Contents

3.1 3
3.2 20
3.4 25
3.8 31
3.9 33
3.11 35
3.12 66
3.13 69
3.15 71
3.27 73
3.32 75
3.38 76
SP01 83
SP02 239
SP03 447
SP04 485
SP05 514
SP06 523
SP07 541
SP08 581

First Regulation 19 Consultation – East Devon Local Plan – Responses by Chapter

Filtered Data Export

3.1

Full name: John Loudoun

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Paragraph

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:

3.1

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Chapter 3 Some sites should simply not be included in the plan due to multiple and cumulative factors that make the site both economically and physically inappropriate for development. Steep sided valleys with heavy clay soils, difficult natural drainage, poor access and various other natural and manmade issues, should simply be discounted as sites that warrant development. Especially where the impact on existing properties e.g. lower down the hillsides, would be significant in a negative way.

The local plan should be bold enough to state that some areas are already at realistic capacity for economic and practical further development due to the nature of the environment e.g. steep sided valleys. In these cases, housing quotas imposed by central government/high authorities, are irrelevant and need to challenged as to their appropriateness.

Certain areas should be 'blocked out' from the local plan as they are inappropriate for further significant development. Small ad hoc developments may occur in due course, but not be part of priority allocation.

Full name: Samantha Thomas

Organisation (where relevant): CarneySweeney

Other party name (if relevant): Cavanna Homes (Cavanna)

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Paragraph

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:

3.1

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Housing Targets / Delivery
Up to 2031/32, the Council indicate a trajectory to deliver 850 dwellings per year on average, with the remaining plan period from 2032/33 onwards to deliver an annual average of 1,070 dwellings per year. Whilst this averages out to provide for the required housing need, it means that for the first part of the plan-period, the LPA will be under-delivering against their identified housing need and more than likely unable to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply within the early parts of the plan-period, as evidenced by Appendix 1 of the Draft Local Plan. This approach appears to be at odds with the Framework, in particular, the requirement to "meet the area's objectively assessed needs". It is, effectively, a workaround, where the LPA will only be delivering 70% of the housing requirement, which would be averaged out by delivery later in the plan period, for the Plan to continue to be assessed against the previous version of the Framework and therefore requiring 80% of the housing requirement to be planned for. Elsewhere in the Draft Local Plan, notably in Strategic Policy HN02 (Affordable Housing), it is referenced that 35% affordable housing would be a target for windfall development outside settlement boundaries. This appears at odds with Policy SP06 which restricts development outside settlement boundaries, presenting concerns about the level of contribution that windfall sites will provide to meeting housing need. Paragraph 75 of the Framework is clear that there should be "compelling evidence" that windfall sites will provide a reliable source of supply. The current wording of Policy SP06 does not provide confidence that development on windfall sites will be a reliable source of supply. In combination, the restrictive nature of Policy SP06, and the reliance of larger sites to deliver the required housing need later in the plan-period cemented by Policy SP02, presents the prospect of a deteriorating housing supply position from the point of adoption within the first half of the plan period. The Framework is clear that planning policies "should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where

this will support local services". The restrictive nature of Policies SP02 and SP06 is at odds with the clear intention of what the Framework is aspiring to achieve. Furthermore, the Framework is clear that strategic policies should provide for objectively assessed needs "as a minimum".

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: James McMurdo

Organisation (where relevant): McMurdo Land Planning and Development Ltd

Other party name (if relevant): Stuart Partners Ltd

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Paragraph

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:

3.1

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: No

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.:

6. The Duty to Cooperate places a legal duty on Local Planning Authorities to engage constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis to maximise the effectiveness of Local Plan preparation in the context of strategic cross boundary matters.

7. The NPPF sets out under paragraphs 24-28 that Local Planning Authorities and County Councils are under a duty to cooperate with each other on strategic matters that cross administrative boundaries. Paragraph 26 specifically notes that joint working should help to determine where additional infrastructure is necessary, and whether development needs that cannot be met within a particular plan area could be met elsewhere. This process within Devon is guided by the Devon Duty to Cooperate Protocol. This protocol includes reference to the development of appropriate housing development strategies across administrative boundaries.

8. EDDC has a duty to cooperate with neighbouring authorities. Moreover, its Local Plan must align with the requirements of the NPPF and synchronise with ECC's Local Plan, particularly if it (or any neighbouring authority), cannot show that it (or any neighbouring authority), can viably meet its (their) housing and employment land needs on land in its (their) jurisdiction.

9. At present, the Council is proposing a 22-year Local Plan to meet its "needs" without harm. This means that the Local Plan will have to earmark land to meet the required housing and jobs numbers projected for 22 years without significant harm to the climate or the environment. 10. Encapsulated, EDDC's present position appears to be that it has decided to meet its own needs on land in its jurisdiction without reliance on other

Councils; but crucially it has not considered the needs of other Councils (like ECC) and whether other neighbouring authorities (like ECC) can meet their development needs. We do not believe that the Local Plan can be found "sound," in such circumstances, unfortunately. 11. The neighbouring authority, ECC, has also taken the position that it can meet all of its development needs on land in its jurisdiction without reliance on other Councils but quite simply its "vision" is undeliverable and unviable mainly because it proposes to build around 8,000 homes on high performing brownfield employment land when it is already 2,000 houses shy (pro rata) of an "at least" housing requirement of 12,000 in the current plan period. 12. In other words, there is a strong possibility that East Devon will have to accommodate a significant proportion of ECC's development "needs" because either housing will displace employment land (unlikely in our view) or land will be required for Exeter's housing needs in other districts, including in the "West End" of East Devon. 13. EDDC is failing in its Duty to Cooperate (as is ECC), to responsibly and sustainably identify and allocate the most appropriate land for development. Further work must be done to ensure that development is delivered in the most sustainable locations around the Exeter area (irrespective of whether it is in EDDC, or ECC). 14. The Plan should be redrafted via constant dialogue with adjoining Councils and key stakeholders including key landowners, such as our client.

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Housing Delivery and 5 Year Housing Land Supply (5YHLS)

1. Neither EDDC nor neighbouring ECC have a robust 5-years housing land supply (5YHLS):

• EDDC's housing land supply position is confirmed (by the Council) at only 2.97 years.

• ECC's, housing land supply is confirmed (by the Council) at 4 years and 10 months. 1

2. If these Local Plans are to be found "sound" at examination then the Councils will have to robustly demonstrate a 5 YHLS. Employment Land Supply

3. Concerning employment land supply in East Devon (and the subregion) Appeal Reference APP/U1105/W/23/3323252 on land at Hill Barton Business Park in East Devon district, is relevant. From Paragraph 29 the Inspector states: "29. It is common ground between the parties that there is a lack of supply of available employment land at present. The draft Framework indicates support for key industries, including freight and logistics.... 30. Consequently, I need to consider the weight to be attached to that lack of supply of available employment land, weight to be attached to policies of the emerging Local Plan and draft Framework, and the need for this development. Supply of

employment land 31. The East Devon Local Economic Review published by the Council in October 2023 summarises the most up to date position in relation to the need for employment land. This indicates current demand (2022) for over 50ha of employment space, of which around 80% relates to the logistics sector, that would include the businesses occupying the appeal site. However, currently available space comprises only 1.7ha, of which over 70% is office space, i.e. unlikely to be suitable for the logistics sector. 32. Over the period 2019-2040 demand for employment space in East Devon is expected to be nearly 130ha, of which over 123ha would be for industrial and logistics space. Current and future supply over that period is anticipated to be approximately 87ha. That indicates a remaining shortfall at the end of that period of approximately 43ha. 33. Logistics businesses, such as those using the appeal site, need locations with good access to the road network. In this part of Devon, this means demand is focussed on Exeter and around the M5. Hill Barton Business Park is well located within that area, with good access to the M5. However, only the west part of East Devon is located within that market area, with potential sites for development to meet the needs of logistics operators being both within and outside East Devon. The Council accept that more land needs to be found for these operators. 34. In conclusion, there is a demonstrable and significant shortfall in the provision of employment land in the area around Hill Barton Business Park, particularly for logistics operators. This must carry significant weight in the planning balance."

4. ECC in this context, in its Regulation 19 Plan, proposes 85% of its housing delivery on brownfield land, a substantial proportion of which is existing high value employment land (when ECC accept s it needs to provide 80ha of employment land in the Plan period). 2

5. In short, the sub region is facing a housing (and an affordable housing) crisis and an employment land supply crisis and plan making has been, and still is being, woefully inadequate and well behind the curve.

Full name: Stuart Houlet

Organisation (where relevant): PCL Planning Ltd

Other party name (if relevant): Waddeton Park Limited (Honiton)

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Paragraph

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:

3.1

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: (PCL Planning on behalf of Waddeton Park Limited (Honiton)): [Representation made in relation to overall Plan Approach]

We have through earlier representations made on the emerging Local Plan raised concerns regarding the overall strategy of the Plan, particularly in terms of approach to meeting housing needs and an inherent imbalance towards constraint and matters that ultimately constrain growth opportunities and the delivery of sustainable development. Some of those issues still remain apparent in the Regulation 19 Plan. This is despite the Government, through the updated NPPF published in December 2024, making it absolutely clear that there is a need to substantially increase housing delivery in the UK, setting a target of achieving 370,000 new homes each year. The focus of the updated NPPF is explicitly on overhauling the planning system to address the chronic housing crisis and to support "builders not blockers" and to deliver growth. The implication of the updated NPPF on East Devon is a significantly increased challenge in the number of homes that are required to be built, significantly above past delivery rates. We recognise the scale of this challenge; however, it also must be recognised that historic and substantial undersupply of housing has contributed to the severe housing affordability issues across the South West, including in East Devon. As we have previously highlighted the continuing housing crisis requires a step change in planning for growth and a departure from traditional protectionism. The updated Framework provides councils with significant tools to maximise opportunities for accommodating the growth that is required. It is noted that the Council are seeking to benefit from the updated NPPF's transitional arrangements by publishing a Regulation 19 version of the

Plan in advance of the cut off of 12th March 2025. This will then enable the local plan to progress under the December 2023 NPPF. It is very disappointing that these transitional arrangements appear to have been used with the sole purpose of enabling a lower housing requirement to be pursued. Which of course will simply continue to increase the gap between housing need and supply in the longer term. The Plan further fails to appropriately meet local housing needs by seeking to offset even that lower housing requirement by introducing what is an unjustified and inappropriate stepped housing delivery approach. Also of concern and evidenced by the number of comments we have on the Plan, is whether the Plan has simply been rushed to Regulation 19 stage without full and reasonable assessment of the overall strategy. It was clear from the Strategic Planning Committee discussions on site selection that the urgency to allocate sufficient numbers to meet the lower requirements has led to politicised decision-making in respect of sites and a great deal of inconsistency. This does give rise to the significant risk of the Plan not being found sound. All this is before taking into account the Plan's over reliance on delivery from a new community that remains largely untested through the Plan process to date; a site selection process that at best has been inconsistent and at worst, procedurally unfair; and a proposed policy basis that seeks unreasonable requirements without any consideration of the viability and deliverability issues they will create. Importantly until the emerging Plan is adopted, the Council will still be required to demonstrate a 5-year supply of housing land based on the new standard method (1188 dwellings per annum), which as the Council themselves recognise under current claimed supply would be less than 3 years. The need to deliver increased levels of housing must therefore be a priority for the Council both through development management and plan-making processes, requiring a step change in approach towards positively planning for growth rather than focussing on constraint and requirements. We are concerned the Plan currently fails to adequately demonstrate this. We elaborate further on the above concerns, that we consider risks undermining the soundness of the Plan if not addressed, when discussing the individual policies and sections of the Plan [elsewhere]. [See overall full representation attached which representor advises is presented as a comprehensive assessment of the emerging plan and the Council's approach and therefore it is important to be considered in its complete form as well as the entries made against the constituent elements].

Overall conclusions of PCL Planning on behalf of Waddeton Park Limited (Honiton): The Regulation 19 version of the Emerging Local Plan raises a number of concerns regarding the ability of the Plan to be found sound. It is clear is that the Council are facing significant housing challenges which the Government is clear in its expectation that it will need to be met through the delivery of substantially more housing. This does mean a step change in approach is required to ensure a balanced and comprehensive approach towards identifying sufficient sites to meet identified needs and considering

this in the round with designations and requirements is essential. Otherwise, the Plan will fail to demonstrate that it is based on an effective strategy underpinned by clear evidence, does not seek to appropriately meet identified needs and will limit the opportunity to deliver sustainable development. Alongside the comments on spatial strategy and detailed policies, we do believe that additional growth at Honiton should be provided and that our clients' site at Heathfield Manor should be re-considered given the role it can play in making Plan resilient.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: See representations made by PCL Planning on behalf of Waddeton Park Limited (Honiton) under individual policies. See also entire comprehensive assessment of the emerging plan and the Council's approach requested to be considered in its complete form as well.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : in order to provide greater elaboration of the detail of these representations

Full name: Karime Hassan MBE

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Paragraph

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:

3.1

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: [Representation on behalf of Exeter Rugby Group (ERG) based in Exeter close to Junction 30 of the M5 at Sandy Park. See also upload of full representation]

Whilst not objecting to the spatial strategy and specific policies of interest in relation to development in the West End, the plan itself references that "comments on all concerns identified should be made at this stage of consultation, this includes in respect of policy WS01, notwithstanding that any such comments, specifically on new community matters, can be elaborated on at the second stage of consultation when more policy detail and supporting evidence will be available. These comments are therefore being made at this stage to identify those matters of concern and to lend support to the importance of some aspects that are essential to delivery of the strategic policy in relation to the West End policy proposals and to achieve the stated aims of the emerging plan. ERG wishes to be engaged in the second stage of consultation when further matters can be elaborated upon.

The Spatial Strategy and Infrastructure: The current adopted Local Plan spatial strategy of bringing homes close to employment in the West End with the provision of a new community functioning as urban extension of Exeter and with a high level of self-containment has been successful in delivering housing and employment, and supporting a more economically active population and a young population. The delivery of the key strategic allocations in the adopted local plan were supported by the work of the then South West Regional Development Agency and its ability to create a front funding mechanism and to invest in early infrastructure to enable the viability of the housing developments to proceed, and to ensure the timely provision of essential transport infrastructure that overcame concerns regarding the capacity of the M5 junction 29 and the A30 to support the planned developments. The following comments

are made recognising that presently there is no equivalent of the SWRDA supporting local authorities in Devon and the scale of investment required to realise the vision of the Emerging Plan may challenge the viability of the new community.

Summary [see upload of full representation]: ERG recognises the strategic intent of the emerging plan to support the growth of the district by directing major housing and employment to the West End, close to the city of Exeter and the major transport infrastructure. This area is vital to the economy of the sub-region and the future prosperity of the county of Devon, providing a younger demographic that is more economically active. The Club's concern is primarily focused on the transport impacts of the developments in the West End and the implications for Junction 30 and long-term consequences for Sandy Park hosting events and fulfilling its ambition. The polices and text recognise the need to provide additional master planning, infrastructure delivery plans and continued cooperation between Exeter and East Devon to meet the aims of the policies. It further recognises the requirement for a delivery mechanism, governance and stewardship to realise the vision for the new community and to address the considerable practical challenges of delivering infrastructure in a timely fashion and fulfilling the ambitions for the new community. ERG would wish to underline the importance of these matters to fulfilling the test of soundness and effectiveness of the plan. These comments are therefore being made at this stage to lend support to the importance of some aspects that are essential to delivery of the strategic policy in relation to the West End policy proposals and to achieve the stated aims of the emerging plan; and to identify the matter of concern, namely transport implications.

Full name: Mr John Hamill

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Paragraph

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:

3.1

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: No

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: Exmouth is classed as a tier 1 town but is wholly unsuitable for large growth as detailed in this Plan. It is on the southern edge of the peninsular wedged between the River Exe and the coast, thus making 360 degree development impossible and the large amount of sprawling development built over the last years has effectively strangled the town. It has already doubled in size since the 1960s and cannot sustain further development on the scale envisaged, at best some infill may be possible.

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Exmouth is classed as a tier 1 town but is wholly unsuitable for large growth as detailed in this Plan. It is on the southern edge of the peninsular wedged between the River Exe and the coast, thus making 360 degree development impossible and the large amount of sprawling development built over the last years has effectively strangled the town. It has already doubled in size since the 1960s and cannot sustain further development on the scale envisaged, at best some infill may be possible.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : Having attempted over a period of months to be heard by EDDC I would like the opportunity to put before the Inspector the inadequate "consultation " process undertaken and the rejection by them of any reasonable objections to their pre-conceived ideas

Full name: Devon Wildlife Trust (planning)

Organisation (where relevant): Devon Wildlife Trust

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Paragraph

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:

3.1

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Policies throughout this chapter are missing reference to the environment. The benefits that nature brings to health and wellbeing are well recognised and specific targets should be included within these policies to ensure that these benefits are realised within every development.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: Targets should detail a minimum size of green space which should be provided, which ensures accessible nature-rich greenspace that is inviting to all who live and work in the area. Reference to the inclusion of green corridors is also required.

