

Local Plan Member Working Group – Note of Discussions

Ottery St Mary and surrounds – 9 August 2024

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

Other Attendees: Cllr Peter Faithful, Cllr Richard Jeffries, Cllr Alistair Bruce., David Valentine – Gittisham PC, James Penman - Plymtree PC, Paul Thomas -Payhembury PC, Tim Cox – Payhembury PC, Martin Smith - Feniton PC, Angela Hill – West Hill PC, Richard Grainger – Ottery St Mary TC

Officers – Ed Freeman, Matthew Dickins, Claire Rodway

Apologies – Cllr Paul Arnott

Please note that representative for Gittisham attended this meeting and spoke in respect of sites in Gittisham parish but that abut and have been deemed in local plan work to be ‘at’, potentially performing an urban extension, to Honiton. The Gittisham feedback received has been recorded against the meeting notes for the 2 August meeting that addressed Honiton.

Issues/ Site Ref	Comments	Additional Attendees
Broadhembury		
General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was not any real support for any of the site allocations options. • Highlighted that the roads to the village are very narrow and infrastructure, particularly sewage, is at capacity. • Affordable housing need in the village was noted. But concern that as a small village/parish there was over-development happening and there is not the relevant infrastructure. 	
Brhe_04	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted that this site in the National Landscape area has a current planning application for 4 affordable and 2 market homes. But there were concerns over delivery. 	
Brhe_09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted the site is outside of the National landscape (but adjacent) though also pointed out the site is comparatively large and could accommodate more than 10 new houses. Seen as need to limit development. • Highlighted the site if developed could form a ‘gateway to the village’. 	
Brhe_05 and Brhe_07	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was no support expressed for allocation of development at these sites. They are in a National landscape/AONB 	
Payhembury		
General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Through Neighbourhood Plan work there was no need for further affordable housing (above that being accommodated on Payh_01). Although this was some time ago. • The village is not within a National Landscape/AONB • The village was highlighted as being small – around 165 homes. 	

Issues/ Site Ref	Comments	Additional Attendees
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single track lanes were highlighted as serving the village. It was reported that the school is over-subscribed and other facilities are inadequate and bus service is poor. There was an observation that an above 10% increase in housing numbers in Tier 4 settlements was too high – the onus should be on meeting local needs. 	
Payh_01	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted that 9 new homes are already being accommodated on this site. 	
Payh_02	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> View was this site should not be allocated for development. 	
Payh_03	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advised that there is opposition to development at this site, even if the site's split. The views was that 'organic growth' would be acceptable and 20 dwellings is too high. The were challenges over the acceptability of highway access to the site (though this was more so in respect of village approach roads). There was a concern that existing roads can't cope with current vehicle flows and more development would worsen problems. 	
Plymtree		
General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was a concern that the infrastructure at and serving the village was inadequate. This is not a settlement in a National landscape/AONB Highway capacity and flooding on road (ice in winter) concerns were particularly noted. Highlighted that many roads in and around the village become unpassable – especially given size of modern lorries. Sewage problems in the village were highlighted with waste flowing up drains and on to roads. It was suggested there would be village support for some smaller scale sustainable homes. But there was also challenge over the robustness of the assessment of comparative sustainability of the village. 	
Plym_01	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highlighted that bottom parts of this site flood. 	
Plym_03	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a current planning application on this site. Numbers have reduced from a capacity of mid-40's to 30 to allow heritage mitigation and accommodate a footpath to community facilities It was noted that there have been years of opposition to development of this site. It was advised that the brook to the side of the site floods. Considered that adjoining listed buildings to this site made it very sensitive to development. 	
Plym_05	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was a challenge to how sensitive this site was in heritage terms in comparison to recommended allocation site Plym_03. It was suggested that this site could be a better site to allocate and development could help secure safe pedestrian access to the village hall. It was suggested that 05 assessment was not as robust and consistent with the assessment for site 03. 	
Feniton		

Issues/ Site Ref	Comments	Additional Attendees
General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggested that Feniton has a poor rather than modest range of facilities. • It was advised that Feniton has a poor bus service and it has a 'railway parkway' not a 'railway station' and stopping trains are limited. It was suggested very few residents of Feniton use the station. • The railway crossing next to the station is at a cross-roads, this causes congestion and queuing. • This is not a settlement in a National landscape/AONB • Advised that every development site in Feniton is liable to flood and could adversely impact on problems elsewhere. Noting much of the village sits in a bowl behind the railway embankment. • It was the advised the railway line and station floods. • It was advised that as there is a combined sewer system at the village water runoff causes over-topping of South West Water sewers that comes up into the streets. • It was contested that the 'super-inquiry' concluded Feniton unsustainable for growth (though it was challenging that this was in respect of the proposals then being considered and the scale of development they would account for). • As a challenge to the scale of growth proposed at Feniton there was, however, also challenge that the village should be taking more. It was noted in assessment that many sites performed comparatively well. 	
Feni_01	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was advised this sites generate water run-off. 	
Feni_05	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted that there is a planning application in on this site. But roads leading away from the site were advised to be narrow and there are capacity constraints relevant to the site. • Suggested that of all the promoted sites this would be seen as the most credible. • There was concern around existing sewage capacity around the site (sewage coming up through toilets – with substandard pipe works) that development could worsen. 	
Feni_09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was advised this sites generate water run-off that runs down towards the station. 	
West Hill		
General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was a challenge that West Hill had insufficient facilities to qualify as a tiered settlement (note references to bus stops/service and playing fields). • This is not a settlement in a National landscape/AONB <p>Action: Review facilities in West Hill to assess whether it should fall in the settlement hierarchy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was an acknowledgement from some that West Hill was an appropriate location for some development. • Concerns over some referencing in the report and consistency with others – eg in respect of the way bus stops were reported. • There was also concern over peripheral development at and around West Hill expanding the village outward. 	

