

Appendix – Notes of Working Party Meeting

Local Plan Member Working Group – Note of Discussions

Axminster and surrounds – 12 July 2024

Working Party/Cllr Attendees – Cllr Mike Howe, Cllr Paul Haywood, Cllr Todd Olive, Cllr Sarah Jackson, Cllr Jess Bailey (part of meeting), Cllr Iain Chubb, Cllr Duncan Mackinder.

Officers - Matthew Dickins, Angela King, Sam Luk

Apologies – Cllr Paul Arnott

Issues/Site Ref	Comments	Additional Attendees
Chardstock		
General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mixed views about reasonable scale of development at the village – though degree of consensus that some development would be acceptable. Preference for development that would see affordable and family homes, seen as needed to sustain the village. Eco-friendly development supported and strong opposition to street lighting. A concern expressed, however, that Chardstock should not be in Tier 4, quality/accessibility of bus service challenged. 	Cllr Ian Keam (Chardstock PC)
Char_01	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landscape impacts concerns from development noted. 	
Char_03	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rejected status noted, potential for adverse heritage impacts from development noted and also loss of existing employment uses. 	
Char_04	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Western part of site, Char_04a, considered credible site for allocation. More work needed on potential development extent and housing numbers. South-eastern part Char_04b opposed, adverse landscape impacts highlighted. 	
Hawkchurch		
General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Status of the village as a Tier 4 settlement challenged. Lack of bus service specifically highlighted as concern (only 1 bus per week) – absence suggested means village should not be considered sustainable for development. Highlights that roads in and around the village are narrow with existing parking problems, and some subject to flooding. Concern that extra development would worsen congestion and pressure on narrow roads. View expressed that many existing new homes are 2nd homes/holiday lets. Highlighted that the school attracts pupils from outside of the village. Suggestion that there could be more support for a neighbourhood plan bringing forward a number of small allocations/sites rather than there being a larger local plan allocation. 	Cllr Ann Nolan (Hawkchurch PC Chair)
Hawk_01	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern that development of Hawk_01 would be too large for the village/out of proportion with existing small village size. Concern that development of the site would result in closure (loss to development) of the community run shop. Highlighted that shop loss could exclude village from meeting Tier 4 status. 	

Issues/Site Ref	Comments	Additional Attendees
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Smaller levels of development at this site suggested as being likely to generate more public support. 	
Hawk_02	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site Hawk_02 did not receive public support. 	
Musbury		
General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted that the village has a good range of facilities and services. Land to the west of the village was identified as susceptible to flooding. Pedestrian routes through the village noted as being of variable quality with many parked vehicles causing problems for pedestrian access (but also slowing speeding vehicles). Suggested that Musbury could be a village that could potentially take more development. 	
Musb_01	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of site Musb_01 generally supported. This included Musb_01a and also potentially (the rejected) Musb_01b. 	
Musb_03	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site Musb_03 was seen as comparatively remote from the village. 	
Musb_04	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site Musb_04 received little direct comment. 	
Musb_05	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Musb_05 suggested as a site that possibly could be credible for some development. 	
Kilmingtion		
General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted that the village has a good range of services though these are concentrated on the eastern edge of the village. Few roads in the village were seen as great for pedestrian use/access, being narrow, winding and dating from the 1800s – through ‘rat-runs’ are limited. The Neighbourhood Plan stressed importance of safe pedestrian access. Suggested that lesser adverse traffic problems from development might arise from sites/locations accessed from the larger Shute Road and Whitford Road (rather than from narrower lanes) / sites by the A35, as proposed by Officers. There was no disagreement with the officer technical site assessment work. Concern that all allocated houses should not be built timewise together, the view being the village from a community coherence perspective would not sustain this, rather a trickling through of future development would be favoured. Suggested that Neighbourhood Plan allocated sites should have their own colour notation on the maps. Welcomed that the work had taken account of and was supporting the proposals and aspirations of the ‘made’ neighbourhood plan 	Cllr Peter Ball (Kilmingtion PC Chair)
Sites Kilm_03 and Kilm_06	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sites Kilm_03 and Kilm_06 were identified, if developed, as likely to generate traffic problems on narrow roads (it’s assumed same comment could apply to some other sites as well). 	
Kilm_09 (a and b) and Kilm_10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At sites Kilm_09 (a and b) and Kilm_10 development was supported, noting part of Kilm_09 is a neighbourhood plan allocation. George Lane and specifically access thereafter to the A35 was considered to be very poor and unsafe. Suggestion that it may be desirable for these sites to be directly accessed off the A35 - but would need National Highways approval. Extent of allocation of Kilm_10 should be adjusted, avoiding pub car park, thereby not prejudicing intensified future pub use. Also 	

