties.</li> <li>• Sensitivities of the site demand high landscaping in/through development – highlighted that on site hedgerow protection/enhancement would be important.</li> <li>• Heritage importance noted and should be respected in development.</li> <li>• Parking concerns and pressures highlighted in the village, with queries raised around potential for development to help address issues.</li> <li>• Concern over impacts of development at the village crossroads, existing congestion noted (including holiday park traffic).</li> <li>• Need to ensure the site is given the correct reference name.</li> <li>• Highlighted that the site used to be an orchard and suggested that provision/establishment of fruit trees in site development would be appropriate.</li> </ul>	
Otto_02 and Otto_04	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considered that both of these sites could be reasonable options for residential development.</li> <li>• Flooding and floodplain concerns were noted, but not necessarily insurmountable.</li> <li>• Sites are small and suggested that whilst not preferred to allocate for development site could potentially be included inside settlement boundaries – with an onus on prospective applicants undertaking and relevant technical assessment work to support any planning applications they wish to bring forward.</li> </ul>	
Otto_03	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rejection of site as allocation for development noted and agreed with.</li> </ul>	

Issues/ Site Ref	Comments	Additional Attendees
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• However, suggested that the site could potentially support limited frontage development on to Behind Hayes.</li> </ul>	
<b>Budleigh Salterton</b>		
General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recognition of Budleigh Salterton as an appropriate settlement for development.</li> <li>• Case made for the removal of area at/around Marshland Road and Lansdone Road from the settlement boundary – further redevelopment/intensification of development seen as undesirable.</li> <li>• Concern that new development should reach highest green standards.</li> <li>• Budleigh Salterton sewage works considered to be at/beyond full capacity.</li> </ul>	
Budl_01	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreement with (new) recommendation of site being inappropriate for residential development noted (see town council 2023 consultation response).</li> <li>• Longer term, however, suggested site could offer new school potential.</li> </ul>	
Budl_02	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General agreement with support for development of this site.</li> <li>• Highlighted that the road frontage footpath for the site and to the west (fronting Evans Field) should be completed.</li> <li>• Preference for road access to the site to be via the Evans Field site to the west, not from the road to the north.</li> </ul>	
Budl_03	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some suggestions that this site could also be allocated for development.</li> <li>• Noted, however, that the site is of some visual prominence (more so than Budl_02).</li> <li>• Considered that if allocated road access should be via Site Budl_02.</li> </ul>	
Other sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Officer recommendations for rejection for development of other sites for development were agreed with.</li> </ul>	
<b>Exton</b>		
General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recognition for appropriateness for development.</li> <li>• Concerns at high speed traffic through the village main road (but also noted that when congested traffic can flow slowly) speed restrictions favoured and also better footpaths.</li> <li>• Affordable and smaller housing favoured.</li> </ul>	
Wood_01 and Wood_28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites regarded as an appropriate option for allocation for development – next logical sites for Exton future development.</li> <li>• Mill Lane highlighted as vulnerable to flooding – though noted that flooding works currently underway.</li> <li>• Noted that both sites are in the Coastal Preservation Area, though visual connectivity with the Sea/estuary questioned.</li> <li>• Suggested that vehicle access for Wood_01 should be through site Wood_28 (not from the main road).</li> </ul>	
Wood_41	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreed that this site should not be allocated for development.</li> </ul>	

