

Local Plan Member Working Group – Note of Discussions

Sidmouth area and Newton Poppleford and Harpford – 14th June 2024

Working Party Attendees – Cllr Mike Howe, Cllr Brian Bailey, Cllr Dan Ledger, Cllr Todd Olive

Apologies – Cllr Paul Arnott, Cllr Olly Davey, Cllr Jess Bailey

Site Ref	Comments	Additional Attendees
Sidm_34	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focused on Sidm_34a as the most appropriate part for development as concerns about overall scale. • Concerns about closure of gap and loss of separation between Sidford and Sidbury particularly if all developed. • Concerns about access arrangements as roads leading into the site particularly the end of Furzehill are very narrow. • The site would need to secure the multi-use trail proposed by DCC which is proposed to aid walking and cycling through this area. • Questioned whether it was appropriate to include any employment uses on this site. 	<p>Cllr Mike Goodman, Cllr Stuart Hughes, Cllr Ian Barlow, Cllr John Loudon, Cllr Marianne Rixson</p> <p>Kelvin Dent – Sidmouth TC</p>
Sidm_06	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is too hilly and prominent • Concerns it would open up pressure to release other land in the future to the north • Concerns about flooding. • Reduction of the Green wedge particularly in combination with other land proposed to come forward nearby. 	

Sidm_29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is it realistic to think this will come forward given that previously allocated employment site to the south has not been delivered? • Concerns about urban creep leading to joining of Sidford and Sidbury particularly cumulative impact with other sites. • Concerns about flooding particularly the junction between Sidm_29 and Sidm_06. • Would need to deliver the multi-use trail. • Viability challenges given lack of interest in allocated employment land to the south albeit concerns that values sought by developer are unrealistic. 	
Sidm_32	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site 32b has been looked at as a potential park and change and would not want to lose this option. • Is there potential to include 32b as woodland is not of good quality. • Generally accepted as a development site. 	
Sidm_31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although not liked as a site for development it is accepted that it makes some sense as squaring off the built edge. • Some concerns about access and how this would be achieved. • General acceptance of this site. 	

<p>Newt_04 and Newt_05</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was noted that the owner of Newt_05 is understood to own an adjacent bungalow with access to footpath 1. This would overcome concerns about access to services and facilities at the centre of the village which arise from the pinch point by the Old Toll House on Exeter Road. • It was considered that there was support for some growth in the village and if access could be overcome as well as other issues with this site such as surface water run off then it would have support. • The primary school was expecting to have capacity in the future. 	<p>Cllr Chris Burhop, Susan Tribble – Newton Poppleford and Harpford PC</p>
<p>Newt_07 and Newto_09</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns about the access arrangements to these sites were noted and agreed with but it was questioned whether access could be obtained from Lark Rise thereby avoiding the narrow lanes. • It was noted that the southern part of the sites is flood zone 2/3 but questioned whether land on the corner of Back Lane and Burrow Lane could come forward if accessed via Lark Rise 	