Full name: Steve Havers

Organisation (where relevant): National Highways

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Paragraph

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:

3.1

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: plan vision outlines that the western side of East Devon will continue to be a focal point for growth, with a Second New Community identified to meet the needs of a growing population, and wider growth focussed on the urban fringe of Exeter and the M5 corridor. Overall, approximately half of all new homes are planned at the West End, and the Spatial Strategy (Strategic Policy 01) focusses new employment development in and around the Enterprise Zone, Exeter Airport and the M5. Elsewhere, further development is focussed on the Principal Centre of Exmouth, and Main Centres including Honiton and Axminster to serve the needs of the immediate area and surrounding communities. 22. The plan justifies the concentration of development in the West End on the basis of it being a highly sustainable area with strong functional links to Exeter, extensive infrastructure and efficient transport connections. It is also understood that environmental constraints to the east limit the scope for large-scale development. 23. Whilst National Highways recognise that the West End location offers the potential to capitalise on existing transport links and connections into Exeter, potential impacts for the SRN need to be fully considered given the proximity of the M5 and A30 Trunk Road, and the potential for cross-boundary movement to/from Exeter in particular. In the absence of appropriate evidence to understand the potential impacts for the SRN, National Highways considers the plan to be unsound and not satisfactorily justified. It is anticipated that the conclusions of the Greater Exeter Transport Strategy work will provide the necessary scrutiny and evidence.

Full name: Steve Havers

Organisation (where relevant): National Highways

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Paragraph

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:

3.1

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Previous Responses and Ongoing Consultations 13. National Highways has provided comments on previous draft versions of the East Devon Local Plan and this response seeks only to build upon previous comments and provide an update on our position in light of ongoing work with the stakeholder authorities. 14. A significant level of development is proposed within the emerging Local Plans for each of the authorities that make up the Exeter functional economic market area (FEMA), with the potential to impact upon the safe and efficient operation of the SRN. Traffic modelling work is ongoing to assess the combined impacts of planned growth, and demonstrate the effectiveness of measures to reduce car-borne travel demand. The work is intended to underpin the Greater Exeter Transport Strategy and Local Plan delivery for the partner authorities. National Highways continues to be a key stakeholder in this process and is contributing its own modelling for the SRN using a microsimulation model of the M5 and A30. We welcome this effective and on-going joint-working to support the production of a positively prepared and justified strategy. However, it is important to note that this work is ongoing and still to be completed and the initiatives, services and schemes contained in the current draft IDP and that for the Second New Community may be insufficient to accommodate the planned level of development. 15. The Greater Exeter Transport Strategy will include a range of service and infrastructure improvements to promote non-car travel. It is critical that this is forward-looking to the 'Vision' for future transport as outlined by central government and interpreted locally through the Local Plans. However, National Highways is not currently convinced that a suitable transport strategy to protect the safe and efficient operation of the SRN has been evidenced. Until and unless this is robustly demonstrated we will continue to have reservations over the justification for the planned growth and its delivery. Subject to the future agreement of transport interventions required to deliver the East Devon Local Plan, a robust funding and delivery strategy may need to be identified for any interventions not currently identified

in the submitted IDP (dated February 2025). There remains a risk that improvements to the SRN or neighbouring local highway junctions could be required to address the residual cumulative impacts of planned growth. 16. Evidence of cumulative traffic demands associated with emerging Local Plan development across the FEMA authorities (including East Devon) has previously been shared with National Highways by Devon County Council. The modelling accounts for 8,000 new dwellings and associated employment at the Second New Community, alongside wider allocations across East Devon and the Exeter, Teignbridge and Mid Devon authorities. National Highways has subsequently accounted for cumulative traffic growth forecasts in our microsimulation modelling of the M5 and A30. The work reported to Devon County Council and the Local Planning Authorities has identified significant congestion at M5 J29 and J30, the A30 Airport roundabouts, and the A3052 Clyst St Mary roundabout. 17. Work to assess a range of emerging transport mitigation measures is reported in the Greater Exeter Mitigation Modelling report prepared by WSP and dated 9 December 2024 (TRI-029). It is unclear whether the work directly informs commitments in the current East Devon IDP. The assessment has been undertaken in Devon County Council's SATURN model of the Greater Exeter area, considering cumulative traffic demands associated with growth across the FEMA authorities. Within the conclusions of the report, the following is identified: "On the eastern side of Exeter around J29 and J30, a number of junctions remain over 100% capacity in the 2040 Core with mitigation scenario. These include movements on J29 and J30 themselves, as well as at Clyst St Mary roundabout and the A30 airport roundabout". The report continues to note that operational modelling would be required to confirm junction performance under forecast traffic demands, with the National Highways microsimulation model identified for this purpose. To date, forecast traffic flows accounting for mitigation have not been assessed in the National Highways model, as analysis of the change in traffic demand has identified that currently identified mitigation has little impact on traffic demand via the SRN junctions. The work would suggest that the currently identified mitigations are not sufficiently ambitious to avoid significant impacts for the SRN junctions. Based on discussion with Devon County Council, we understand that further work is to be undertaken to review traffic flow demands and associated transport interventions for the Second New Community site, and this work is awaited by National Highways.

3.2

Full name: Andrew Minter

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Paragraph

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:

3.2

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:

3.2: Infrastructure cannot cope at present (schools, sewage, surgeries, social care, etc) in this part of East Devon...There is NO MENTION of how the infrastructure to accompany these unwanted building lans will be funded, let alone delivered.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: Make Lympstone a Service Village, NOT a local centre

In SD01 show Lymp_07 as being part of Lympstone, NOT a distant part of Exmouth; it isn't part of Exmouth.

State that EDDC will consider significant development of the National Landscape/AONB in order to meet Central Governments MISGUIDED and INCORRECT targets...(for goodness sake EDDC, be a bit more militant!)

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: No

4(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.: see comments above

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : I want my voice to be heard

Full name: Helen Parr

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Paragraph

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:

3.2

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Chap 3 The Spatial Strategy

3.2 The NPPF…reduce travel needs and offer transport choices." Colyton is not a sustainable location and will necessitate travel Bus services to Colyton inadequate- The nearest station is Axminster, 5 miles away. bus ride 12 minutes, departures every four hours Monday to Saturday. Sunday? taxi 9 minutes

Development will result in travel for Secondary School- eg to Axminster, Lyme Regis, Sidmouth Employment, Supermarket- nearest is Seaton, 3 miles away, 12 minutes by bus). Hospital- Exeter 25 miles away, bus 1 hr. 13 mins Dentist- Seaton

Full name: Rob Wallbank

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Paragraph

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:

3.2

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: "Justification for Policy", 3.2, works for where housing is close to work, but in the towns and villages noted in Para C, this is unjustified as there are already houses that are on the market and have been for a long time thus demonstrating there is no need for the current housing stock, let alone any new development. It is important to distinguish between main and local centres and placing emphasis on these as a result of their category. Demographic population and available work influence the significance of the towns and villages as well as their position within existing travel corridors and train/bus networks. Axminister is reasonably served as it has rail connections, but Seaton and Ottery for example have poorer connections, placing much more reliance upon car travel. Seaton therefore enjoys a pleasant and rural feel with locals who not only live there, but those that work there. It is not a commuter town, nor a satellite to other conurbations, and continued development of green land removes its appeal, damages the environment, removed local village and town identity, damages wildlife corridors and adds to the pollution due to stretched infrastructure. Under the Strategic Plan SP03, Seaton has a proposal for 522 new homes. This is a dangerous proposal for all the reasons set out above. There is not a need for this level of development because of the current housing stock and minimal work needs. For further information on these matters, see my comprehensive report dated 2nd June 2024.

Full name: Rob Wallbank

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Paragraph

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:

3.2

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: The strategic Policy SP01, para C, refers to “significant” development at the main centres of…Seaton…to serve their own needs and that of the wider surrounding areas. Elsewhere this is referred to as “local areas” which demonstrates that the enquiries made in producing this document, recognise that Seaton does not have housing needs for it’s own residents, but employment lies elsewhere. That elsewhere isn’t anywhere near, as the other villages and towns named are all local to Seaton. This implies very clearly that housing will exceed local needs, and therefore commuting will be needed. This needs to be addressed as such a policy is contrary to the Local and wider Plan objectives and places the whole document at risk of failing in its green credentials and net zero Carbon ideas, let alone damage to the green countryside and impact on the Jurassic Coast and historic green areas, Roman remains, vital to town and village identities.

3.4

Full name: Chris Aston

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Paragraph

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:

3.4

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: No

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: You state that there is 'substantial' employment opportunities in the area. This is false. There is not. Please describe where 700 plus home with circa 3 persons per household will both now and in the near and long term be able to access jobs that support local economic growth. It further states that there is extensive infrastructure, again this is a falsification. The adjoining country roads already cannot cope with the amount of traffic heading to and from Exeter or the M5 with degradation of the road surface due to volume of traffic a never ending maintenance task, not to mention the lack of pavements, cycle safe paths or crossing points to woodbury common.

2(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter legally compliant, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter legally compliant. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: The wording should read, 'whilst there is currently not a large and diverse range of employment opportunities in the area, we will hold any developer to account to first develop a secondary school, appropriate healthcare facilities aa well as sewerage and travel infrastructure that can support such a development'

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: You have already stated that Exmouth has a high population comparatively to the rest of the East Devon area. Yet we

know that adding more homes in the area is compounding the housing problem. By introducing homes that are still out of the price range of many people who work in the area all we are doing is encouraging cash wealthy families to relocate into the area, they can afford the homes (as developers on average can charge 150% more for a property in a desirable location, rather than in a location which provides more job security but is not as pleasing on the eye. All development should be to the west of Exmouth in order to allow access to the M5, train stations and wider cycle network whic h does not exist in the proposed location. Throughout the documents there is no reference to how educational needs of children and young adults will be met nor how the travel infrastructure will be improved without impacting surrounding natural habitats.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

4(a). If yes, and you wish to support this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter's compliance with the duty to co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.: Yes this does and active engagement with the local community for considered planning is 100% necessary.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : We experience daily the effect of ill considered planning and development in everything we do in East Devon. From trying to get children into secondary schools in the area to trying to simply 'move' around the area and make use of the facilities which are already overburdened.

Full name: Andrew Minter

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Paragraph

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:

3.4

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:

3.4: Lympstone is MISCLASSIFIED as a local centre, just because it has a tiny station with 13 car parking spaces (used by locals!). It is in reality a service village of 900 houses.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: Make Lympstone a Service Village, NOT a local centre

In SD01 show Lymp_07 as being part of Lympstone, NOT a distant part of Exmouth; it isn't part of Exmouth.

State that EDDC will consider significant development of the National Landscape/AONB in order to meet Central Governments MISGUIDED and INCORRECT targets...(for goodness sake EDDC, be a bit more militant!)

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: No

4(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.: see comments above

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : I want my voice to be heard

Full name: Sacha Pemberthy

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Paragraph

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:

3.4

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: Yes

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: The assertion around Exmouth having a diverse job market and comprehensive local services is a flawed justification for the policy. The job market is largely seasonal in the tourism industry or minimum wage in care homes and it is important to reflect that. In terms of local services and infrastructure they are already massively over capacity so any further development only makes sense if clear provision of a new sewage treatment plant and upgrade of all sewage systems in put in place and local GP services have significant investment. Further with one road into Exmouth the traffic system for getting in and out is not fit for this level of development.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: It needs to be amended to change from saying Exmouth has a diverse job market to reflect the reality of most employment in Exmouth being minimum wage and much of it seasonal and also note that while there are a comprehensive range of services these are already over capacity.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: No

4(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.: There is no reference to the depth of collaboration that would be required in Exmouth for the development not to have adverse environmental and social impacts.

3.8

Full name: Samantha Thomas

Organisation (where relevant): CarneySweeney

Other party name (if relevant): Taylor Wimpey Exeter

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Paragraph

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:

3.8

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Housing Targets / Delivery Up to 2031/32, the Council indicate a trajectory to deliver 850 dwellings per year on average, with the remaining plan period from 2032/33 onwards to deliver an annual average of 1,070 dwellings per year. Whilst this averages out to provide for the required housing need, it means that for the first part of the plan-period, the LPA will be under-delivering against their identified housing need and more than likely unable to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply within the early parts of the plan-period, as evidenced by Appendix 1 of the Draft Local Plan. This approach appears to be at odds with the Framework, in particular, the requirement to "meet the area's objectively assessed needs". It is, effectively, a workaround, where the LPA will only be delivering 70% of the housing requirement, which would be averaged out by delivery later in the plan period, for the Plan to continue to be assessed against the previous version of the Framework and therefore requiring 80% of the housing requirement to be planned for. Elsewhere in the Draft Local Plan, notably in Strategic Policy HN02 (Affordable Housing), it is referenced that 35% affordable housing would be a target for windfall development outside settlement boundaries. www.carneysweeney.co.uk This appears at odds with Policy SP06 which restricts development outside settlement boundaries, presenting concerns about the level of contribution that windfall sites will provide to meeting housing need. Paragraph 75 of the Framework is clear that there should be "compelling evidence" that windfall sites will provide a reliable source of supply. The current wording of Policy SP06 does not provide confidence that development on windfall sites will be a reliable source of supply. In combination, the restrictive nature of Policy SP06, and the reliance of larger sites to deliver the required housing need later in the plan-period cemented by Policy SP02, presents the prospect of a deteriorating

housing supply position from the point of adoption within the first half of the plan period. The Framework is clear that planning policies “should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services”. The restrictive nature of Policies SP02 and SP06 is at odds with the clear intention of what the Framework is aspiring to achieve. Furthermore, the Framework is clear that strategic policies should provide for objectively assessed needs “as a minimum”.

3.9

Full name: Neal Jillings

Organisation (where relevant): Summerfield Homes Ltd

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Paragraph

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:

3.9

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: Yes

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:

3.9 references the objective of boosting significantly housing supply, yet the plan seeks to reduce housing requirements over those existing up to the end of March 2032 as part of a plan that seeks to undershoot the standard method by 20%. there is a mismatch between words and actions.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: Actively plan to boost significantly the supply of housing

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Suzanne Hales

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Paragraph

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:

3.9

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: No

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: The housing figure not correct, where do these come from? If that many houses are built without new roads , train lines etc the county will come to a holt. New housing is not properly joined to employment sites, it will require people to drive everywhere.

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3.11

Full name: Simon Coles

Organisation (where relevant): CarneySweeney

Other party name (if relevant): C R Down Farming Ltd and Stuart Partners Ltd

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Paragraph

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:

3.11

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: It is considered that splitting consultation on two parts of the same plan to enable the draft EDLP as a whole to take advantage of having to meet only at least 80% of the District's identified need does not meet the transitional arrangements in the December 2024 Framework. This is in circumstances where the forthcoming consultation on the second new community will in effect be a Regulation 18 consultation and where the draft EDLP is only planning for up to 80% of the District's needs.

In this respect, the draft EDLP is ducking the ambition and challenges in the December 2024 Framework and presented in two Written Ministerial Statements of 30 July 2024 (Angela Rayner MP) and 12 December 2024 (Matthew Pennycook MP), setting out the need to address the national housing crisis and in so doing, to turbocharge the national economy. It is also delaying important strategic decisions on the scale and location of new development, including at the proposed second new community, which should be addressed now.

Full name: Owen Jones

Organisation (where relevant): LRM Planning

Other party name (if relevant): David Wilson Homes

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Paragraph

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:

3.11

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: Yes

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Transitional arrangements

5.1 Page 5 of the consultation Local Plan suggests that as the Local Plan has reached the Regulation 19 stage on or before 12th March 2025 and its draft housing requirement can meet at least 80% of local housing need, it benefits from the transitional arrangements set out within para. 234 of the 2024 version of the NPPF.

5.2 However, as shown in para. 4.2 of the Local Development Scheme, a second Regulation 19 consultation is due to be undertaken in Spring 2025. It is our understanding that the second Regulation 19 consultation will focus on the second new community, which is a key element of the proposed housing delivery strategy.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.:

5.3 It is DWH view that the requirement for a second Regulation 19 consultation to ensure a 'complete' draft Plan, which will occur after the 12th March 2025 deadline, means that the transitional arrangements set out in para. 234 of the NPPF are not applicable in this case. Consequently, the Plan should be assessed against the 2024 version of the NPPF and provide the full objectively assessed need for housing.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : Due to the significant policy issues concerned.