Issues/ Site Ref	Comments	Additional Attendees
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was noted that topography, and a concentration of facilities in a single location to the north of the village, makes it a long and difficult walk for many residents. Additional peripheral development will exacerbate this 	
West04, West_06 and West_18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognised that these sites are shown as allocation but there was some opposition to their allocation. 	
Rejected sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was clear opposition to allocation of sites that have been rejected through the assessment process. 	
Tipton St John		
General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was lengthy discussion about the presence of the school in the village, its relevance and potential relocation within the village or wider parish (note that due to flooding concerns it cannot continue to occupy its current site). It was asserted that if Tipton lost its school (noting suggestions at present for relocation to Ottery St Mary) then facilities at the village would fall below thresholds and as such the village should fall out of the Tier 4 classification. As a non-tier 4 village, no further housing should be allocated 	
Otry_04	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site is outside the National Landscape/AONB There was a view that highway access to the site was/would be very poor. There was a call for this site to be allocated for a school and five self build houses. 	
Otry_06	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential scope for modest development suggested for part of this site. Though there were also voices of opposition. This site is within the National Landscape/AONB and is very rural. 	
Otry_22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was a view that this site was a better option than Otry_04 in highway terms. Though there were also voices of opposition to allocation of this site. This site is outside (adjoining) the National Landscape/AONB but higher than, and visible from, it 	
Ottery St Mary		
General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was noted that the colouring on the map was unclear/incorrect and a new map would be produced for SPC Concern that Ottery has seen considerable development in recent years but without additional infrastructure provision. There was a view that the primary school is full and it does not have capacity to grow or expand. A view was that sites should not be allocated until there is sufficient school place provision. 	

Issues/ Site Ref	Comments	Additional Attendees
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was asked (given housing numbers are high) whether Otter St Mary residents were asked about the scale of development proposed at the town (they were not explicitly asked). • Concern that there is insufficient highway capacity to accommodate any new housing, particularly on the north, east and south sides of the town. • Concern that none of the sites can access facilities via continuous, safe pedestrian pavements 	
Otry_15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted that there was no pavement directly serving this small site. 	
Otry_18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was noted that a planning application was refused at this site but it is now at appeal. Devon County Council as highway authority regard development as acceptable (contrary to their previous advice) – but there was challenge to this conclusion as a minimum standard pavement width cannot be achieved. Road access to the site was seen as poor and adjoining roads as dangerous. • It was noted that there were high hedges around the site that did not support development and the site was elevated and of some visual prominence. • Objections to developing on Grade 2 agricultural land, and for landscape impact reasons were maintained 	
Otry_09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site not supported for development through the neighbourhood plan group work. • Site is allocated in the Neighbourhood Plan for community use and in the current local plan safeguarded for school/community use. • Concerns raised in respect of impacts of development at this site included surface water runoff, pedestrian safety, air quality impacts, proximity to a quarry and ancient woodland and visual/landscape impacts. • Concern that a pavement can only be provided on the opposite side of the road at some points, and crossing is dangerous 	
Otry_10 and GH/ED/27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sites not supported for development. Flooding concerns at and associated with the site/s were particularly highlighted. These have resulted, it was said, to increasing flooding at the cricket pitch as well as near by. • It was advised that a safe footpath link cannot be secured to/from these sites – this is especially a concern for school children. • There were level differences highlighted that could leave to overlooking. • Overhead power lines and a footpath bisect the sites • Visual impact concerns from development were highlighted. 	
Otry_21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was noted that this site should have been shown on the map as recommended for allocation for development. • Concerns about this site included visual impacts, high quality agricultural land loss, electric cables crossing the site, AONB intervisibility and poor pedestrian and cycle access. • Concerns that vehicles will have to use existing estate roads and may have to cross a flood plain. 	

Issues/ Site Ref	Comments	Additional Attendees
Otry_01a and b	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site advised to be in a Green Wedge and as such should not be developed. • Otry_01b as a mixed use development would provide the only employment land proposed for the town (on the existing farm buildings) 	
Otry_14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was suggested that this could be a potential housing site if sports pitches were relocated elsewhere – a suggestion for some on land to the west. 	
Otry_19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Previously refused on appeal, single track road, no pavement 	
Rejected sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was clear opposition to allocation of sites that have been rejected through the assessment process. 	