

# Appendix A – Working Party meeting notes

## Local Plan Member Working Group – Note of Discussions

### West End and surrounds – 16 August 2024

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

Other attendees – Cllr Paula Fernley

John senser - Clyst St Mary, Cllr Rob Hatton – Bishops Clyst PC, Cllr Jo Yarwood, - Whimple PC, Angie Hurren – Clerk to Broadclyst PC,

Officers – Ed Freeman, Matthew Dickins, Angela King, James Coles, Sam Luc, Ryan Oliver, Keith Lane

Apologies – Cllr Paul Arnott

Issues/ Site Ref	Comments	Additional Attendees
<b>Broadclyst village</b>		
General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• It was noted that just the south-west field of Site Brcl_12 was proposed to be allocated – maps need adjusting (though see site specific comments below).</li><li>• There was qualified support expressed for development but concern that if inappropriate then Broadclyst would increasingly become a dormitory settlement. Highlighted that the village needs employment opportunities and sites.</li><li>• Noted that better facilities could be secured through/associated with development, though good facilities generally noted do exist in Broadclyst – but noted the Parish Council want an office in the parish and there is other unmet demand.</li></ul>	
Brcl_09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Noted site is allocated in the Neighbourhood Plan.</li></ul>	
Brcl_12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Support indicted for development but suggested could be larger than officer recommendation and that it should include an element/requirement for employment development as well – esp. SMEs and B1 and B2 uses.</li><li>• Though was highlighted if all of Brcl_12 was developed it would be a very large scale development.</li></ul>	

Issues/ Site Ref	Comments	Additional Attendees
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Care over site development needed in respect to where road access is secured, noting site height/level concerns, and pedestrian safety considerations.</li> </ul>	
Other sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No challenges to officer recommendations noted.</li> </ul>	
<b>Broadclyst Brcl_31 – next to M5</b>		
General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There was little expression of enthusiasm, and much criticism, for potential development of this site.</li> <li>Possible Langaton Lane vehicle access not seen as acceptable (but noted this was not being proposed).</li> <li>Noted a general aspiration to keep increases in A138 traffic to minimal levels, development could comprise this wish.</li> <li>If developed there would be a significant call on infrastructure and facility needs.</li> <li>Site seen as urban sprawl to Exeter with limited redeeming qualities as a development option.</li> </ul>	
<b>Land at Westclyst</b>		
General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scale of recent growth in this area noted.</li> </ul>	
Polt_07	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted that heritage sensitivities are significant, but also question to what extent they remain given the fire at Poltimore House.</li> <li>Suggested that site development could assist with enhancement at Poltimore, the grounds and Clyst Valley Regional Park delivery.</li> <li>Suggested adverse landscape impacts have already arisen from recent development and have compromised undeveloped ridgeline concerns.</li> <li>In comparison with Brcl_31 this was, however, suggested as potentially a better site allocation option.</li> </ul>	
Brcl_04	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Flooding concerns noted at site that would significantly limit residential development potential.</li> <li>Noise concerns highlighted at the site, proximity to M5.</li> <li>In response to a query, suggesting possible employment uses, noted that the site has not been promoted for employment uses.</li> </ul>	
<b>Lodge Trading Estate – Brcl_27</b>		
General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In the Neighbourhood Plan work there as a rejection of this site for residential allocation.</li> <li>The railway road crossing and bend in the road were noted as significant concerns, but also noted that existing businesses, with large vehicles, already traded from the site.</li> <li>Flooding noted as a major development constraint.</li> <li>Cycle and pedestrian safety concerns noted on nearby roads.</li> </ul>	
<b>Brcl_26 - Proposed Gypsy site – east of M5</b>		
General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There was a challenge over acceptability for gypsy use noting proximity to motorway and noise concerns, especially given insulation standards of caravans. Past history of concerns over housing development in locality highlighted.</li> </ul>	