Full name: Neil Mantell

Organisation (where relevant): LRM Planning

Other party name (if relevant): The Cherwell Group

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Paragraph

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:

3.11

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: ///// PART 2 - CONTINUED FROM PART 1 67fe83735867810013eba9a4 /////

HIGH SPEED PROVISION

It is noted that the emerging policy requires the provision of high speed broadband. However, since December 2022, for new homes, it has been a requirement of Approved Document R of the Building Regulations for developments to provide: (1) gigabit-ready physical infrastructure necessary for gigabit-capable connections up to a network distribution point, or as close as is reasonably practicable where the developer does not have the right to access land up to that distribution point; and (2) subject to a costs cap, a functioning gigabit-capable connection.

As such, for residential development, it is considered that the policy requirement duplicates Building Regulations and therefore it does not serve a clear purpose. Accordingly, it conflicts with national policy and should be removed from future iterations of the Plan.

WASTE TRANSFER STATION AND WASTE WATER TREATMENT WORKS

The Cherwell Group are aware of the need for a new waste water treatment works to serve the new development. They are also aware that the utility provider is currently undecided as to whether it should be located within the new community. Whilst the Cherwell Group are aware of its strategic need and if necessary, its location within the new community, it should not be at the expense of restricting delivery from it. Indeed, whilst the waste water treatment works is being constructed, existing capacity and if necessary, temporary package treatment works, should be utilised to ensure that housing delivery from the new community comes forward as early as possible.

STEWARDSHIP

Policy WS01 confirms that a town-wide stewardship vehicle and governance will be required early on in the planning and delivery process. There remains a requirement for the allocation wide masterplan to provide a stewardship strategy that provides full details of the governance structure, methods of funding the stewardship vehicle, details of the public spaces and community assets to be owned, managed and maintained by the stewardship vehicle and an indicative programme for the establishment of the proposed stewardship vehicle. It is noted that para. 4.8 of the Local Plan confirms that public spaces and community assets within the new community will need to remain in public ownership.

The Cherwell Group acknowledge that stewardship will be a critical component of the new community. They are also aware that, as the proposed new community is the second that will occur within East Devon, many of these considerations will have been debated previously at Cranbrook. The Cherwell Group is aware of an East Devon Cabinet Paper dated 28th July 2021, which discussed the various stewardship models that had been discussed in the context of Cranbrook, which by the time that the paper was written, was a thriving community, with the established Town Council providing effective local leadership.

The Paper discussed various stewardship models. It confirmed that initially within Cranbrook, as with many developments, an estate management company was responsible for, amongst other things, the management and maintenance of public spaces. This was funded by a management charge applied to each home. However, in 2018, public assets and services were transferred to Cranbrook Town Council, with their management and maintenance being funded through the parish precept and residents having their estate charge removed. This did not require any commuted sums to be paid

by the developers to the Town Council, but is reflected on the Council Tax bill for each property.

Two further options were considered within the Cabinet Paper for the stewardship of assets; asset endowment and profit share. In terms of the former, LRM Planning have been involved in a development where such an approach was used, alongside a conventional estate charge.

As part of the Former Wisley Airfield development, a Stewardship Strategy and an In Perpetuity Funding Framework was agreed. Through that work it was agreed that the Wisley Airfield Community Trust would be established, which is a charitable trust responsible for the operation and maintenance of the community assets (after they were fully funded and built out) and the promotion of community activities to aid with placemaking. The Trust is to be governed by a board of Trustees including residents, the Council, the County Council, the Parish Council, specialist stakeholders, the developers and other business interest groups.

The Strategy and Framework confirms that the Trust is to be responsible for:

maintenance of public open spaces and community facilities;

the maintenance of the SANG land;

sustainable transport initiatives, including bus services and subsidy, e-bikes and car clubs;

costs for the Trust's staff and its ongoing operation; and

placemaking, including community development, activities and events.

A number of potential sources of revenue were identified, including:

an estate charge for each dwelling and commercial unit;

income from community assets, periodic income and charitable grants; and

a scheme of endowment, whereby a number of residential properties were gifted to the charitable trust to be let to private tenants to provide a long term and unrestricted income. Initially, 19 dwellings were endowed to the Trust.

Subject to viability, such an approach to delivering the stewardship of the new community over the longer-term would be supported by the Cherwell Group.

THE COUNCIL'S EMERGING MASTERPLAN

The Cherwell Group note that the Council's more detailed proposals for the new community will be published in the second Regulation 19 consultation later in 2025. They therefore understand that the Council's masterplanners will be continuing to work on the masterplan until that point and that the versions of the masterplan issued by the Council to the landowners in January 2025 is subject to change. However, in order to assist the Council in preparing their final masterplan, the Cherwell Group have the following comments on the most recent version of the masterplan shared in January 2025:

Park and ride – the park and ride is currently proposed to be located to the west of the proposed access from the A3052. It is within land that is not controlled by the Cherwell Group. As shown in the Cherwell Group's masterplan, which is provided in Appendix 2, there is sufficient room within land controlled by the Cherwell Group for the park and ride to be accommodated within their masterplan. To allow for its earlier delivery, the park and ride should be relocated to the east of the proposed access road from the A3052 and within land controlled by the Cherwell Group.

Secondary school – the Cherwell Group note that the only secondary school proposed within the emerging masterplan is located in the north eastern area of the land under their control. However, Policy WS01 of the emerging Local Plan indicates that the preference is for the site to accommodate a "an education campus which will provide

primary and secondary school places as well as provision for early years, pupils with special educational needs and Post 16." There therefore seems to be a disconnect between the emerging Policy and the Council's proposed masterplan. There is approximately a 2.25ha difference in size between a secondary school and an education campus. Analysis undertaken by the Cherwell Group's masterplanner has indicated that there is not the sufficient quantum of land within the north eastern portion of the Cherwell Group's landholding, of a suitable level, to accommodate an education campus and its ancillary infrastructure, including playing pitches. In order to ensure that the masterplan and therefore Policy WS01 of the emerging Local Plan is effective, there will be a need to relocate the school to an alternative location.

APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

The emerging Policy requires proposals within the new community to progress in accordance with an agreed allocation-wide masterplan, infrastructure delivery strategy, phasing strategy and a financial appraisal. Additionally, the Policy also confirms that a stewardship strategy is required as part of the site wide masterplan. Unless otherwise agreed with the Local Planning Authority, each planning application should accord with the approved documents.

The Cherwell Group has four principal concerns with these elements of the Policy, as follows:

To ensure that the emerging Policy is clearly written and unambiguous, the Plan should be clear as to what stage of the development management process the allocation-wide masterplan, infrastructure delivery strategy, phasing strategy and the financial appraisal is required to be agreed (i.e. is it prior to the submission of the first application, or as part of it). In that regard we draw attention to the wording of the Cranbrook Expansion Area policies, which state that "the parameter plans shall be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority as part of the first approval of any planning application for development…"

Again, to ensure that the emerging Policy is clearly written and unambiguous, there will be a need for the Policy to indicate how the allocation-wide masterplan, infrastructure delivery strategy, phasing strategy and financial appraisal is required to be agreed.

As there is no obvious lead developer (i.e. with an overall controlling portion of the second new community), there will, given the significant implications that the allocation-wide masterplan, infrastructure delivery strategy, phasing strategy and financial appraisal will have on the deliverability of all development proposals within the new community, be a need for these elements of work to be undertaken with meaningful engagement with all landowners. Agreement should be reached with all members of the consortium before the work is approved by the Local Planning Authority. To ensure that Policy WS01 is effective, this should be specified in the wording of the Policy.

The Policy states that whilst the emerging Local Plan only allocates land to accommodate 8,000 new homes and supporting facilities and infrastructure, infrastructure capacity should take account of the ambition to grow the community by a further 2,000 homes, to 10,000 in the longer term. Whilst for some elements of infrastructure this could be a possibility, without any surety over where the additional development will be located, it may be difficult for others. For instance, what assumptions will or can be made about trip assignment in relation to junctions onto the existing public highway and the location of education provision, when the location of the additional 2,000 homes is unknown?

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

LAND USE BUDGET

No land use budget has been provided with the current Local Plan consultation that can be used to demonstrate that the development proposed in the area of land allocated at Policy WS01 is deliverable and therefore effective. The Cherwell Group reserves the right to provide further comment on this matter in future iterations of the Plan.

VIABILITY

Financial viability was a key consideration for the Cranbrook new community and it is likely to be for the second new community, particularly given the likely requirements for significant levels of infrastructure that will be necessary to support such a

development. At Cranbrook, a detailed Infrastructure Delivery Plan was prepared to support the Cranbrook Plan. The Cherwell Group notes that the Local Planning Authority intends to publish an Infrastructure Delivery Plan for the second new community alongside the second Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan. The necessary infrastructure listed in that document and total costs for delivering the infrastructure will be key to understanding whether or not the new community is financially viable and therefore deliverable and in turn effective. The Cherwell Group therefore reserves the right to comment on the infrastructure delivery plan and the scheme's financial viability in their representations to future iterations of the Plan.

In addition, whilst the Community Infrastructure Levy is operational in parts of East Devon, the Local Planning Authority made Cranbrook exempt during the plan-making process. Instead, infrastructure has been secured through the conventional Section 106 process. The approach to funding and delivering infrastructure at the second new town needs early consideration and confirmation.

CONFORMITY WITH PARAGRAPH 74 OF THE NPPF

Para. 74 of the 2023 version of the NPPF confirms that the supply of new homes can often best be achieved through planning for larger scale development, such as new communities, provided they are:

well located;

well designed; and

are supported by necessary infrastructure and facilities.

Moreover, working with communities and other stakeholders, local planning authorities should identify suitable locations for such development where this can help to meet identified needs in a sustainable way. In doing so, they should:

consider the opportunities presented by existing or planned investment in infrastructure, the area's economic potential and the scope for net environmental gains;

ensure that the size and location will support a sustainable community, with sufficient access to services and employment opportunities within the development, or in larger towns to which there is good access;

set clear expectations for the quality of the places to be created and how this will be maintained;

ensure appropriate tools, such as masterplans and design codes are used to secure a variety of well-designed homes to meet the needs of different groups of the community;

make a realistic assessment of likely rates of delivery; and

consider whether it is appropriate to establish a Green Belt around or adjoining new developments of a significant size.

An assessment of how the new community proposed at Policy WS01 of the emerging Plan accords with each of these tests is set out below in turn.

WELL LOCATED

As has been demonstrated in Section 5 above, the new community provides a strong fit with the Plan's spatial strategy, which was assessed through the Sustainability Appraisal and was found to be the preferred option. It mirrors the strategy employed in the Adopted Local Plan.

Moreover, three options for the location of the new community have been assessed within the evidence base supporting the Local Plan, including the Sustainability Appraisal. The location of the new community was again found to be the most appropriate when considering reasonable alternatives.

WELL DESIGNED

The Local Planning Authority's own assessment work underpinning the emerging Local Plan, the design work required by Policy WS01 of the emerging Local Plan, together with other more generic design related policy, including Policy DS01 and DS02, will ensure that the new community is well designed. SUPPORTED BY NECESSARY INFRASTRUCTURE AND FACILITIES

We understand that the Infrastructure Delivery Plan for the second new community, which will be published later in 2025, will establish the necessary infrastructure and facilities that will need to support the new community. This will ensure that the services and facilities required on a daily basis by the future residents of the new community will be available and can be accessed via active and sustainable modes of travel. It will also ensure that the impact of the development is mitigated.

EXISTING OR PLANNED INVESTMENT IN INFRASTRUCTURE

The location of the new community ensures that it is in close proximity to the strategically important Clyst Valley Regional Park, which aims to, amongst other things, connect communities with nature, by traffic free trails. The active travel strategy prepared by AWP ensures that the new community will provide active travel connections between the development and the Clyst Valley Regional Park, including via green connections, which will also provide a functional connection for the benefit of biodiversity interest.

The new community is also located in close proximity to an energy from waste facility. There are proposals for the facility to provide residual heat to the Cranbrook New Community and we understand that it could also supply heat for all or some of the second new community. Whilst, as discussed in Section 8 below, there are potentially other alternatives, it does, in the context of para. 73(a) of the 2023 version of the NPPF, constitute an opportunity presented by infrastructure.

ECONOMIC POTENTIAL

The employment land proposed within the new community will complement the existing and planned strategically important employment provision located within the western area of East Devon and on the eastern edge of Exeter.

NET GAINS TO BIODIVERSITY

An appropriate net gain to biodiversity can be achieved from the new community. Functional green connections are also proposed to the Clyst Valley Regional Park.

SERVICES, FACILITIES AND EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES WITHIN THE NEW COMMUNITY AND IN THE WIDER ENVIRONS

As set out in Policy WS01 of the emerging Local Plan, the new community will house a full range of social, community and education facilities, a town centre, a number of smaller neighbourhood centres and employment land. The new community will also be located in close proximity to the services, facilities and employment opportunities located within the West End, on the eastern edge f Exeter and within Exeter city centre.

EXPECTATIONS ABOUT THE QUALITY OF PLACE

The combination of the vision for the new community and the detailed policy framework provided by Policy WS01 of the emerging Local Plan, and more generic development management policies, ensure that there are clear expectations regarding the quality of the place.

MASTERPLAN AND DESIGN CODES

Policy WS01 and DS02 of the emerging Local Plan will require the submission of an allocation wide masterplan and a design code or codes.

REALISTIC ASSESSMENT OF RATES OF DELIVERY

The Cherwell Group provided an assessment of the anticipated rates of delivery in Section 6 above. They consider that whilst the rates of delivery for the new community are ambitious, they are aspirational, but deliverable.

GREEN BELT

The Cherwell Group do not consider it necessary for a Green Belt to be provided to the east of Exeter. The proposed new community benefits from strong defensible boundaries to the west, south and north, including the Clyst Valley Regional Park, the M5, the A3052 and the A30.

No such designation has been required for the Cranbrook New Community and it is considered that, if necessary, other development management policies would suffice. The Cherwell Group are aware that, for instance, Green Wedge designations have successfully been used at Cranbrook. Moreover, such a designation may impact on the ability for the Local Planning Authority to allocate land for the additional 2,000 homes that is to be made in a subsequent development plan document. Consequently, it is not considered that the tests of para. 144 of the NPPF have been met in this instance.

SUMMARY

It can be seen that the proposed new community strongly accords with para. 74 of the NPPF. It is therefore, in these terms, consistent with national planning policy.

SYNTHESIS

The Cherwell Group considers that, fundamentally, the second new town is a sound proposition. They consider that it is founded on robust evidence and provides a strong fit with national planning policy.

They have suggested a number of minor amendments to the proposed wording of Policy WS01. These suggested alterations are proposed to ensure that the allocation is both justified and effective.

Full name: Neil Mantell

Organisation (where relevant): LRM Planning

Other party name (if relevant): The Cherwell Group

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Paragraph

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:

3.11

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: Yes

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: Yes

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: The Cherwell Group's comments on housing land supply are limited to the proposed second new community. Please see Section 6 of the attached representation (see below):

HOUSING SUPPLY

The following section of this representation provides a broad assessment of the proposed housing land supply contained within the East Devon Local Plan. It specifically concerns lead-in times associated with strategic sites, including the second new community.

LEAD-IN TIMES ASSOCIATED WITH THE SECOND NEW COMMUNITY

In order to meet the proposed housing requirement within the emerging Local Plan, the Local Planning Authority have rightfully identified the need for strategic housing allocations, including a second new community. Housing monitoring information published by the Local Planning Authority confirms that strategic allocations provided a valuable and consistent component of supply and will continue to do so.

For instance, over the period 2013/14 to 2023/24 the strategic allocations located within the West End alone have contributed just under 50% of total housing completions (4,932 homes out of 9,984 net total completions), with Cranbrook alone contributing approximately 29% of supply over the same timescale. Moreover, Table 14 of the latest Housing Monitoring Update continues to demonstrate that the expansion areas at Cranbrook will provide a valuable source of housing over the period 2026/27 to 2030/31 and beyond.

Notwithstanding the above, so as to ensure that the objectively assessed need for housing is deliverable over the plan period, which in turn will ensure that the emerging Local Plan is positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy, there is a need to ensure that the components of housing supply will deliver as anticipated by the Plan.

As the largest allocation proposed within the emerging Local Plan, the delivery assumptions for the second new community should be carefully considered. Indeed, para. 74(d) of the 2023 version of the NPPF confirms that when planning for largescale development, such as a new community, Local Planning Authorities should, amongst other things, make a realistic assessment of the likely rates of delivery, given their lead-in times, and identify opportunities for supporting their rapid implementation.

Reflecting on the delays in the delivery of the Cranbrook Expansion Areas (see para. 6.2 of the latest Housing Monitoring Report), it appears that the Local Planning Authority is, in order to speed up the rate of delivery from the second new community, advocating a conventional approach, with planning applications being submitted pursuant to Policy WS01, rather than, as was the case with the Cranbrook Expansion Areas, requiring the delivery of a second geographically specific development plan document.