Issues/Site Ref	Comments	Additional Attendees
	retaining the car park would lessen potential for adverse heritage impacts from development.	
Kilm_11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted the site is a Neighbourhood Plan allocated site. 	
Kilm_12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted that trees had been felled on this site and there is a legal need in coming years for review of any regrowth. No support expressed for development of this site. 	
Other Kilmington sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other sites in the village were very briefly touched on or not commented on. None were suggestions as good allocations for development. 	
Axminster		
General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was a recognition of appropriateness for growth at the town. However, there were strongly expressed concerns around the overall scale/amount of development at the town being proposed. Suggestion that the need for a Place Making Board to be established, similar to in place for Exmouth, be investigated / links made with the Axe Valley Renewal Forum economic development work??. Concern about infrastructure capacity at the town and ability to cope with scales of projected future growth. Highlighted that new infrastructure should match housing development, but real concerns that it would not. Suggestion that lower build rates would be appropriate for the town. Highway capacity concerns and extra traffic impacts associated with extra development were seen as particularly worrying. Relief road was discussed and there remain calls for road improvements in the town. It was suggested that there is a need for substantive transport evidence collecting and analysis and this should inform allocations choices and mitigation/future transport projects. Highlighted that Devon County Council were disposing of land in their ownership at Stony Lane which could be used to accommodate an 'inner relief road' and highway improvements. It was agreed that this matter needs investigation. Suggestion that minor transport changes, e.g. in respect of bus stop locations, could lead to notable transport/vehicle flow benefits. Concern that development of sites on the eastern side of the town could lead to flooding problems downstream. Highlighted that east/west running streams and adjoining land should be protected as green land for wildlife importance, noting current existing value. Sites / expansion to the south generally seen as more favourable/acceptable. Noted 'blue site' to the north (GH/ED/83) now been consented for 100+ homes Suggestion that any site that might be built on the past proposed alignment of the relief road should incorporate road works that at a later date could become part of a future relief road. However concerns that any such roads would not be of relief road standard. 	Cllr Bernie Steadman (Axminster TC)
GH/ED/79 (and Axmi_22) and GH/ED/80a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted that GH/ED/79 (and Axmi_22) should have been shown coloured in green not blue on the map as in officer reporting they are favoured for development. Noted that road access to GH/ED/80a would be expected to come through GH/ED/79. There were particular concerns around the traffic flows and congestion impacts that development of these sites may generate 	

Issues/Site Ref	Comments	Additional Attendees
	(re. access off Lyme Road in particular), as well as topography/flooding concerns—as such there was opposition to development expressed.	
Axmi_02, Axmi_08 and Axm_09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Axmi_02, Axmi_08 and Axmi_09 - These sites, on the southern side of the town, were considered more credible development options in comparison with sites to the east of the town. • Possible flooding concerns were however noted as were heritage constraints. 	
Axmi_07	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Axmi_07 was favoured as a (re)development site noting the existing employment use with vacant space at present, road access problems and potential for more productive mixed use redevelopment. 	
Axmi_17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At Axmi_17 it was highlighted that there was scope for a more comprehensive development scheme at and around this site, potentially using existing allotments (need for relocation/alternative provision noted) and incorporating garage block and community centre building (with new community provision suggested). 	