Issues/ Site Ref	Comments	Additional Attendees
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desire expressed for any development of the site to facilitate a pedestrian link through it.</li> <li>• Langaton Lane noted as a green lane with highway constraint issues. Highlighted that road access would be from the south.</li> <li>• It was stressed that there is a need for gypsy site provision and that the site has decent accessibility to services and facilities and good road access to the south.</li> <li>• The site would be a permanent not traveller's site.</li> <li>• Flooding concerns were highlighted in respect of parts of the site and access road.</li> </ul>	
<b>Brcl_23 – Land north of Science Park</b>		
General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seen a s good site to allocate with support for mixed housing and employment uses.</li> <li>• Site see to offer good scope for provision of new jobs close to housing development.</li> </ul>	
<b>Polt_04 and 06 – alongside the M5</b>		
General comments	<p>Comments for the two sites combined were made within the context of proposals for a new motorway service station.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted that draft Exeter local plan refers to possible closure of the existing service station, scope for its site redevelopment and potential provision elsewhere (location not referenced).</li> <li>• There was no expression of support for development of a new service station at this location, though it was noted that the existing services are poorly located.</li> <li>• Highlighted that the site is high quality farmland.</li> </ul>	
<b>Clho_09 - Proposed employment land north of Exeter Airport</b>		
General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggested that (contrary to officer recommendation) the site could form a reasonable site to allocate – especially if other recommended or assessed employment sites are not taken forward as allocations.</li> <li>• Access concerns were noted, with no current road access. However, suggested access could be secured through Treasbeare, Cranbrook development when it is being/has been built.</li> <li>• Highlighted that there would likely be noise considerations associated with the site and any development.</li> </ul>	
<b>Proposed employment land east of Exeter Airport</b>		
General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General consensus that these sites specifically - GH/ED/44, GH/ED/43, GH/ED/45, Rock_09a and Farr_01 were good choices for allocation for development.</li> </ul>	
Rock_09b	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted not recommended for an allocation.</li> </ul>	
<b>GH/ED/66 - Proposed employment land north of Sowton village</b>		
General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was no enthusiasm expressed for the allocation of this land for development.</li> <li>• It was highlighted as open very attractive land.</li> </ul>	

Issues/ Site Ref	Comments	Additional Attendees
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It was considered that a new bridge across the A30 would be needed. Linking to the Science Park, in order to secure sustainable high-quality development.</li> <li>It was reported that there is strong local opposition to the prospect of development. It was advised that Sowton village (to the south) was of heritage importance and was a small tranquil village and development would have significant adverse impacts.</li> </ul>	
<b>Clyst St Mary – sites at and around the village</b>		
General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It was reported that there was a local aspiration for the village to be 'taken-out' of the local plan and instead for proposal for development and allocations for development to be taken forward and provided for through the Neighbourhood Plan.</li> <li>It was reported that the Neighbourhood Plan proposals would promote positive outcomes for the village and accommodate more housing than recommended site allocations in the local plan assessment work.</li> <li>It was noted that the Neighbourhood Plan (draft at consultation at the time of the meeting) favours allocation of sites Sowt_03 and Sowt_11 where as the local plan recommends allocation of Sowt_03 and Sowt_09.</li> <li>It was highlighted that Neighbourhood Plan proposed allocations would allow for and require a link road from Bishops Court Road to a new junction on to the A3052. This would allow for closure or downgrading of existing busy road through the village.</li> <li>It was reported that Devon County Council had expressed concerns about a possible link road in respect of increasing traffic flows on Bishops Court Road – but this suggestion was challenged as was any notion that this is currently a quiet little trafficked road.</li> </ul>	
Sowt_09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There was opposition expressed to the allocation of this site.</li> <li>Flooding concerns were highlighted.</li> <li>There was concern expressed about the ability of or confidence in South West Water to deal with sewage capacity issues in the village (including at/close to this site).</li> </ul>	
Sowt_01 and Sowt_02	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It was agreed that these sites should not be allocated for development.</li> </ul>	
Sowt_11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There was support for development of this site in conjunction with Sowt_09 to its north, sites to accommodate a relief road – however, it was noted that (to date) Devon County Council, as highway authority, have not shown/offered support for a new road access on to the A3052</li> <li>It was noted that officers expressed landscape impacts concerns associated with site, a counter view was however that these would be limited and existing recent development had to some degree compromised 'undeveloped openness' considerations.</li> <li>Opinion that of the village favours the link road over possible adverse landscape impacts then this should prevail, but also potential significance of impacts was challenged.</li> </ul>	