Even with the accelerated option, it is likely that it will take a number of years to achieve first completions, with ordinarily, the following stages being required:

the pre-application advice process;

the submission and determination of an outline planning application (resolution to grant);

the completion of the Section 106 Legal Agreement;

site acquisition;

preparation of pre-reserved matters applications, such as a design code;

preparation of a reserved matters application;

submission and determination of a reserved matters application;

submission and discharge of any pre-commencement and pre-occupation planning conditions and obligations;

site clearance/infrastructure servicing; and

first legal completions.

Research undertaken by Lichfields [Lichfields, 'Start to Finish,' March 2024]. indicates that the median timeframe for an application of over 2,000 homes to be validated to the first detailed permission (which could be either an outline and a reserved matters application, or hybrid/full application) is 5.1 years. Whilst it is acknowledged that the new community is likely, given land ownerships, to be brought forward via multiple applications, which could seek permission for a smaller quantum of development on an individual basis, it provides a conservative, yet realistic timeframe for a development of the comprehensive scale being proposed. Lichfields then conclude that sites of over 2,000 dwellings will take between 1.4 and 1.7 years to move from the first planning permission to first occupations. Consequently, they predict that for a site of the scale of the proposed new community, the overall lead-in time to first completions is between six and seven years.

At a local level, the most obvious comparisons are the Expansion Areas at the Cranbrook New Community. An application on the Treasbeare Expansion Area was submitted at the end of July 2022. East Devon District Council resolved to grant approval on the Expansion Area in February 2023 and outline planning permission was approved in June 2024. Consequently, planning permission was achieved in just under two years. The Council's latest housing Monitoring Report confirms that first completions from the Expansion Area are forecast in monitoring year 2026/27. This analysis suggests that it will take five monitoring years from submission of the outline planning application to first completions at the Treasbeare Expansion Area. Consequently, there exists the potential to accelerate delivery from the new community beyond that advocated by Lichfields.

BUILD OUT RATES

Lichfields' analysis confirms that for developments of 2,000 dwellings or more, the average annual completion rate ranges from 100 to 188 dwellings per annum. They do, however, identify three sites where the annual average build-out rate was in excess of 200 dwellings per annum. Again, looking more locally, research by LRM Planning indicates that over the period 2012/13 to 2023/24, a total of 2,879 homes were constructed at Cranbrook, which provides an annual average completion rate of 240 homes. Delivery peaked in 2014/15 at just under 400 completions. This rate of delivery was also achieved whilst other developments in close proximity to Cranbrook and within the West End were also delivering, including Redhayes (Tithebarn Green/Mosshayne) and Pinhoe, which could have impacted on the 'absorption rate.' Again, it indicates that historically, annual average delivery rates at the upper end of Lichfields analysis have recently been achieved within the West End.

It is acknowledged that the rates of delivery from Cranbrook were achieved in differing economic circumstances, but equally delivery from the new community is envisaged over the medium and longer terms and therefore over a full economic cycle.

Moreover, Table 12 of the latest Housing Monitoring Update also envisaged an annual average delivery rate of 288 homes per annum from the Cranbrook Expansion Areas over the period 2026/27 to 2030/31. Excluding the first year of completions, which are ordinarily lower, annual average delivery rates are anticipated to be over 300 homes per annum.

LEAD-IN TIMES

The analysis undertaken by Lichfields suggests that it could take between six and seven years from the submission of a valid planning application to first legal completions. More locally, the Treasbeare Expansion Area is forecast to come forward within five monitoring years.

Based on more locally specific examples, and an assumption that at least one planning application on the new community would be submitted by the time of the Local Plan Examination in Public, a realistic lead-in time until first legal completions is set out in Table 1 on page 20 of the attached document.

On the basis of the lead-in times outlined in Table 1 above, this would leave 12 monitoring years for the 3,300 homes envisaged by Policy WS01 to be delivered by 2042 to be completed. This equates to an annual average delivery rate of 275 homes per annum. Whilst this represents an increase in the historic delivery rates at Cranbrook, it is a rate of delivery that has been achieved across the West End as a whole and it accords with the rate of delivery forecast from the Cranbrook Expansion Areas. Accordingly, it is considered that the planned provision proposed for the second new community is aspirational, but a deliverable proposition. Therefore, the quantum of development proposed for the second new community over the plan period (3,300 homes) will be effective.

However, the historic rates of delivery within the West End and Cranbrook were only achieved because multiple outlets were all delivering homes at the same time. To achieve the rates of delivery anticipated for the second new community within the emerging Local Plan, there will again be the need for multiple outlets delivering at least from both the north and the south simultaneously.

THE SECOND NEW COMMUNITY

Consistent with the Plan's spatial strategy, which has been demonstrated to be the most appropriate, Policy WS01 proposes the allocation of a second new community. Following an assessment of three potential options through both a discrete technical

assessment and via the Sustainability Appraisal, the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan continues to identify land to the north of the A3052, east of the M5 and to the south of the A30 as being the preferred location for the second new community.

The Cherwell Group strongly supports the Local Planning Authority's assessment that a second new community is required in order to meet the housing requirement and agree with its proposed location. Indeed, as set out in Section 10 below, the Cherwell Group's own analysis of potential locations for the second new community would suggest that the Local Planning Authority's own assessment work underplays the scoring for the proposed location for the new community.

However, their concerns only strengthen the conclusions presented within the Local Planning Authority's assessment work; that Option 1 is the most sustainable option and has rightfully been taken forward as the preferred option in the consultation version of the Local Plan.

Notwithstanding the above, this section of these representations does not focus on the evidence base underpinning the emerging Local Plan, but instead focuses on Policy WS01 of the emerging Local Plan, and the Local Plan's Policies Map.

The Cherwell Group's comments on these matters is provided below.

POLICIES MAP

Whilst not a document that will be subject of Examination, the Cherwell Group are supportive of the Policies Map, which allocates land at Axehayes Farm as part of the wider second new community.

Having regard to the technical work prepared by the Cherwell Group and the Local Planning Authority, the site's allocation is a justified proposition. The development proposed on the site will help to ensure that Policy WS01 and therefore the wider Local Plan, is deliverable and therefore effective.

HOUSING

The emerging Local Plan proposes that around 3,300 new homes will be brought forward on land allocated within the proposed new community in the period up to 2042, with a further 4,700 new homes to follow in the period after 2042. The Local Planning Authority also proposes to increase the size of the new community by a further 2,000 homes, to 10,000 homes, over the longer term.

As set out in the section above, in the period up to 2042, in order for the housing provision envisaged from the second new community to be delivered in full, there is likely to be the need to adopt an average annual rate of delivery of around 275 homes per annum. It has been demonstrated above that whilst this rate of delivery is aspirational, it is deliverable and therefore effective.

In order to achieve the required annual average rate of delivery from the new community, it is highly likely that multiple development locations, each delivering housing at the same time, will be required. This will require development to occur from at least the north and south development nodes. With each development node having multiple outlets, it is likely that the rate of delivery could be achieved. In this regard it is noted that the HELAA methodology states that sites of this scale (or in this case nodes given the geographical area of the second new community) could deliver 150 homes per annum.

FORMS OF HOUSING

The Cherwell Group intend, as is proposed to be required by the emerging Local Plan, for a range of types, sizes and tenures of homes to be provided. Housing will be provided to meet the needs of the community, including families, those that want to build or commission their own homes and the elderly.

PHASING

The Cherwell Group are aware that the Local Planning Authority's advisors have prepared an indicative phasing strategy. It shows Axehayes Farm as coming forward in

the period to 2042. Such an approach would ensure that development closest to the services, facilities and employment opportunities within Exeter would come forward in advance of more peripheral locations to the east. It would help to ensure that the required sustainable and active travel connections within the western areas of the southern development node of the proposed new community come forward before development to the east.

DENSITY

The Policy sets an expectation that there will be a site wide density of 45 dwellings per hectare, with higher density of at least 55 to 60 dwellings per hectare within the town centre, neighbourhood centres and around key destinations and transport hubs.

Based on the land use budget contained within the landowner presentation provided by the Council's consultants, the Cherwell Group have a number of concerns with this approach, including:

the topography across the wider new community presents a significant challenge. Achieving consistent gross densities of 45dph in sloping areas is unlikely to be feasible without compromising on quality design, accessibility and placemaking;

the calculations underpinning the masterplan appear to be based on gross density, which does not reflect how density is actually delivered in residential parcels. Once incidental open space, existing landscape features that will need to be retained and infrastructure (including streets) are factored in, the net density within development parcels would need to be considerably higher, potentially pushing beyond what the local market can realistically support;

in order to achieve these density requirements, the housing mix would need to be skewed heavily towards higher density typologies, which may not reflect local housing need or demand.

These concerns will need to be responded to in the next consultation version of the Regulation 19 Plan.

GYPSY AND TRAVELLER

Policy WS01 of the emerging Local Plan seeks the provision of 30 Gypsy and Traveller pitches within the new community, of which 15 will be provided in the period up to 2042.

The Cherwell Group acknowledges that the Council has a duty to meet the housing needs of the Gypsy and Traveller community. However, the Cherwell Group have a number of issues with the approach being adopted by the Local Planning Authority, which include:

the need for Gypsy and Traveller provision;

the location of the proposed Gypsy and Traveller provision;

reasonable alternatives; and

viability.

THE NEED FOR GYPSY AND TRAVELLER PROVISION

The Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) confirms that the following provision is required over the plan period to 2042:

Gypsy and Traveller provision that met the planning definition – 18 pitches;

undetermined Gypsy and Traveller need – up to 7 pitches;

Gypsy and Travellers that do not meet the planning definition – 4 pitches; and

Travelling Showpeople – 0 pitches.

At most, there is a need for 29 pitches, although as stated in the Council's GTAA, it is envisaged that the needs of households that were assessed as part of the evidence base work that do not fall within the definition of Annex 1 of the national planning policy for traveller sites "should be met as part of the general housing need [ORS , East Devon District Council Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (2024), para. 8.5]." Consequently, there is a need for 25 pitches over the plan period.

The assessment work does not include an assessment of provision that benefits from planning permission, but which has not, as yet, come forward. In that regard we note that planning permission has been secured for 15 pitches from the Cobdens [Application 22/0406/MOUT] and Treasbeare Expansion Areas [Application 22/1532/MOUT]. If, as is suggested by the document, this additional provision has not been included in the assessment, then the residual requirement would reduce to just 10 pitches.

The Cherwell Group are also aware that Policy WS11 of the emerging Local Plan proposes to allocate land to the east of the M5 for at least five pitches. Consequently, on a worst case basis, including assuming that no Gypsy and Traveller provision came forward through criteria-based Policy HN09, then there would be a residual requirement for only five pitches.

To plan for a higher quantum, without the necessary evidence to suggest that it is required, would not be a justified approach.

Over the longer-term, it would appear that there is limited evidence to suggest that there is a need for a further 15 pitches in the period post 2042. The Local Planning Authority's evidence base work only establishes needs between 2023 and 2045. It only identifies a further need for three additional pitches in the period between 2042 and 2045. It does not suggest that there is a need for a further 15 pitches beyond the plan period. Consequently, it would be an unjustified strategy to plan for this additional provision at this stage. Instead, it is considered that the additional provision post 2042 should, if it is to be provided within the second new community, be considered as part of the subsequent development plan document that will allocate the additional 2,000

homes required to ensure that the new community reaches 10,000 homes in total. That would ensure that the requirement is evidenced and would therefore be a justified strategy.

THE LOCATION OF THE PROPOSED GYPSY AND TRAVELLER PROVISION

Without prejudice to the points made above, should there be a need for Gypsy and Traveller provision to be made within the second new community, then its/their location will need to be carefully considered. There will be a need to ensure that, amongst other things, the chosen site or sites is/are suitable from a topographical, landscape and access perspective. Experience from the Cranbrook development would also indicate that noise is a significant constraint given the inability for noise mitigation to be provided for trailers. This could suggest a location divorced from existing noise sources, including the strategic transport network and existing employment sites, would be more appropriate.

Moreover, previous studies have highlighted the A30 as being a key travelling route [Devon Partnership, Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment, 2015]. As such, a location in close proximity to that strategic route could be appropriate.

REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES

The emerging Local Plan only proposes to make two allocations to meet the needs of the Gypsy and Traveller community; within Policies WS01 and HN09 of the emerging Local Plan. Other than these two options, both of which are allocated for development, there does not appear to be any assessment of other reasonable alternatives within the District where the housing needs of the Gypsy and Traveller community could be met.

This is particularly important, as the evidence base underpinning the spatial strategy confirms that the most preferable distribution of development would see 60% of housing need met within the West End. However, having regard to the committed Gypsy and Traveller development within Cranbrook and proposed allocations WS01 and HN09, 100% of the Gypsy and Traveller need is proposed to be focused in the West End. This appears to conflict with the conclusions of the evidence base and is not, therefore, a justified proposition.

VIABILITY

Evidence prepared in support of the Cranbrook Plan demonstrated that the proposed Gypsy and Traveller provision from the Expansion Areas would have resulted in a financial loss. Cranbrook Plan Document PSD36 confirmed that the cost for constructing the 15 Gypsy and Traveller pitches within the Cranbrook Expansion Areas would be £1,808,000. Cranbrook Plan Document PSD21a confirms that the values of the Gypsy and Traveller plots was, at that time, £55,000, giving a total value for the 15 pitches of £825,000. Consequently, a loss of £983,000 was predicted. We are aware that since the Cranbrook Plan was made, developers are now, via the Section 106 Legal Agreements, required to construct the pitches at their cost, and transfer them for £1 to the Local Planning Authority. Consequently, their construction cost will be a cost borne to the wider development.

Given the above, and assuming that there is a requirement for the development to provide the constructed pitches, as there was at Cranbrook, in order to ensure that the new community is an effective proposition, the loss associated with the Gypsy and Traveller provision should be fully reflected within any viability assessment.

EMPLOYMENT LAND AND THE TOWN CENTRE

The proposed development at Axehayes Farm does not, as reflected in the Council's proposed masterplan for the second new community, propose any employment land or town centre uses. Consequently, the Cherwell Group do not provide any detailed comments regarding the proposals.

Notwithstanding the above, they are supportive of the provision of both employment land and town centre uses within the second new community, which will provide a strong fit with national planning policy [Para. 74 and 105 of the NPPF]. The provision of employment and town centre uses (housing a range of services and facilities) will be key components of the proposed new community. Both the employment and town centre uses will ensure that the daily needs of the residents of the new community are met, which will, by internalising trips, therefore limit the need to travel, which in turn will help to reduce congestion and emissions.

SOCIAL, COMMUNITY & EDUCATION FACILITIES AND OTHER INFRASTRUCTURE

The Cherwell Group acknowledge that to ensure that the second new community constitutes sustainable development, there will be a need for it to include social, community and education facilities. For large-scale development such as that being proposed, this is a requirement of national planning policy [Para. 74 and 97 of the NPPF].

In regard to Policy WS01, it is noted that there will be a requirement for a full range of social, cultural, leisure, health, community and education facilities. This is not disputed by the Cherwell Group. Indeed, they will be an important placemaking component of the second new community. However, it is noted that a number of key evidence base documents that will be required to underpin the Local Plan, including the infrastructure delivery strategy for the new community, the playing pitch strategy and the open space strategy, have not, as yet, been produced. These will need to be published alongside the second Regulation 19 consultation in order to demonstrate that the proposals are justified and effective.

Indeed, it is highly likely that the social, community and education requirements for the new town will be informed by consultation with key infrastructure providers. These responses will need to be assessed to ensure that they satisfy the tests of Regulation 122(2) of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations and are afforded a prioritisation. As with the Cranbrook Plan, the prioritisation will be an important element of work so as to ensure that the development is a viable proposition.

We comment on the proposals shown in the Council's latest masterplanning work for an all-through school to be located within land that is within the control of the Cherwell Group in the masterplanning section below.

INFRASTRUCTURE

PUBLIC OPEN SPACE PROVISION

The Cherwell Group acknowledge that the new community will be required to provide on-site public open space provision. As stated in national planning policy, access to a network of high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and physical activity is important for the health and well-being of communities and has other wider benefits [Para. 102 of the NPPF].

However, national planning policy also states that policies should be based on robust and up-to-date assessment of needs for open space, sport and recreation and opportunities for new provision. At the time of writing, neither the playing pitch strategy nor the open space strategy has been published. As stated above, these documents will be required to be published alongside the second Regulation 19 consultation in order to demonstrate that the Council's masterplan proposals are deliverable within the land allocated in the emerging Local Plan for the new community, and therefore Policy WS01 is an effective and justified proposition.