Issues/ Site Ref	Comments	Additional Attendees
<b>Woodbury</b>		
Wood_06 and Wood_08	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seen as reasonable sites for allocation for development, but community benefits felt to be needed from any development.</li> </ul>	
Wood_09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site reasonably well favoured for development by community (some opposition, mostly support - specifically so in respect of current planning application for the site).</li> <li>• Positive discussions held with applicant (through noted that all that has been suggested could be secured through legal agreements).</li> <li>• Development could open up public access creating open space close to the village core.</li> <li>• Development should be sensitive to heritage settings and assets.</li> </ul>	
Wood_10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strongly expressed opposition to development at this site.</li> <li>• Concerns about secure safe highway access from the village road to the west into the site.</li> <li>• Vehicle access over a bridge to the site, with dangerous dual pedestrian use was criticised.</li> <li>• Poor and unsafe pedestrian access criticised.</li> <li>• Questioned whether access could be achieved via Beeches Close.</li> <li>• Concerns over flooding raised in comment –</li> </ul> <p><b>Action – Speak to DCC about highway access concerns.</b></p>	
Wood_16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considered to be a reasonable allocation for development.</li> <li>• Though concern over lack of community benefits in respect of current development proposals and also in respect to road access.</li> <li>• The frontage road to the site was noted as being busy with parking congestion noted.</li> </ul>	
Wood_20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allocation not supported with concerns raised around highway access.</li> </ul>	
Wood_24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted that there was some past community support for this site, though also that it is quite divorced from the settlement.</li> </ul>	
GH/ED/72	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggestion that this site in Woodbury parish, close to Lympstone village – could be a credible ‘Woodbury’ development option.</li> </ul>	
<b>Lympstone</b>		
General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted that GH/ED71 and 72 are in Woodbury parish.</li> <li>• There was observation expressing objection to development along Exeter Road (specifically applies to GH/ED/71).</li> </ul>	
GH/ED/71	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rejection of this site as an allocation gained support. It was highlighted that it forms a very attractive, highly visually open, non-development gateway into the village.</li> <li>• The site forms an ancient pasture are with historic estate, behind attractive wall, to the west.</li> </ul>	
GH/ED/72	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whilst representative at/from Lympstone settlement/parish rejected this site for development there were comments in support of development.</li> <li>• Highlighted the site lack community support as an option for development.</li> </ul>	

Issues/ Site Ref	Comments	Additional Attendees
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The question was raised – why if GH/ED/73 was acceptable why not GH/ED/72?</li> <li>There was also an observation that if housing as to be provided this site is better than development in the south of the parish along Courtlands Road.</li> </ul>	
GH/ED/73	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It was highlighted that GH/ED/73 was far less visually prominent than GH/ED/72.</li> <li>The site was seen as a long-standing future credible option for Lympstone expansion.</li> <li>Concern expressed about acceptability of highway access from the site onto Strawberry Hill.</li> <li>Noted that there was a planning application in on this site.</li> <li>Care would be needed over nature/type of housing coming forward with affordable being ‘pepper-potted’ through the scheme.</li> </ul>	
GH/ED/74 and GH/ED/75	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It was agreed that these sites should be rejected as options for development.</li> <li>Adverse visual impacts would result from development.</li> </ul>	
Lymp_01	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted that the site has a planning application in for 2 homes.</li> <li>Concern over adverse visual impact and extra traffic impacts on the village.</li> <li>But also view that the site was a reasonable development option – noting proximity to village facilities but also that some demolition would be required.</li> </ul>	
Lymp_02, Lymp_03 and Lymp_04	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rejection support – flooding concerns highlighted.</li> </ul>	
Lymp_11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed site should not be allocated – regarded as unacceptable.</li> </ul>	
<b>Exmouth</b>		
General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There was a challenge to the principle for (larger scale) development at Exmouth. This was based on concerns that almost all sites under consideration are on the edge of the town and are some distance from services and facilities available in the town centre. This undermines the conclusion in the plan that Exmouth is the most sustainable settlement. New development can be delivered closer to services and facilities elsewhere.</li> </ul>	
<b>Sites at/to the north-western of Exmouth</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There was general concern, though not universal opposition, to development on the northern side of Exmouth.</li> </ul>		
Lymp_05 and Lymp_06	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with recommendation to not allocate.</li> </ul>	
Lymp_07	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strong opposition to recommendation allocation of this site.</li> <li>Advised of community opposition to development of this site including from a local business.</li> <li>Site reported to be highly visible with lots of public access/footpaths through the site including East Devon way.</li> </ul>	