Issues/ Site Ref	Comments	Additional Attendees
Sowt_03	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The allocation of this land, with Sowt_11 to the north was favoured in order to help secure a new link road.</li> <li>Devon County Council, as highway authority, have indicated road access being from the housing development to the west (Tillage Way) – not via a new junction on to the A3052.</li> </ul>	
<b>Sowt_15 - employment land at/near Oil Mill Lane</b>		
General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No objections to allocation were raised.</li> </ul>	
<b>Land at/close to Darts Farm</b>		
General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There were no objections to the proposed allocations or views expressed favouring allocation of 'rejected' sites.</li> </ul>	
<b>Land north of Topsham</b>		
General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There were significant concerns expressed in respect of the potential allocation of the land north of Topsham for development.</li> <li>It was reported that the proposed development land is high quality agricultural land.</li> <li>It was considered that allocation runs counter to settlement hierarchy set out in the plan and plan strategy does not set policy basis to make allocation/s.</li> <li>Concern over viability and ability of development to afford provision of additional facilities. Development was seen as potentially exacerbating problems of development occurring without facilities.</li> <li>Concern that development would not be self-contained in the way it worked.</li> </ul> <p><b>Action – Officers to review proximity to existing services and facilities form the site in according to assess whether it meets plan sustainability tests.</b></p>	
Clge_07	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opposition was expressed to allocation of this site for employment uses. It was seen as important green space viewed when coming off the motorway.</li> </ul>	
Clge_08	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site highlighted as being at significant risk of flooding - it's within the lower Clyst valley.</li> <li></li> </ul>	
<b>Land at and around Greendale</b> This site was deferred for consideration noting that it falls outside of the assessment area for sites under consideration at this meeting – a suggestion was raised for consideration via a Zoom meeting.		
<b>Land at and around Whimple Village</b>		
General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted that there were flooding and run-off challenges associated with many development sites/options at Whimple.</li> <li>Pedestrian safety concerns were flagged up as significant within/at the village.</li> <li>Car parking congestion in the village was noted.</li> </ul>	

Issues/ Site Ref	Comments	Additional Attendees
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whilst there was expression of opposition to development there was also view expressed that the village had scope to accommodate higher growth levels – whilst highway and flooding concerns noted it was suggested in other ways the village was a credible location for more development.</li> <li>• Highlighted that Whimble is doing a Neighbourhood Plan and work would look at potential development allocations options.</li> <li>• There was some support for ribbon development along the road from the village southward to London Road – this could help secure safe pedestrian access.</li> <li>• It was reported that there are aspirations for affordable housing in the village and potentially a small business hub.</li> <li>• The entrance to the village was highlighted as a concern.</li> </ul>	
Whim_11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommendation for allocation of this site was challenge. Pedestrian access concerns to the site were highlighted.</li> <li>• Trees to site frontage were advised to be subject to TPOs with damage envisaged in order to secure a road access.</li> </ul>	
Whim_07	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This site was suggested as a possible credible option for development.</li> </ul>	
Whim_08	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This site was suggested as a possible credible option (parts of) for development – specifically behind Cranley Gardens.</li> </ul>	
Whim_03	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This site was suggested as a possible credible option for development – but noted there could be access challenges but suggest Grove Road is not too bad. Also noted drainage concerns would need to be overcome.</li> </ul>	
<b>Three Possible additional strategic land allocations</b>		
General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was no support expressed for allocation in the local plan for any of these proposed schemes.</li> </ul>	
Land between Clyst St Mary and Clyst St George	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• View expressed that it would be inappropriate to seek to do two new towns at once – allocation of this site would prejudice development coming forward at the new town site to the north</li> <li>• Concerns that infrastructure would not be delivered – provision being non-viable.</li> <li>• Concerns expressed around creating a dormitory settlement.</li> </ul>	
Land between Crealy and Greendale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highlighted the scheme was on a busy congested road that separates it from the (main) new town site.</li> <li>• Linear form of development site was challenged.</li> <li>• However, it was suggested as being the ‘least worst’ of the three strategic options being considered (perhaps it will be a longer term/future plan option).</li> </ul>	
Addlepool proposal – between Clyst St George and Ebford	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not considered to be a credible option for now – perhaps more credible in the longer term.</li> <li>• Not seen as a sustainable stand-alone development option.</li> </ul>	