SANG

As set out in para. 13.15 of the emerging Plan, the provision of SANG land forms a key element of mitigation for developments that are located within 10km of the Exe Estuary Special Protection Area (SPA) and the Pebblebed Heaths Special Area of Conservation (SAC). The emerging Plan's supporting text suggests that mitigation should be provided at a rate of 8ha per 1,000 population, which was the same requirement as set out in Policy CB14 of the Cranbrook Plan. However, unlike Policy CB14 of the Cranbrook Plan, an occupancy rate is not provided. To ensure that there is no ambiguity regarding the expectations for SANG land, an occupancy rate should be clearly stated within the emerging Plan.

ACTIVE, SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT AND OTHER HIGHWAYS IMPROVEMENTS

As evidenced by AWP's joint commission, which is discussed in Section 2 above, the Cherwell Group are supportive of the transport strategy for the new community affording a priority to active and sustainable modes of transport as part of a wider 'vision and validate' approach. Indeed, alongside the mix of uses proposed within the development, it will ensure that journeys within the new community are capable of being made by active and sustainable modes of transport. This will not only reduce carbon emissions and have health benefits, but it will also potentially avoid physical

infrastructure improvements. Active and sustainable transport connections will also be proposed to local destinations, including via the provision of park and rides and mobility hubs.

The Cherwell Group's masterplan, which is described in Section 2 above, incorporates the proposed pedestrian, cycle and highway connections proposed in AWP's work.

COMMUNITY ENERGY/HEATING AND ON-SITE RENEWABLE ENERGY PRODUCTION

The Cherwell Group comment on the emerging policy framework in relation to carbon reduction, district heating and renewable energy generation in Section 8 of these representations.

SURFACE WATER DRAINAGE

As set out in Section 2 above, on behalf of the wider consortium, AWP have prepared a surface water drainage strategy for the new community. It has, where relevant to Axehayes Farm, been incorporated into the Cherwell Group's masterplan.

NEW EDUCATION PROVISION

As indicated above, the Cherwell Group acknowledge that education provision will be an important component of social infrastructure within the new community that will help with place-making. They are therefore supportive of its provision on-site. They do, however, have concerns relating to the proposed location of the campus school. These concerns are set out below.

///// PART 1 - CONTINUED IN PART 2 6825bd8a8d67220013ed5d07 /////

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: N/A

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified

above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: N/A

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : Due to the significant policy issues concerned

3.12

Full name: Neal Jillings

Organisation (where relevant): Summerfield Homes Ltd

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Paragraph

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:

3.12

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Paragraph 1.1 confirms that the requirements of Regulation 19 have not been met as 'each' of the submission documents have not been made available in accordance with Regulation 35. NPPF(234)(a) does not apply and the requirements of the December 2024 NPPF and the December 2024 Standard Method housing requirement apply for the purposes of plan making.

1.2 & 1.4 should refer to 1,188, rather than 1,146

2.1 assumes that all new homes with permission will be built out. this contradicts reality, which is acknowledged in para. 2.6, which clearly infers that not all houses that gain planning permission will be built out.

5.1's assessment of 5yr HLS is predicated on artificially lowering the already insufficient housing requirement with a view to demonstrating and adequate land supply position. If the Council bases its land supply calculation on the requirements being 71% (850

being this proportion of 1,188) of what the standard method requirement is, then it is no more than a paper exercise.

The calculations in Appendix 5 (Rolling 5yr land supply calculations) are incorrect. Planning Practice (ref. Paragraph: 013 Reference ID: 68-023-20241212) states that 'The housing requirement to be considered for the purposes of this buffer is defined as the total housing requirement, divided by the number of years in the plan period, rather than any stepped housing requirement'. This means that the 20% buffer applies to the 950 figure and not to the 850 figure as the Council has done. This seems self evident following Planning Practice Guidance. The impact on annual requirement with the buffer is that the requirement should be 1,140 rather than 1,020. This changes the supply figure for 2027/28 (assuming the buffer) as 4.63 years rather than the stated 5.18 years.

NPPF(73)(a) requires 'at least' 10% of housing supply to be from small sites under 1 hectare. The Local Plan undershoots against this very clear minimum target. The proposed get out of windfall sites bridging the modest shortfall is insufficient and is in conflict with the requirements of 73(a). this policy clearly states that the Council should identify the means of achieving this minimum target, through development plan and brownfield registers. Identifying an uncertain source of supply does not, in our view, meet the spirit or intent of the NPPF in this regard. I am not sure that a supply of one off self build windfalls meets the intent to support Small and Medium Enterprise housebuilders. More small sites should be identified in the Local Plan.

Regarding Appendix 4 (Allocated sites projections) should be amended as follows.

Axmi_24 - it has a resolution to grant and is likely to be commenced in 26/27. Delivery should be brought 6 years forward Sidm_31 - Application in awaiting determination. Commencement should be brought forward to commence in 27/28. Delivery should be brought 5 years forward. Dunk_05 - Application to be submitted 25/26, with commencement expected 27/28. Delivery should be brought 2 years forward.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: Allocate more small sites to satisfy the requirement in

NPPF(73)(a). Amend delivery rates of identified sites above. Amend calculations on rolling land supply to reflect clear Planning Practice Guidance text.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

3.13

Full name: Rachel Danemann

Organisation (where relevant): Home Builders Federation (HBF)

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Paragraph

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:

3.13

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: 51. HBF welcomes the inclusion of a housing trajectory within the Plan, as this is essential for the effective monitoring of the Plan.

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: 53. The trajectory also clearly illustrates and underlines our concerns about the phasing of the housing requirement over the plan period with the majority of the housing being delivered later in the Plan pe-riod. This conflicts with the overarching national policy approach of seeking to increase house build-ing in the short and medium term.

54. The housing trajectory should also be clear how much of the housing requirement is to be delivered through Neighbourhood Plans. As neighbourhood planning is an entirely voluntary activity and as such is outside of the control of the Council, HBF do not believe housing delivered through Neighbourhood Plans is a reliable enough source of supply to contribute to the Housing Land Supply Position, and they should be viewed as providing additional capacity.

55. Overall, therefore HBF do not believe the housing requirement or the housing land supply is sound, for all the reasons listed above, and the Council need to fundamentally revisit the Plan. The need for the Plan to be considered under the new Dev 2024 NPPF, and not the transitional arrangements, fundamentally increases the

starting point for the housing requirement considerations which HBF would then argue need to be higher for the reasons set out above.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: . However, the Appendix One housing trajectory is currently insufficient. In order to enable effective monitoring and to demonstrate the 5 Year Land supply on adoption of the Plan the Housing Trajectory should be expanded to show a minimum the site-by-site, year-by-year breakdown of housing de-livery over the plan period. This must also then link into the Monitoring Framework for this Plan.

52. As mentioned earlier, in order to enable effective there is a need to split out delivery from Cranbrook and delivery of the rets of the housing requirement.

In our view this means the Plan needs to be wholly revisited to include a higher housing requirement and additional housing allocations. We cannot see how our concerns, which are so fundamental, could be addressed through the EIP process by suggested Main Modifications.

3.15

Full name: Peter Strouts

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Paragraph

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:

3.15

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: No

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: East Devon have allocated a immense amount of housing in Lympstone and Exmouth. There is not a sustainable transport solution for these settlements. There is one train line which is accessible to the houses already developed near to the stations and a cycle path. The majority of the houses are not near these sustainable transport solutions and all proposed developments are not near, meaning a substantial increase in road use, and so higher risks of car accidents, CO2 and emissions, but also a larger delay for workers getting to work, reducing their productivity. All sites are green sites, meaning a reduction in farm land for sustainable living, plus a loss in biodiversity, trees, soil quality and worsening flash flooding.

2(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter legally compliant, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter legally compliant. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: A dramatic reduction in the number of houses allocated to Lympstone and Exmouth.

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: As mentioned above. Too many houses is unsustainable and makes net zero harder to achieve.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified

above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: A dramatic reduction in the number of houses to be built.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: No

4(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.: East Devon is allocating the lion share of houses in settlements like Lympstone and Exmouth because they have a local train, trying to justify the developments as sustainable. But the developments are at least a mile from the train, and never used by residents in these locations. For instance in Lympstone theses developments would lead to car use into the village, increasing pollution, accidents, and delays (meaning lower output of workers).

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : I advise clients such as Legal and General and Network Rail on sustainable development of their land. I really do not think much sensible thought is going into these local plans.

3.27

Full name: suzanne page

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Paragraph

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:

3.27

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: Yes

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: The suggestion to use the land at Feniton is inappropriate due to road service to the site. It has been recently shown during the flood alleviation works with increased HGV traffic to this site and redirection during road closures the villages experienced road traffic delays of up to 30 minutes when two hubs attempt to pass on the road. Constant permanent increase in HGV traffic on the single lane roads that serve the site will result in ongoing widespread road obstructions impeding children's ability to access school on time and affecting the villagers ability to get to work.

Also residents of old Feniton uae green lane to walk to the station HGVs on this road will be high risk for road traffic accidents with cyclists and pedestrians on the lane.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: If access to the site is via green lane not off the main road (A30) then the road would need to be dual lane with pavements and or cycle paths added to the station for safety.

Or access only off the a30

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

3.32

Full name: Sue Cooper

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Paragraph

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:

3.32

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: Yes

2(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter legally compliant, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter legally compliant. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: None

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: Yes

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: Support for East Budleigh Settlement Boundary –SPO5 para 3.32 and the settlement boundary shown on CSD-002 - Local Plan Interactive Policies Map based on the methodology outlined in the The Settlement Boundaries Topic Paper and the site assessment undertaken by East Devon.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: None

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

3.38

Full name: Natalie Daly

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:

3.38

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: Yes

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: There is no consideration for the wider sewage system infrastructure. The current sewage system is not able to handle the already in place usage, nevermind adding more houses to the system. It is spoiling Exmouth and Budleigh Beach and Sandy Bay, leading to reduced tourism and ultimately reduced economic spend on a town which relies on tourism. Nowhere is there reference to sewage, sewage capacity and the lack of sewage infrastructure. When will this be factored into planning for new homes and people held accountable. We will end up with more instances in Exmouth where the beach has to be closed in it's busy summer periods damaging the town as it did August 2024. If building new homes was paused until the sewage infrastructure was improved, this would put pressure on south west water to invest and improve the system.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: Consider the pressure on the current and not-fir-for-use sewage infrastructure and state how you will improve it to be able to handle the planned increased us.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: No

4(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.: For the reasons above as there are issues with the sewage infrastructure which are being ignored and are ultimately decreasing the quality of the towns of those already living there. The people's voice around this issue is being ignored. South West Water need to be held accountable.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Claire Alers-Hankey

Organisation (where relevant): Greenslade Taylor Hunt

Other party name (if relevant): Waddeton Park Ltd

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

Full name: Nick Matthews

Organisation (where relevant): Savills

Other party name (if relevant): Mac Mic Strategic Land

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : See previous comments.

Full name: Nick Matthews

Organisation (where relevant): Savills

Other party name (if relevant): Mac Mic Strategic Land

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : We object to the inflexible nature of this policy and wish to explain this position to the Inspector.

Full name: Nick Matthews

Organisation (where relevant): Savills

Other party name (if relevant): Mac Mic Strategic Land

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

Full name: Nick Matthews

Organisation (where relevant): Savills

Other party name (if relevant): Mac Mic Strategic Land

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

SP01

Full name: Sara Davies

Organisation (where relevant): Lympstone Water Quality Group

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: No

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: The selection of 'sustainable locations' is based on a flawed Sustainability Appraisal. The latter does not reflect current evidence on water quality, catchment sensitivities, or the concerns raised by local communities. Consequently, development is proposed in areas which are not sustainable, e.g., Exmouth and Lympstone on the Exe Estuary, which is a Special Protection Area, SSSI, and Ramsar site. There is no reference to the Habitats Regulations Assessment.

2(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter legally compliant, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter legally compliant. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: Review and update the Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulations Assessment to ensure they are accurate and robust. Demonstrate that the Spatial Strategy is seriously considering these assessments, particularly concerning water quality which is a critical issue for East Devon.

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: It is not based on a robust and up-to-date Sustainability Appraisal. Some of the 'sustainable locations' identified are not appropriate locations for further development due to the sensitivities of the catchments and water bodies, e.g., in Exmouth and Lympstone on the Exe Estuary.

Suggested modification: Update the vision so it reflects the importance of our natural watercourses, and the role of the planning system in protecting and improving water quality and biodiversity. See 'Planning Advice for Integrated Water Management', https://catchmentbasedapproach.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/Planning-Advice-Note.pdf

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: As stated in 2(c).

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: No

4(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.: The fact that the spatial strategy does not reflect the sensitivities of the catchments and water bodies (e.g., in Exmouth and Lympstone) indicates that there has been inadequate cooperation on these issues which relate to both environmental protection and infrastructure planning.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Robert Jones

Organisation (where relevant): River Otter Fisheries Association

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: SP01 – We agree with EDDC that central Government housing requirements do not take sufficient account of the substantial part of East Devon that is AONB – EDNL / National Nature Reserve /SAC or other sensitive natural environment including the rivers Axe and Otter and that accordingly further development in East Devon has to be satisfied in a substantially reduced land area. Accordingly central Government calculations should revised DOWNWARDS to reflect this fact.

Full name: George Marshall

Organisation (where relevant): Exeter City Council

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: Yes

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: Housing Reflecting the boundaries of the local housing market area, East Devon, Exeter, Mid Devon and Teignbridge Councils have jointly commissioned local housing needs assessments and gypsy and traveller accommodation assessments which ensure needs will be met across the sub-region on consistent basis. There is also a consistent housing and employment land availability assessment methodology across the area. The City Council notes that East Devon District Council is planning to meet its housing requirement within its boundary, an approach which is supported by the City Council.

Employment East Devon, Exeter, Mid Devon and Teignbridge Councils have a jointly commissioned economic development needs assessment which provides the employment evidence for the functional economic area (FEMA). It is noted that through the East Devon Local Plan East Devon are making a significant contribution to employment land requirements and that overall, the employment development needs of the FEMA are being met. This demonstrates that the area operates on a 2 functional geography which crosses administrative boundaries. The City Council supports this approach.

Full name: Iestyn John

Organisation (where relevant): Bell Cornwell LLP

Other party name (if relevant): Clinton Devon Estates

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Please see attached representation.

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : In order to address questions which might arise on housing delivery and the spatial strategy.

Full name: Iestyn John

Organisation (where relevant): Bell Cornwell LLP

Other party name (if relevant): Dorepark Ltd

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: Yes

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: Please see attached representations.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : In order that we can provide information on matters which are central to housing supply and spatial strategy.

Full name: Iestyn John

Organisation (where relevant): Bell Cornwell LLP

Other party name (if relevant): Dorepark Ltd

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: Yes

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: Please see attached submission.

Full name: Amy Roberts

Organisation (where relevant): Bell Cornwell LLP

Other party name (if relevant): Waddeton Park Ltd

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Please refer to attached sheet.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: Please refer to attached sheet.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : To emphasise that the spatial strategy is flawed because sensible options for housing delivery around Cranbrook (but outside of the Cranbrook DPD area) have not been considered.

Full name: Amy Roberts

Organisation (where relevant): Bell Cornwell LLP

Other party name (if relevant): Clyst Haven Ltd

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: Yes

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: Please refer to the attached sheet.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Amy Roberts

Organisation (where relevant): Bell Cornwell LLP

Other party name (if relevant): GB House and Son

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: Yes

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: Please refer to the attached sheet.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Amy Roberts

Organisation (where relevant): Bell Cornwell LLP

Other party name (if relevant): Mr and Mrs Feast

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: Yes

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: Please refer to the attached sheet.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Daniel Rogers

Organisation (where relevant): Bell Cornwell LLP

Other party name (if relevant): Mr B Penny

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: MR B PENNY REPRESENTATIONS ON THE EAST DEVON LOCAL PLAN (2020 – 2042) REGULATION 19 CONSULTATION DRAFT (MARCH 2025) BY BELL CORNWELL LLP 1 INTRODUCTION Bell Cornwell LLP acts as planning consultant for Mr. Bruce Penny, the long standing owner of land to the south of Courtlands Lane. Land registry details (DN548773) show that Mr. Penny is the freehold owner of the site. His land currently benefits from a draft allocation for 12 dwellings under reference Exmo_23. The land is currently in agricultural use. Our client, therefore, has significant interest in the future local plan for the district. Against this background, the following comments are made on the draft policies within the East Devon Local Plan Regulation 19. Consultation. CHAPTER 3. THE SPATIAL STRATEGY Strategic Policy SP01: Spatial Strategy Mr. Penny supports the overall approach of Strategic Policy SP01: Spatial Strategy which allocates Exmouth as a Principle Settlement for the district. The general strategy approach, which will see development allocations delivered at 5 different tiers of settlement in a dispersed approach to growth, is entirely appropriate and a sensible route to take. The identification of Exmouth as the principal settlement is supported. It is a logical choice given excellent range of facilities and is less environmentally constrained than many other towns in the district. The scale and form of growth can be carefully controlled through local development management policies so that it complements the character of the area and helps meet local needs. Similarly, it is important that the LPA meet there requirements under the NPPF to ensure that 10% of their allocations are delivered on small or medium sized sites as required by paragraph 73. Obviously small and medium sized sites can make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirement of an area, and are often built out relatively quickly. To promote the development of a good mix of sites local planning authorities should: a) identify, through the development plan and brownfield registers, land to accommodate at least 10% of their housing requirement on sites no larger than one hectare…" Mr. Penny's site would represent

such an opportunity and being located outside of the AONB it is an eminently sensible allocation to meet this requirement at just under 0.5ha.