Issues/ Site Ref	Comments	Additional Attendees
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site falls in the area shown as Green Wedge.</li> <li>• Concern of impacts on Listed buildings and wall that are close to the site (comments also apply to Exmo_11/ Exmo_23).</li> <li>• Concern that site development would be isolated from other built-up areas.</li> <li>• Pointed out (in its favour) that the site is on a good bus route and close to cycle routes so good in sustainable travel terms and close to good road links.</li> <li>• Drainage concerns at the site were reported to not be serious.</li> <li>• Concern that development would add to congestion (also applies to/in conjunction with possible development of Lymp_12).</li> <li>• As a point of accuracy wording in officer report needs checking/amending in respect of recommendation to allocate (should do rather than do not allocate).</li> </ul>	
Lymp_08	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considered that site should not be allocated. In the Green Wedge and seen as isolated from other development.</li> <li>• Dinan Way extension/development could impact on the site (reported that road works could start soon).</li> </ul>	
Lymp_12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General agreement to rejection as option for development – though noted that Dinan Way extension would go through the site.</li> </ul>	
Exmo_11/ Exmo_23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site seen as isolated and reported to be in the Green Wedge – opposition to allocation for development.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Sites to the north of Exmouth/around Hulham Road</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was strong opposition expressed to development at and around this area. Based on opposition to development in this area it was queried what a favoured alternative for development would be – strong support for large scale development at Exmo_20a was expressed as a better option.</li> </ul>		
Lymp_13, Lymp_17 and Exmo_4b	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These sites were shown as rejected choices as allocations for development. There was strong opposition to development in this general part of Exmouth so implying agreement to oppose allocation for development.</li> </ul>	
Lymp_09, Lymp_10a, Lmp_14 and Exmo_4b	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These sites are taken together as they were collectively proposed for allocation for development in the draft plan, noting that there are also separate/additional submissions sites that overlap these in part/full).</li> <li>• This collection of sites were strongly opposed as allocations for development.</li> <li>• It was suggested that rather than be built on the sites should make a valuable Green Infrastructure contribution and recreation area. Significant flooding concerns were expressed at and for the sites – with run off onto Hulham Road.</li> <li>• Sites were regarded as remote from built-up areas of Exmouth and remote from services and facilities (doctors, schools, etc).</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Sites on the western side of Exmouth</b></p>		
Exmo_06	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted that this site has a resolution to grant planning permission. No substantive opposition to development expressed.</li> </ul>	

Issues/ Site Ref	Comments	Additional Attendees
Exmo_08 and Exmo_16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There was some opposition to allocation of these sites (more so Exmo_16) – it was highlighted that Exmo_16 would have road access from the north with expectation of this linking through to Exmo_08.</li> </ul>	
Exmo_07	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rejection for allocation was supported.</li> </ul>	
Exmo_09, Exmo_15 and Exmo_17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It should be noted that Exmo_17 is a large site, Exmo_09 falls within a northern third of it and Exmo_15 is a very small site in part of its north-west.</li> <li>There were varied responses in respect of suitability for the overall larger site (in the National Landscape - AONB) of Exmo_17 for development.</li> <li>Concerns expressed around visual intrusiveness and landscape impacts (suggested could form a precedence for additional development in the National Landscape).</li> <li>Importance of trees and hedgerows on an undulating site area were highlighted.</li> <li>In contrast, however, it was noted that the site is close to many facilities and has a cycle path running through (this should be under passed for road traffic).</li> <li>Suggestion that a new road through this site could provide for holiday traffic through route.</li> <li>Highlighted that there have been calls for cemetery expansion on to land in the south of this site.</li> </ul>	
Exmo_16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some support for development at this site.</li> </ul>	
Exmo_20a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This site was not debated at length but there was clear support for this site as a better development option for development than some sites recommended for allocation.</li> <li>It was highlighted that major development, a large site, offered scope to secure community facilities and benefits in association with development, whereas (the concern was expressed) smaller sites do not offer this potential.</li> <li>Heritage sensitivities at this site, specifically church/buildings at St John in the Wilderness, were noted.</li> </ul> <p><b>Action: Whilst this site was rejected in officer assessment, based on lack of currently being promoted by/on behalf of land owners for development, officers are reviewing this site option again.</b></p>	
Exmo_24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rejection of this site as an allocation for development was supported – adverse traffic impacts were noted.</li> </ul>	
<b>Sites in the built up parts of Exmouth and south of Exmouth</b>		
Rejected 'blue shaded sites'	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It was noted that a large number of sites failed site sifting and these were rejected as potential allocations – agreed they should not be allocated. Exmo_03 was also rejected on account of/through site assessment work.</li> </ul>	
Exmo_50	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree this site, the police station, provided a good redevelopment opportunity and hence allocation.</li> <li>Suggested the site could accommodate greater numbers (e.g. through a flat development) and there were calls for affordable housing provision.</li> </ul>	