

Local Plan Member Working Group – Note of Discussions

Honiton and surrounds – 2 August 2024

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

Other Attendees – Cllr Colin Brown, Cllr Jenny Brown, Serena Sexton (Honiton TC), Paul Kendall (Upottery TC), Cllr Yehudi Levine, Cllr Roy Collins, John Sipple (Dunkeswell PC), Jill Wardle (Combe Raleigh PC).

Officers – Ed Freeman, Matthew Dickins, Sam Luk

Apologies – Cllr Paul Arnott

Issues/ Site Ref	Comments	Additional Attendees
Dunkeswell		
General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern was raised that Dunkeswell should not be categorised as a service village – highlighted the village did not have a pub or school and the road to the village was narrow and twisty (but it was pointed out that there was a range of other facilities). Noted that local plan work had set out a spatial strategy for development. 	
Dunk_01	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted that grounds for objection included landscape, heritage and ecology reasons. 	
Dunk_02	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advised that the site accommodated the football club and air ambulance (though questioned how much of the site these uses used). There was no positive reference to the potential for this site to be allocated for development. 	
Dunk_04	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highlighted that part of this site was occupied by existing bungalows. In this context a housing needs survey had advised 12 affordable houses were needed with 12 having been built. 	
Dun_05	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern was raised about the acceptability of securing a highway access into this site and highway access more generally (though noted that Devon County Council as highway authority had not raised objections). Considered that there would need to be the loss of one or more trees to secure highway access. Highlighted that there was no public footpath from the site and into the village (it was contested that land owners would not allow footpaths through adjoining developed areas which would otherwise avoid using the road). Concerns were raised about flooding and water run-off issues at the site. 	
Upottery		
<p>Upottery failed in the tests to be classified as service village in the settlement hierarchy assessment work. The villages lacked the requisite number of facilities identified as required. However, there was a request from Upottery Parish Council to attend the meeting to present a case for the suitability of the village to accommodate a development allocation in the local plan.</p>		

Issues/ Site Ref	Comments	Additional Attendees
General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was contested that as Upottery had a good range of facilities, close to those required to fall in the hierarchy, it should be elevated to status of a service village. It was highlighted that the pub also serves as a shop. It was also highlighted that residents access services and facilities in nearby settlements. It was highlighted that the Neighbourhood Plan group had supported modest development in the village (it was noted that there is nit a Neighbourhood plan for the village but one could be produced with the option to seek to make land allocations for development). <p>Action: Officers to review classification of Upottery in the settlement hierarchy</p>	
Upot_01	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was support expressed for development of land on the eastern edge of the village to accommodate around 20 houses. Development was suggested as offering scope to improve highway safety issues. 	
Honiton		
<p>It should be noted that there are a number if sites on the eastern side of Honiton (deemed to be ‘at’ Honiton in respect of local plan making work) that fall in Gittisham Parish. Representatives of Gittisham parish attended the working party meeting held on 9th August 2024. However, for ease of referencing their comments, and reading them alongside Honiton representative comments, they are included in this report. It should be noted that issues surrounding potential for further development elsewhere in Gittisham parish were not raised at the meeting.</p>		
General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was concern raised in respect of facilities serving the town, sports facilities highlighted, though also some recognition for appropriateness of further development. 	
Sites on the western side of the town - general	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Representatives from Honiton town were broadly comfortable with development on the western side of the town. Representatives from Giitisham, however, raised concerns, including potential for encroachment on and towards Gittisham village. 	
Gitti_03 and Gitti_04	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highlighted that these employment sites had been allocated in the existing local plan and had not been developed. It was noted that infrastructure costs for the sites would be very high and there was lack of viability evidence to show deliverability (it was highlighted that work is ongoing looking into viability considerations – it was questioned if some residential development on this land could be appropriate). Surprise was expressed around reference for potential new railway station in the assessment notes. Suggested that 15 hectares of new employment land is not needed. 	
Gitti_05b	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highlighted that part of the site is in the East Devon National Landscape (need to demonstrate development is in the public interest). 	
Honi_15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted that this site was on rising ground with landscapes impact concerns noted. 	
Honi_04	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted this site was not recommended for allocation. It was highlighted that it is elevated and of landscape prominence. 	

Issues/ Site Ref	Comments	Additional Attendees
Honi_05	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was comment in favour of development at this site though flooding concerns were highlighted. It was noted that the site will fall in development boundaries and could come forward through a windfall application. 	
Honi_06	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allocation of this site for development found favour though it was noted that there were Tree Preservation Orders on trees at the site and also it was queried whether there could be further need for school land at this site from the adjoining existing school use. <p>Action: check with Devon County Council over school needs – response: in recent correspondence with Devon County Council we have received feedback in respect of school capacity considerations given the scales of development set out in draft local plan proposals. For Honiton town the feedback advises: “There are trends of migration from the town into the surrounding rural locations to access primary provision and minimal housing development proposed for these locations. With this taken into consideration, there are no concerns about primary capacity in Honiton and the proposed level of development for the town. Honiton primary school has been expanded to 630 places but is currently operating at 420 places due to low intake.”</p>	
Honi_07	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seen as a credible development site. 	
Honi_08	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree to not allocate – noted forms part of/adjoins the Glen. 	
Honi_12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree to not allocate. Noted that site sits on rising and elevated land. 	
Honi_13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was highlighted that this site has an existing planning permission – but this was understood to be for limited development/part of the site. <p>Action: Check whether the permission may prejudice making an allocation for development.</p>	
Honi_09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree not to allocate. Flooding concerns highlighted. 	
Honi_10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site falls north of the exiting Taylor Whimpey. Concerns were raised around highway access matters and traffic impacts on the land to the north of the site. Review of an existing planning application at the site showed, however, highway access coming through the development site to the south. Noise impact concerns were also raised given proximity to the A30 road. Noted however, that the Environmental Health section at the Council had not objected to the current planning application. 	
Honi_14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern was raised that the site was accessed under a narrow railway bridge and that a past planning application had been refused. There was a general concern that highway access was sub-standard and also that development would see built expansion of Honiton extending onto the surrounding countryside. 	
GH/ED/39a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site, north of the railway line, was noted as having a resolution to grant planning permission for residential development on it. 	
GH/ED/39b	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For this site, south of the railway line, there was opposition to development. 	