Full name: Daniel Rogers

Organisation (where relevant): Bell Cornwell LLP

Other party name (if relevant): Acorn Property Group

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: ACORN PROPERTY GROUP REPRESENTATIONS ON THE EAST DEVON LOCAL PLAN (2020 – 2042) REGULATION 19 CONSULTATION DRAFT (MARCH 2025) BY BELL CORNWELL LLP 1 INTRODUCTION Acorn Property Group is a very well-established, locally based housing developer and land promoter with interests across the district. Acorn Property Group has helped to facilitate new homes, affordable housing and other uses in the area. They are an independent development and regeneration specialist that has, successfully created a range of residential-led refurbishment and new build schemes. Specifically, Acorn Property Group has interests in land at Hillhead, Colyton, which is an allocated site in the Emerging Local Plan which is suitable for residential development. Given the nature of their long-standing delivery of housing in the district, Acorn Property Group is an important local stakeholder within interests in the proposals in the East Devon Local Plan for future development in the district. Against this background, Bell Cornwell LLP has reviewed the policies and information set out in the East Devon Local Plan (2020 - 2042) Regulation 19 Consultation Draft and makes the following representations. CHAPTER 3. THE SPATIAL STRATEGY Strategic Policy SP01: Spatial Strategy Acorn Property Group supports the overall approach of Strategic Policy SP01: Spatial Strategy and, in particular, the support for development at the Local Centres (including Colyton) that meets local needs and the needs of those in the immediate surrounding areas. The dispersed approach to growth, which will see proportionate and much needed growth in a wide spread of settlements is the most appropriate strategy for the district. One of the failings of the current Local Plan (and part of the reason why the LPA have suffered from a lack of 5 year housing land supply in recent years) is due to the current strategy that sees the vast majority of delivery in a single location (e.g. Cranbrook) and in a new town which takes significant time to deliver. A more dispersed spatial strategy will provide a better opportunity for more varied housing stock and a potentially faster rate of housing delivery. Securing housing growth across a wide spread of settlements is the most

appropriate strategy for the district. ACORN PROPERTY GROUP REPRESENTATIONS ON THE EAST DEVON LOCAL PLAN (2020 – 2042) REGULATION 19 CONSULTATION DRAFT (MARCH 2025) BY BELL CORNWELL LLP 2 The adopted local plan did not focus sufficiently on existing towns and villages and an approach that looks to re-engage and deliver development at all tiers of settlement should be welcomed. Local centres like Colyton, with good levels of services and facilities can play an important role in housing delivery, and the current strategy takes a positive approach which will ensure the districts housing and employment needs are catered for.

Full name: Daniel Rogers

Organisation (where relevant): Bell Cornwell LLP

Other party name (if relevant): Mr J Persey

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: MR J PERSEY REPRESENTATIONS ON THE EAST DEVON LOCAL PLAN (2020 – 2042) REGULATION 19 CONSULTATION DRAFT (MARCH 2025) BY BELL CORNWELL LLP 1 INTRODUCTION Mr Persey and his family are long standing owners of large areas of agricultural land in East Devon. Our client's interests include much of the land around the village of Plymtree and the surrounding area. The family continue to farm the land today, and also have commercial operations including Fordmore Farm Shop and other commercial space on the East Devon / Mid Devon border. Our client therefore has a wide range of land and building interests in the district and they are actively promoting a site for housing in the village of Plymtree (Plym_03). Against this background, Bell Cornwell LLP has reviewed the policies and information set out in the East Devon Local Plan (2020 -2042) Regulation 19 Consultation Draft and makes the following representations. CHAPTER 3. THE SPATIAL STRATEGY Strategic Policy SP01: Spatial Strategy Mr. Persey supports the overall approach of Strategic Policy SP01: Spatial Strategy which encourages development and housing allocations at service villages like Plymtree. The general strategy approach, which will see development allocations delivered at 5 different tiers of settlement in a dispersed approach to growth, is entirely appropriate and a sensible route to take. As service village, Plymtree (with its existing services, facilities and infrastructure) is well placed to take proportionate but much needed growth. The village has a good range of facilities (school, shop, village hall, pub) and is not environmentally constrained being entirely outside of the AONB. It ultimately has more facilities and is less environmentally constrained than many other villages in the district. Plymtree has appropriate facilities to receive an allocation, and the scale and form of growth can be carefully controlled through local development management policies so that it complements the character of the area and helps meet local needs. The current PAN number for the primary school shows that the school has capacity to accommodate more children, and additional development will help sustain village facilities. MR J

PERSEY REPRESENTATIONS ON THE EAST DEVON LOCAL PLAN (2020 – 2042) REGULATION 19 CONSULTATION DRAFT (MARCH 2025) BY BELL CORNWELL LLP 2 Collectively, villages could make a meaningful contribution to the district's overall housing land supply and growth of this type would also have the advantage of diversifying supply, meeting local needs and supporting rural facilities. Securing housing growth across a wide spread of settlements is the most appropriate strategy for the district. One of the failings of the current Local Plan (and part of the reason why the LPA have suffered from a lack of 5 year housing land supply in recent years) is due to the current strategy that sees the vast majority of delivery in a single location (e.g. Cranbrook) and in a new town which takes significant time to deliver due to the heavy infrastructure requirements that exists with delivering housing in such locations. In our view, the current local plan did not focus sufficiently on existing towns and villages and an approach that looks to re-engage and deliver development at all tiers of settlement should be welcomed. Even small villages like Plymtree, have existing infrastructure (a school, a pub, a shop) that can provide services and facilities for a proportionate amount of growth and additional housing will support these facilities and prevent rural villages from falling into a 'sustainability' trap, where they are not allowed to grow or thrive. It is important to ensure that the new local plan can deliver sufficient supply to allow for choice and flexibility in the local market. The ability to deliver employment and housing in service villages is a positive approach which will ensure the districts housing and employment needs are catered for.

Full name: Daniel Rogers

Organisation (where relevant): Bell Cornwell LLP

Other party name (if relevant): Combe Estates

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Strategic Policy SP01: Spatial Strategy Combe Estate supports the overall approach of Strategic Policy SP01: Spatial Strategy and, in particular, the support for prioritising significant development at the Main Centres (including Honiton) that meets local needs and those in immediate surrounding areas. The general strategy approach, which will see development allocations delivered at 5 different tiers of settlement in a dispersed approach to growth, is entirely appropriate and a sensible route to take. As main centre, Honiton (with its existing services, facilities and public transport infrastructure) is well placed to take significant but proportionate much needed growth, and securing this growth across a wide spread of settlements is the most appropriate strategy for the district. One of the failings of the current Local Plan (and part of the reason why the LPA have suffered from a lack of 5 year housing land supply in recent years) is due to the current strategy that sees the vast majority of delivery in a single location (e.g. Cranbrook) and in a new town which takes significant time to deliver. COMBE ESTATE REPRESENTATIONS ON THE EAST DEVON LOCAL PLAN (2020 – 2042) REGULATION 19 CONSULTATION DRAFT (MARCH 2025) BY BELL CORNWELL LLP 2 In our view, the current local plan did not focus sufficiently on existing towns and villages and an approach that looks to re-engage and deliver development at all tiers of settlement should be welcomed. Honiton can make a meaningful contribution to the district's overall housing land supply and growth of this type would also have the advantage of diversifying supply, meeting local needs and supporting rural facilities. Equally for employment development, sufficient provision must be made in the new local plan to support economic development right across the district so that growth is not stifled or lost to locations outside of East Devon. It is important to ensure that the new local plan can deliver sufficient supply to allow for choice and flexibility in the local market. The ability to deliver employment and housing in main centre locations is a positive

approach which will ensure the districts housing and employment needs are catered for.

Full name: Daniel Rogers

Organisation (where relevant): Bell Cornwell LLP

Other party name (if relevant): Various - see pdf attachments

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: Yes

2(a). If yes, and you wish to support the legal compliance of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: see attachment

2(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter legally compliant, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter legally compliant. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: See attachment

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: Yes

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: See attachment

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: See attachment

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

4(a). If yes, and you wish to support this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter's compliance with the duty to co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.: See attachment

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Bethan Haigh

Organisation (where relevant): Boyer Planning

Other party name (if relevant): Vistry Group

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: Vistry support the principle of the draft spatial strategy detailed within Policy SP01, which seeks to direct development towards the most sustainable locations in East Devon.

The most sustainable locations have been identified as the West End of the District, followed by the Principal Centre of Exmouth, and the Main Centres of Axminster, Honiton, Ottery St Mary, Seaton and Sidmouth. Vistry support the proposed settlement hierarchy, and its distribution of development to the most sustainable locations.

It is noted that settlements not listed within the Spatial Strategy are defined as in 'open countryside' for the purposes of the Local Plan. It should be recognised that development can contribute to increasing the sustainability of settlements through the provision of additional services and facilities. New development can also contribute to the long-term viability of settlements through the indirect spending of future occupiers, and the provision of future residents to ensure the long-term vitality of communities.

For the reasons described above, Vistry support Strategic Policy SP01 and its Spatial Strategy, which aims to meet the needs of the West End, Principal Centres, Main Centres, Local Centres, Service Villages and the wider open countryside as a whole.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : Our attendance is necessary to effectively discuss the points raised in these representations.

Full name: Bethan Haigh

Organisation (where relevant): Boyer Planning

Other party name (if relevant): Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd. C/O Boyer

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: Yes

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: Strategic Policy SP01 – Spatial Strategy

2.2 Strategic Policy SP01 confirms that new development will be directed towards the most sustainable locations in East Devon, with the most sustainable location identified as the West End of the District, followed by the Principal Centre of Exmouth and the Main Centres of Axminster, Honiton, Ottery St Mary, Seaton and Sidmouth.

2.3 We support Honiton's identification as a Main Centre, which is to accommodate significant development across the Plan period 'to serve its own needs and that of the wider surrounding areas'. Honiton is a sustainable settlement with a range of facilities and services, a mainline railway line and well placed to accommodate new development.

2.4 We support this settlement hierarchy and agree that it accords with the key tenet of the NPPF (2023), directing housing growth to the most sustainable locations.

Full name: Jemma Shorrock

Organisation (where relevant): Boyer Planning

Other party name (if relevant): Persimmon Homes South West Limited

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: PHSW supports that new development should be directed towards the most sustainable locations in Devon as set out within Strategic Policy SP01 which directs new development at the West End of the District, followed by the Principal Centre of Exmouth and the Main Centres, which include Axminster.

This approach is considered to be consistent with National Policy and the Government's long-standing policy of directing growth to the most sustainable locations as detailed within the NPPF (2023).

Full name: Nick Guildford

Organisation (where relevant): C G Fry & Son

Other party name (if relevant): Mr & Mrs Cowling

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: Yes

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: We fully support the identification of Hawkchurch as a Service Village, in acknowledgement that it represents a sustainable location for new development, providing an opportunity to make a meaningful contribution towards the significant housing needs of East Devon. Such new development is the lifeblood of smaller settlements helping to support local services and facilities which, in the case of Hawkchurch include the primary school, public house, church and village shop. It also helps to support the SME sector and the delivery of high quality local open market and affordable homes.

Full name: Simon Coles

Organisation (where relevant): CarneySweeney

Other party name (if relevant): C R Down Farming Ltd and Stuart Partners Ltd

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: CarneySweeney acts for CR Down Farming Ltd and Stuart Partners Ltd in connection with land south of A3052 and east of A376, Clyst St Mary, East Devon

We support the aim of the spatial strategy, in particular focussing the highest levels of growth in the West End. However, reference to the second new settlement is conspicuous by its absence.

The West End's distinctive characteristics are confirmed at Paragraph 3.4 1st bullet-point, which acknowledges that the West End is a highly sustainable area with strong functional links to Exeter, extensive infrastructure, proximity to urban services and efficient transport connections, making it a prime location for strategic development.

In addition, it is also notable that this part of the District is least constrained in environmental terms.

These characteristics make the West End the most appropriate area to accommodate major development through existing and new allocations. They also make the West End an appropriate area to meet needs arising in Exeter City Council's administrative area, which cannot be met there for capacity, viability and environmental reasons, as well as likely shortfalls in housing delivery against East Devon's housing requirements, as a result of the unduly onerous policies and provisions contained in the draft EDLP, likely under-delivery in Cranbrook and also the second new community.

Full name: Jess Perminter

Organisation (where relevant): CarneySweeney

Other party name (if relevant): CR Down Farming Ltd and Stuart Partners Ltd

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: Yes

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: We support the aim of the spatial strategy, in particular focussing the highest levels of growth in the West End. However, reference to the second new settlement is conspicuous by its absence.

The West End's distinctive characteristics are confirmed at Paragraph 3.4 1st bullet-point, which acknowledges that the West End is a highly sustainable area with strong functional links to Exeter, extensive infrastructure, proximity to urban services and efficient transport connections, making it a prime location for strategic development.

In addition, it is also notable that this part of the District is least constrained in environmental terms

These characteristics make the West End the most appropriate area to accommodate major development through existing and new allocations.

They also make the West End an appropriate area to meet needs arising in Exeter City Council's administrative area, which cannot be met there for capacity, viability and environmental reasons, as well as likely shortfalls in housing delivery against East Devon's housing requirements, as a result of the unduly onerous policies and provisions contained in the draft EDLP, likely under-delivery in Cranbrook and also the second new community.

Full name: Simon Collier

Organisation (where relevant): Collier Planning

Other party name (if relevant): Eagle One MMIII Ltd

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: We write on behalf of Eagle Investments (SW) Ltd to make representations on the Local Plan Regulation 19 Publication Draft consultation with reference to land which it owns to the west of Hulham Road, Exmouth. We generally support the spatial strategy set out within draft Strategic Policy SP01. We support the identification of Exmouth as the Principal Centre outside of the West End part of the district and its elevation, in comparison with the current Local Plan, above the other towns within the settlement hierarchy. This recognises that Exmouth is comfortably the largest town in East Devon and provides the greatest number and range of services and facilities. It is appropriate and entirely justified therefore that the plan identifies Exmouth as a higher tier settlement than the other towns. However, at only approx. 11% of the overall housing requirement, the apportionment to Exmouth would appear to, if anything, be lower than might be expected or appropriate to be directed to the largest and highest tier settlement within the district.

Full name: Simon Collier

Organisation (where relevant): Collier Planning

Other party name (if relevant): Eagle One MMIII Ltd

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: We write on behalf of Eagle Investments (SW) Ltd to make representations on the Local Plan Regulation 19 Publication Draft consultation with reference to land which it owns at St Johns, Exmouth, which is included as part of the draft allocation Exmo_20. We generally support the spatial strategy set out within draft Strategic Policy SP01. We support the identification of Exmouth as the Principal Centre outside of the West End part of the district and its elevation, in comparison with the current Local Plan, above the other towns within the settlement hierarchy. This recognises that Exmouth is comfortably the largest town in East Devon and provides the greatest number and range of services and facilities. It is appropriate and entirely justified therefore that the plan identifies Exmouth as a higher tier settlement than the other towns. However, at only approx. 11% of the overall housing requirement, the apportionment to Exmouth would appear to, if anything, be lower than might be expected or appropriate to be directed to the largest and highest tier settlement within the district.

Full name: Simon Collier

Organisation (where relevant): Collier Planning

Other party name (if relevant): Eagle One MMIII Ltd

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: We write on behalf of Eagle Investments (SW) Ltd to make representations on the Local Plan Regulation 19 Publication Draft consultation with reference to land which it owns to the south of Hulham Road, Exmouth. We generally support the spatial strategy set out within draft Strategic Policy SP01. We support the identification of Exmouth as the Principal Centre outside of the West End part of the district and its elevation, in comparison with the current Local Plan, above the other towns within the settlement hierarchy. This recognises that Exmouth is comfortably the largest town in East Devon and provides the greatest number and range of services and facilities. It is appropriate and entirely justified therefore that the plan identifies Exmouth as a higher tier settlement than the other towns.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: However, at only approx. 11% of the overall housing requirement, the apportionment to Exmouth would appear to, if anything, be lower than might be expected or appropriate to be directed to the largest and highest tier settlement within the district.

Full name: Simon Collier

Organisation (where relevant): Collier Planning

Other party name (if relevant): Eagle One MMIII Ltd

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: We write on behalf of Mr and Mrs Parks to make representations on the Local Plan Regulation 19 Publication Draft consultation with reference to land which they own at Meeting Lane, Lympstone. We generally support the spatial strategy set out within draft Strategic Policy SP01. We support the identification of Lympstone as a Local Centre and its elevation, in comparison with the current Local Plan, above the Service Villages within the settlement hierarchy. This recognises that Lympstone is suitable for additional development to reinforce the service role that it performs in respect of its surrounding area. It is appropriate and entirely Justified therefore that the plan identifies Lympstone as a higher tier settlement than the Service Villages. However, this elevated status within the settlement hierarchy is not reflected in the scale of housing (92 homes) that is actually allocated at Lympstone in comparison with some of the lower tier Service Villages. It is significantly below the levels at some of the other Local Centres (124 at Broadclyst and 216 at Woodbury) and even either lower or not dissimilar to the scale of housing proposed at many of the lower tier Service Villages (72 at Clyst St Mary, 102 at Feniton, 55 at Newton Poppleford, 64 at West Hill, 83 at Whimple). This anomaly would appear to have arisen from the site selection process which was largely driven by the outcomes of a series of meetings of the Strategic Planning Committee rather than an objective assessment of sites and the proposed spatial strategy. It is neither a Justified strategy not an Effective one as it proposes to deliver more housing in settlements which have been found to be less sustainable than Lympstone, despite there being more land that is suitable for accommodating more housing within Lympstone, as we explain later in this letter.

Full name: Simon Collier

Organisation (where relevant): Collier Planning

Other party name (if relevant): Eagle One MMIII Ltd

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: Yes

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: We generally support the spatial strategy set out within draft Strategic Policy SP01 which seeks to focus a large proportion of development requirements at the West End part of the district.

Full name: CORAL CURTIS

Organisation (where relevant): Grass Roots Planning

Other party name (if relevant): BROADCLYST LVA LLP (LVA)

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: Yes

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Strategic Policy SP01: Spatial Strategy sets out that "New development will be directed towards the most sustainable locations in East Devon, by: … D. Supporting development at the local Centres of Broadclyst…" This overarching strategy for the area is welcomed, particularly the support for development at the Tier 3 – Local Centre of Broadclyst. The levels of future housing development are outlined in Strategic Policy SP02. This states that "Housing provision will be made for at least 20,909 dwellings (net) to be delivered in the plan area between 1 April 2020 to 31 March 2042. The housing requirement will be delivered through a stepped trajectory, with an annual target of 850 homes from 2020/21 to 2031/32, increasing to 1,070 homes per year from 2032/33 to 2041/42." While this level of housing is generally supported, it only represents 80% of the housing requirement calculated using the new standard methodology introduced in December 2024 with the updated National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). While this is allowed for in the transitional arrangements set out in Paragraph 234 of the NPPF, we question whether East Devon District Council should be looking to exceed this and plan for the full housing requirement given the recognised housing crisis and the fact that even upon adoption, the Plan would require an immediate review under the new NPPF. This would equate to 26,136 dwellings over the plan period, as well as assisting in accommodating any overspill need from Exeter. Moreover, given that the Council has chosen to provide for the minimum housing requirement allowed via transitional arrangements, it is crucial that the draft housing allocations are at least maintained. Notwithstanding the above, we also have concerns that EDDC might not be considered to benefit from the transitional arrangements given that this is only a partial Regulation 19 Consultation. We presume legal advice has been taken on this point. Strategic Policy

SP04 sets out the employment provision and distribution strategy for the district, which totals 178.16 hectares, including 90.66 hectares of employment land on sites allocated in this emerging plan. The justification for the policy outlines that the amount of employment land that this site (ref. Brcl_12) should deliver is 0.6 hectares. We generally support this approach and the quantum of employment development identified for this site, which we confirm and agree can be accommodated within the masterplan, alongside the housing and open space provision, and other key infrastructure and enhancements. In conclusion, we question whether EDDC should be looking to increase the housing requirement to meet its needs now, particularly if it is not considered that they are able to benefit from the transitional arrangements. Furthermore, it demonstrates that the allocations, including Land west of Whimple Road, Broadclyst (ref. Brcl_12) should be maintained, and the Council cannot afford to remove any of these from the spatial strategy given the pressing need to boost the supply of housing land.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : TO RESPOND, AS REQUIRED, TO ANY QUESTIONS IN RELATION TO POLICY SD07 AND IN PARTICULAR SITE BRCL_12.

Full name: Alan Williams

Organisation (where relevant): Grass Roots Planning

Other party name (if relevant): South West Strategic Developments Ltd

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Strategic Policy SP01: Spatial Strategy sets out that "New development will be directed towards the most sustainable locations in East Devon, by: ... E. Allowing limited development at the Service Villages of ... Feniton ..." This overarching strategy for the area is welcomed, particularly the support for development at the Tier 4 – Service Village of Feniton. The levels of future housing development are outlined in Strategic Policy SP02. This states that "Housing provision will be made for at least 20,909 dwellings (net) to be delivered in the plan area between 1 April 2020 to 31 March 2042. The housing requirement will be delivered through a stepped trajectory, with an annual target of 850 homes from 2020/21 to 2031/32, increasing to 1,070 homes per year from 2032/33 to 2041/42." While this level of housing is generally supported, it only represents 80% of the housing requirement calculated using the new standard methodology introduced in December 2024 with the updated National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). While this approach is allowed for in the transitional arrangements set out in Paragraph 234 of the NPPF, we question whether East Devon District Council qualifies for the transitional arrangements, and whether the Council should be looking to exceed this and plan for the full housing requirement given the recognised housing crisis and the fact that upon adoption, the Plan would require an immediate review under the requirements of the new NPPF.

The full requirement would equate to 26,136 dwellings over the plan period, as well as assisting in accommodating any overspill need from Exeter. Moreover, given the Council has chosen to provide for the minimum housing requirement through the transitional arrangements, it is crucial that the proposed housing allocations are at least maintained.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: In conclusion, we welcome the Council's strive to boosting housing supply, but consider that it could go further in meeting future housing need in East Devon and the wider area. Furthermore, it demonstrates that the allocations, including Land adjacent to Beechwood, Feniton (ref. Feni_08) should be maintained, and the Council cannot afford to remove any of these from the spatial strategy given the pressing need to boost the supply of housing.

Full name: Chris Dadds

Organisation (where relevant): JLL

Other party name (if relevant): Charles Kislingbury on behalf of L Askew

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: The NPPF (paragraph 20) requires strategic policies to set out an overall strategy for place-making, focusing significant development on sustainable locations that reduce travel needs and offer transport choices.

Draft policy SP01 sets out the proposed spatial strategy which directs new development towards the most sustainable locations in East Devon. The proposed strategy directs new development towards the West End of the district, comprising a further new community, ongoing development of Cranbrook and other strategic developments.

The 'West End' comprises a highly sustainable area that has seen significant development since 2010, with substantial residential growth, employment opportunities, and strong functional links to Exeter. This zone offers extensive infrastructure, proximity to urban services, and efficient transport connections, making it a prime location for strategic and new development.

The draft Local Plan therefore promotes a sustainable pattern of development that aligns growth with infrastructure. Our client supports East Devon District Council's approach to the spatial strategy which focuses new development at the West End of the district, as soundly based in evidence and in accordance with national planning policy and guidance.

Full name: Chris Dadds

Organisation (where relevant): JLL

Other party name (if relevant): Charles Kislingbury on behalf of L Askew

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: The NPPF (paragraph 20) requires strategic policies to set out an overall strategy for place-making, focusing significant development on sustainable locations that reduce travel needs and offer transport choices.

Draft policy SP01 sets out the proposed spatial strategy which directs new development towards the most sustainable locations in East Devon. The proposed strategy directs new development towards the West End of the district, comprising a further new community, ongoing development of Cranbook and other strategic developments.

The 'West End' comprises a highly sustainable area that has seen significant development since 2010, with substantial residential growth, employment opportunities, and strong functional links to Exeter. This zone offers extensive infrastructure, proximity to urban services, and efficient transport connections, making it a prime location for strategic and new development.

The draft Local Plan therefore promotes a sustainable pattern of development that aligns growth with infrastructure. Our client supports East Devon District Council's approach to the spatial strategy which focuses new development at the West End of the district as soundly based in accordance with national planning policy and guidance.

Full name: Alex Munday

Organisation (where relevant): Kitchener Land and Planning

Other party name (if relevant): Mr Lillie and Ms Blundell

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: Yes

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: Alexander Munday of Kitchener Land and Planning (KLP) on behalf of Mr Lillie and Mrs Blundell

In general we are supportive of the proposed spatial strategy and agree that there is a need to focus the spatial strategy on development at the most sustainable towns in the district. However, it is clear that the most sustainable villages are capable of playing a significant role within the spatial strategy.

To help with this we welcome the Council's decision to include allocations at a range of settlements, not only the larger towns in the District.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: We do continue to maintain that reference within the Draft Plan to an allowance for only 'limited development to meet local needs at the Service Villages' should be carefully considered to ensure that the growth directed to those villages is proportionate. From reviewing the Regulation 19 plan it is clear that for a number of villages more than simply 'limited' development is directed to those settlements. This is a matter we support we therefore consider that it is the wording 'limited' which should be reviewed in order to ensure that the important role the villages can play is strengthened within the draft plan.

Full name: Zoe Mason

Organisation (where relevant): Lichfields

Other party name (if relevant): Church Commissioners

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: [Representation on Behalf of Church Commissioners who own land in Clyst Honiton] The Commissioners supports Strategic Policy SP01 and the focus for new development on the West End of the district, including a new town and other strategic developments east of Exeter. In particular, we note that Clyst Honiton is identified as 'open countryside.' We would emphasise that Clyst Honiton is a sustainable and suitable location for development given the good connectivity to the existing road network, Exeter Airport and Exeter.

Full name: Owen Jones

Organisation (where relevant): LRM Planning

Other party name (if relevant): David Wilson Homes

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: Yes

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: 7 The spatial strategy and the distribution of development INT RODU C TIO N

7.1 The following section of this representation considers the proposed spatial strategy and the distribution of development proposed within the consultation version of the Local Plan. Each topic is considered in turn below.

7.2 The work demonstrates that Whimple has a not dissimilar level of services and facilities to other Tier 3 settlements and a greater level of services and facilities than other larger Tier 4 settlements. It also benefits from having active and sustainable transport connections to the services, facilities and employment opportunities found within the West End (which is only 1km to the west) and Exeter. Consequently, it is not a justified proposition to retain Whimple as a Tier 4 settlement. Such an approach is unsound. It would be a more justified approach to enhance its role to a Tier 3 settlement.

7.3 Moreover, it would also, with the commensurate increase in the quantum of housing that would be focused at Whimple resulting from the increase in its role and function, help to address DWH concerns that Whimple is afforded a disproportionately lower level of housing in comparison to other Tier 3 and 4 settlements, which is again unjustified and unsound. Having regard to Whimple's services and facilities in comparison to other Tier 3 and 4 settlements, DWH considers that it could accommodate a greater level of housing than is currently proposed. An increase in housing at the settlement, above that proposed within the Local Plan, would therefore be justified. It would also broadly accord with the emerging Plan's spatial strategy,

which seeks to focus development within the West End in the first instance. The West End, which is located only 1km to the west of Whimple, is connected to the settlement by strategically important active and sustainable transport connections. THE SP ATIA L STR AT EGY

7.4 The Local Plan Review's proposed spatial strategy is set out within Strategic Policy SP01 and its supporting text. The strategy seeks to direct new development to the most sustainable locations within the District. The Policy indicates that development will be focused at the West End of the District in the first instance, including a further new community, on-going development at Cranbrook and other strategic development close to Exeter. Significant development is then planned at the Principal Centre of Exmouth and the five other Main Centres, with development that meets local needs being supported at five Local Centres. Limited development is proposed at 23 Service Villages.

7.5 A strategy that seeks to focus strategic development in East Devon's West End in the first instance, represents a continuation of the spatial strategy used in the 2016 Local Plan. It responds to the District's constraints and opportunities and those found within neighbouring areas.

7.6 In terms of constraints, there are three National Landscapes that are located within East Devon (the East Devon National Landscape, the Blackdown Hills National Landscape and a small extent of the Dorset National Landscape), which cover approximately two-thirds of the District. The designations cover most of the southern, south eastern, eastern and northern areas of East Devon. EAST DEVON LOCAL PLAN PUBLICATION DRAFT CONSULTATION 27

7.7 Given the availability of land to accommodate housing outside of these designations and in other areas of the District, major development within the three National Landscapes is likely to conflict with national planning policy8.

7.8 In terms of opportunities, the central and western areas of the District are also located in close proximity to the city of Exeter. A strategy which focuses growth in the western area of East Devon therefore ensures that new homes are provided in close proximity to the services, facilities, employment opportunities and infrastructure provided within Exeter city centre and those found within its more peripheral locations close to East Devon, including Sowton Industrial Estate. As this strategy has been one that has been employed within East Devon for a number of years, there are a number of strategic developments in the western portion of East Devon that now supplement the services, facilities, employment opportunities and infrastructure found within Exeter.

7.9 Given the above, the proposed spatial strategy will ensure that homes are provided closest to where most jobs are likely to arise, where there is the greatest potential to secure increased active and sustainable transport investment and usage, and where

there exists the greatest range of services and facilities. Given these characteristics, it will result in a pattern of development which limits the need to travel and provides for a genuine choice of transport modes. In turn, this will help to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve air quality and public health.

7.10 A concentration of development within the West End of East Devon also responds to market demand; there remains strong developer and market interest for residential development in the western portion of East Devon.

7.11 As stated above, the proposed spatial strategy is a continuation of the spatial strategy contained within the 2016 Local Plan. It was subject of Independent Examination in 2014 and 20159 and was found to be a sound proposition. It is based on the principles of sustainable development, including those contained within the NPPF (including paras. 11(a) and 110).

7.12 Notwithstanding the above, whilst DWH are supportive of a strategy that focuses development at East Devon's West End in the first instance, it should not be at the detriment of providing a suitable level of housing in other towns and villages within the District. Whilst there is not a requirement for a spatial strategy to respond to development needs at a settlement level, each settlement will have its own needs. This was a matter which was considered by the Inspector of the current Local Plan10. In general terms, the spatial strategy does provide the opportunity for each settlement to meet its own needs.

7.13 However, DWH is aware of a number of settlements that are located in the western portion of the District, which are largely unaffected by environmental designations, and have a good range of services and facilities, and benefit from strong active and sustainable transport connections. They are also located in close proximity to the services, facilities and employment opportunities found within the western portion of East Devon. Such settlements are capable of having a greater role within the spatial strategy and, in a manner that is broadly consistent with it, could accommodate greater levels of development. Further development in such locations would also help to sustain and enhance the essential services and facilities found in such locations, that service both the settlement and its rural hinterland.

7.14 Whimple, for instance, has, as identified in the Role and Function of Settlements evidence base document11, relative to its size, a good range of services and facilities, including a primary school; a 8 Para. 190 of the NPPF. 9 Please refer to para. 22 of the Inspector's Report, January 2016. 10 Para. 26 of the Inspector's Report, January 2016. 11 East Devon District Council, The Role and Function of Settlements, 2021. EAST DEVON LOCAL PLAN PUBLICATION DRAFT CONSULTATION 28 railway station; a convenience store/shop; a post office; a doctor's surgery; a community hall; two public houses; allotments; sports provision and children's play facilities.

7.15 As stated in Section 2 above, being located approximately 1km to the east of the eastern edge of the Cobdens development, it is in a comfortable active travel distance of the services, facilities and employment opportunities found within Cranbrook (which are due to be enhanced through the development of the Expansion Areas) and those to the west. Improvements to the active travel facilities along London Road have been secured through the developments within the Cranbrook Expansion Areas and further improvements are proposed through the Clyst Valley and New Communities Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan.

7.16 In addition, Whimple also benefits from having its own railway station, which is located on the strategically important West of England Railway Line. Generally, a twice hourly service is provided to a range of destinations, including Cranbrook, Pinhoe, Exeter Central and Exeter St Davids to the west and Axminster, Honiton, Crewkerne, Yeovil, Salisbury, Basingstoke and London to the east. Service enhancements are proposed on the Line, with it forming part of the Devon Metro. Whimple is therefore sustainably connected to the services, facilities and employment opportunities found within higher tier settlements located to the east and west. The services and facilities found within Whimple in comparison to other settlements Whimple in comparison to Tier 3 Local Centres

7.17 Evidence provided within the Role and Function of Settlements Report demonstrates the services and facilities within Whimple are not of a dissimilar level to those found within a number of Tier 3 Local Centres, including Woodbury (please see the comparison provided at Appendix 4).

7.18 Comparing Whimple and Woodbury, other than having a greater retail provision, the services and facilities on offer in Woodbury mirror those found within Whimple. Whilst the bus services are more regular in Woodbury, importantly, unlike Whimple, it does not have a railway station. Both have a broadly comparable employment density.

7.19 Given the similarities in the levels of services and facilities between Whimple and other proposed Local Centres, consideration should be given to uplifting Whimple's status in the settlement hierarchy to a Local Centre. Such an approach, which would be justified based on the evidence underpinning the Plan, would provide a better fit with the services and facilities found within the settlement. A greater role for Whimple in meeting needs would also help ensure that its services and facilities would be protected and enhanced, whilst also acknowledging its geographic relationship with the strategic developments found within the West End and Exeter, which are accessible by active and sustainable forms of travel. Whimple in comparison to Tier 4 Service Villages

7.20 A comparison between Whimple and other Tier 4 Service Villages is also provided at Appendix 4. Summarily, it confirms that: ? Feniton – Feniton has a more limited range of services and facilities than Whimple, including not having a GP and one less public

house; ? Newton Poppleford – whilst Newton Poppleford has a better bus service, Whimple benefits from a train station and a GP. Consequently, Whimple has a greater range of community facilities; and ? West Hill - whilst West Hill has a better bus service and a modestly better retail provision, Whimple has a train station, a GP, two public houses and allotments over the services and facilities found within West Hill. Consequently, Whimple has a greater range of community facilities.

7.21 Moreover, in comparison with Dunkeswell, Whimple has a train station, a primary school and two public houses over the provision in Dunkeswell, although it is acknowledged that Dunkeswell has one more shop. EAST DEVON LOCAL PLAN PUBLICATION DRAFT CONSULTATION 29

7.22 It can therefore be seen that Whimple has a greater range of community facilities than the larger Tier 4 settlements identified in emerging Policy SP01. It also demonstrates that relative to its size, it has a good range of services and facilities. Having regard to the population of other Tier 3 and 4 settlements and the range of services and facilities found within them, Whimple is capable of supporting a larger population. Evidence base

7.23 The proposed spatial strategy also provides a suitable response to addressing climate change. Research undertaken by the University of Exeter12 has demonstrated that “location is the single most important factor in determining potential emissions arising from new development.”

7.24 The work concluded that in general terms, transport related emissions were lower when development was located closer to existing major urban areas. Indeed, the work indicated that the location of development and the range of sustainable transport options available to residents would, on average, result in a greater carbon emission reduction than requiring all new dwellings to be constructed to ‘zero carbon’ for regulated emissions.

7.25 Consequently, a strategy that focuses development in the western portion of the District, in close proximity to Exeter City and existing developments on the western edge of East Devon, will, with additional sustainable transport measures, result in lower carbon emissions.

7.26 As has been demonstrated, whilst Whimple is, relative to its size, a sustainable settlement in its own right, it is also located in the western portion of East Devon and in close proximity to strategic services, facilities and employment opportunities. Its significant active and sustainable transport offer ensures that it is not an unsustainable, dormitory settlement. Indeed, if an enhanced role were afforded to Whimple in the settlement hierarchy and in accommodating the District’s needs, it would provide a strong fit with the University of Exeter’s work, as development would be located in close

proximity to major urban areas and at a location with a range of sustainable transport options. Sustainability Appraisal

7.27 As indicated above, the proposed spatial strategy seeks, in general terms, to continue to follow that set out in the adopted Local Plan, which itself was prepared in the context of the 2012 version of the NPPF. Consequently, at Examination, it would have been necessary for the Local Planning Authority to demonstrate that it was "the most appropriate strategy, when considered against reasonable alternatives…13"

7.28 It follows that unless there has been a material change in circumstance since the Inspector's Report was published in January 2016, the proposed spatial strategy should again be considered as being appropriate (noting that for the emerging Plan to be justified and therefore a sound proposition, the 2023 version of the NPPF only requires the Local Plan to promote "an appropriate strategy," rather than "the most appropriate strategy" in the 2012 version of the NPPF).

7.29 At a macro level, DWH is not aware of any material considerations that would suggest that a more appropriate spatial strategy should be adopted.

7.30 Indeed, the Sustainability Appraisal published alongside the consultation version of the Local Plan continues to suggest that the proposed spatial strategy is preferred as it: "…promotes development at existing settlements where there is a range of jobs, services, and facilities; whilst also focussing development where there is good connectivity in close proximity to a 12 Please refer to Section 2.3.1 of the 2020 Low Carbon and Climate Change Evidence Base for the Greater Exeter Strategic Plan Report. 13 Para. 182 of the 2012 version of the NPPF. EAST DEVON LOCAL PLAN PUBLICATION DRAFT CONSULTATION 30 much wider range of jobs, services, and facilities in the West End and Exeter. The scale of development proposed in the new town offers the greatest potential for a mix of uses, reducing the need to travel and providing opportunities sustainable travel links, which provides better accessibility and reduced carbon emissions (sic)14."

7.31 However, for the reasons set out above, DWH considers that there is a strong case for Whimple to be afforded a greater role in the spatial strategy, as a Tier 3 Local Centre. Indeed, as has been demonstrated, it has a comparable level of services and facilities to other Tier 3 settlements within the District. On the face of the evidence, it could not be considered to be a justified position to not include Whimple as a Tier 3 settlement.

7.32 Using the Sustainability Appraisal's own analysis, the promotion of Whimple to a Tier 3 Local Centre, with the additional resulting development, would provide a number of positive outcomes against the Sustainability Appraisal's objectives, including: ? SA Objective 1 (Landscape) - it would continue to focus development outside nationally designated landscapes and/or the undeveloped coast; ? SA Objective 4 (Climate change and carbon emissions) - Whimple has a good range of services and facilities

that are capable of supporting a larger population. It is also within an active travel distance of the services, facilities and employment opportunities within the West End and Exeter, which are also connected by sustainable modes of transport (the West of England Main Line). A greater focus of development at Whimple would therefore provide a strong alignment with the Objective. ? SA Objective 5 (Climate change adaption) – the analysis identifies Whimple as being located within a Critical Drainage Area and therefore it identifies development in such locations as having an uncertain effect. However, in some cases, as has been demonstrated in Section 2 above, development in such a location can help to alleviate the issue. In such a circumstance this would achieve a positive outcome. ? SA Objective 6 (Land resources) – the analysis identified that Whimple is affected by a Minerals Safeguarding Area. This overplays the situation, with the designation extending to the north of the A30, but being divorced from the undeveloped areas of land that surround Whimple. Additional allocations at the settlement would therefore not affect any Minerals Safeguarding Area. ? SA Objective 8 (Homes) - further development at Whimple is likely to result in additional smaller-scale developments coming forward, which, as identified in the analysis, are faster to build-out. In the context of: (1) the requirement not meeting the objectively assessed need for housing; and (2) the need for a stepped trajectory for the first 12 years of the Plan, a greater number of small-scale sites would help to provide a closer alignment with needs in the first part of the plan period. ? SA Objective 9 (Health and wellbeing) – further development at Whimple would ensure that future residents have access to the sports provision within the settlement, as well as other rural recreation opportunities. It is also connected via active and sustainable modes of transport to the existing and proposed leisure opportunities within Cranbrook. ? SA Objective 10 (Access to services), SA Objective 11 (Jobs and employment) and SA Objective 13 (Connectivity and transport) – further development at the Service Villages was identified as resulting in a greater volume of travel to Exeter from inaccessible areas, with poorer travel links. This, however, is not the case for Whimple, which benefits from active and sustainable travel connections to East Devon's West End and Exeter. If Cranbrook, which lies just 14 Page 140. EAST DEVON LOCAL PLAN PUBLICATION DRAFT CONSULTATION 31 1km to the west of Whimple/one stop on the West of England railway line is considered to be a sustainable location to accommodate development then, by definition, so should Whimple.

7.33 Consequently, an enhanced role for Whimple in the spatial strategy, which has both the services, facilities and environmental capacity to accommodate further growth, could result in a pattern of development that is consistent with the spatial strategy. It would also strengthen the positive outcomes against the SA Objectives for the preferred spatial strategy. THE D I STRI BU TI O N OF D EVEL OPMEN T The West End

7.34 As set out above, the emerging Plan's spatial strategy seeks a continuation of the spatial strategy adopted in the 2016 Local Plan, which, in the first instance, focused

development within East Devon's West End. For the reasons set out above, this strategy continues to be the most appropriate.

7.35 Excluding windfall provision, Strategy 2 of the adopted East Devon Local Plan seeks to focus 10,563 dwellings out of the 16,393 dwellings planned for, in the West End. This equates to approximately 64% of the planned provision.

7.36 The Regulation 19 Sustainability Appraisal (CSD-003) confirms that the preferred option for the distribution of development is Option A, which is a continuation of the housing distribution in the current Local Plan. However, the preferred option considered a focus of only 60% of development within the West End (12,500 dwellings).

7.37 Whilst the emerging Local Plan sought to focus nearly two-thirds of provision within the West End, this level of provision has not materialised. Table 3 of the Council's latest Housing Monitoring Update confirms that 4,932 homes have been constructed in the West End in the period April 2013 to March 2024. This represents a shortfall of around 1,523 homes against the annualised requirement for the West End of 597 homes per annum. Over that same period, 50% of the District's total housing completions have occurred within the West End.

7.38 Moreover, the Monitoring Report forecasts again that there will be a shortfall in delivery within the West End against the distribution set out in Strategy 2 of the adopted Local Plan by the end of the plan period. Around 52% of forecast completions are to occur in the West End (7,882 dwellings are forecast to be completed in the West End, against total forecast completions of 15,216 homes). Whilst, prima facie, it could be argued that a lower housing apportionment should be afforded to the West End, it is noted that only around 25% of the overall anticipated delivery from the Cranbrook Expansion Areas is forecast to occur by the end of the plan period. Consequently, the majority of delivery from the Expansion Areas is likely to occur outside the plan period. The Local Planning Authority attributes the shortfall in the West End to the delay in the adoption of the Cranbrook Plan. This therefore justifies the approach being taken in the emerging Local Plan not to prepare a second development plan document for the new community.

7.39 However, it does suggest that the Local Planning Authority is correct to place less reliance on the West End in meeting objectively assessed needs, for such a focus is unlikely to be deliverable or effective. Consequently, there is a need, in order for the Plan to be both deliverable and effective, for a reduced focus within the West End, but to a level that does not undermine the achievement of the benefits of adopting such a strategy, as set out in the Sustainability Appraisal. The preferred distribution of development as set out in the Sustainability Appraisal strikes this appropriate balance.

7.40 Across the plan period, it would result in an average annual delivery rate for the West End of 568 homes, which is a rate of delivery that has been achieved in the West

End before, suggesting that it is both a deliverable and an effective proposition. EAST DEVON LOCAL PLAN PUBLICATION DRAFT CONSULTATION 32

7.41 It should be noted that no equivalent table to that set out in Strategy 2 of the current Local Plan is provided within the emerging Local Plan. Moreover, this information cannot be obtained from the table contained within Strategic Policy SP03 or easily from Appendix 2 of the emerging Local Plan, as they: ? do not encapsulate a full picture of supply over the plan period, as they exclude elements such as the Second New Community; ? establish a requirement for neighbourhood planning areas, which are often wider than settlement level; ? in some cases, attribute development to a designated neighbourhood area that principally relates to the West End. For instance, in Whimple's case, of its total requirement of 611 dwellings, 500 dwellings are attributable to a Cranbrook Expansion Area. Consequently, as set out in the Sustainability Assessment, the 500 units attributed to Whimple from the Cranbrook Expansion Areas would, in that apportionment, be associated with delivery in the West End, rather than at the Service Village.

7.42 Additionally, the housing supply information contained within Document KSD-009 is over two years old and therefore does not reflect the components of supply introduced into the emerging Plan since the Regulation 18 consultation.

7.43 The omission of a table that confirms whether the Plan provides for the distribution set out in the preferred distribution option in the Sustainability Appraisal is a significant omission that should be remedied in the second Regulation 19 consultation. It would help to demonstrate that the Plan is justified. The rest of East Devon

7.44 The preferred option for distributing development as set out in the Sustainability Appraisal would see approximately 8,300 dwellings being distributed in the 'rest of East Devon' (approximately 40% of the housing requirement), of which: ? 30% (6,200 homes) is to be focused at Exmouth and the Main Centres; and ? 10% (2,100 homes) to the Local Centres, Service Villages and the Countryside.

7.45 For the areas of the District that are located outside the West End, this would equate to an annual average delivery rate of 377 dwellings per annum. This is a rate of delivery that has been achieved in nine out of the past 11 monitoring years. Consequently, it is a deliverable and therefore an effective proposition.

7.46 In the context presented in Sections 6 and 8 of these representations, where there is a need for: (1) the housing requirement to be increased to better reflect objectively assessed needs or account for the shortfall in delivery against the current Local Plan's housing requirement; and (2) a need to increase the supply of homes in the first 12 years of the Plan and place less reliance on a stepped trajectory (particularly when the Plan does not proposed to meet objectively assessed needs in full), there is a need to

explore the potential for further allocations to be made, particularly where they provide a strong fit with the spatial strategy.

7.47 Further development at Whimple, for instance, would, as has been demonstrated above, be consistent with the spatial strategy. It would provide a balance between affording an opportunity for a greater amount of rural need to be met at a settlement which has services and facilities that are capable of supporting an increased population, but in a location where higher order services, facilities and strategic employment locations can be accessed by active and sustainable modes of transport.

7.48 Given its locational advantages, DWH are concerned about the level of housing proposed at the settlement; excluding the commitment at the Cobdens Expansion Area, just 111 homes are proposed EAST DEVON LOCAL PLAN PUBLICATION DRAFT CONSULTATION 33 at the settlement over the period 2020 to 2042, which provides an annual average delivery rate of just 5 homes per annum.

7.49 Despite, as suggested in the Role and Function of Settlements Report (GEV-001), Whimple housing

0.81% of the District's population, the Local Plan proposes, excluding a windfall provision, the settlement to accommodate just 0.53% of the overall planned housing provision. In comparison, Woodbury houses 1.18% of the District's population, but will accommodate approximately 1.75% of the District's housing provision. Similarly, Feniton, which, as demonstrated above, has fewer services and facilities than Whimple, houses 0.16% of the District's population, but is proposed to accommodate approximately 0.61% of the planned provision. Whimple's current role within the spatial strategy in comparison to other Local Centres

7.50 Excluding the anticipated delivery from the Cranbrook Expansion Area, Whimple's housing requirement is 111 dwellings. This is a similar quantum of development to that envisaged at two of the Local Centres; Budleigh Salterton (132 homes) and Colyton (169 homes).

7.51 Consequently, given its services, facilities, active and sustainable transport connections and the quantum of development proposed at the settlement, Whimple is already fulfilling the role and function of a Local Centre. It would therefore be a justified strategy to redesignate Whimple as a Local Centre. This would provide it with the opportunity to have a greater role in meeting East Devon's housing needs. Whimple's housing capacity based on its services and facilities

7.52 It has been demonstrated that Whimple has a greater number of services and facilities than other settlements with a larger population. Woodbury, Feniton and Newton Poppleford, for instance, all have populations in excess of 1,700 residents, whilst West Hill has a population of over 2,000 residents. Conservatively, before any

additional allocations are proposed within the emerging Local Plan, it is considered that Whimple has, on the basis of its services and facilities, the capacity to accommodate a further 217 homes15.

15 The difference between the populations of Whimple (1,189 residents) and Woodbury, Feniton and Newton Poppleford (approximately 1,700 residents), divided by 2.35 persons, per home.

THE R OLE AND FU NCTI O N OF SE TTL EME NTS 10.37 Disappointingly, para. 3.17 of the 'Role and Function of Settlements' background paper describes Whimple as being a dormitory settlement and a "relatively unsustainable" place to live. This conclusion is made after an assessment of the jobs to homes balance, wherein it is identified that the settlement has nearly three times as many residents available to work than the number of jobs available in the settlement. 10.38 This conclusion, as indicated at para. 3.34 of the same document, has influenced the Local Planning Authority's views on the levels of residential development that Whimple could accommodate, as it was considered that "residential development in isolation is likely to perpetuate unsustainable travel to work patterns." 10.39 However, such analysis ignores the significant existing active and sustainable transport opportunities provided at Whimple and the potential for them to be enhanced. Indeed, Whimple is located within a reasonable cycling journey time of Cranbrook and the employment opportunities clustered at that settlement and the surrounding areas. Other than one other road, Cranbrook is linked to Whimple by London Road. The Cranbrook Plan has secured significant funding for environmental enhancements to London Road. Those improvements, which are to be delivered by Devon County Council, will have a design speed of 20mph and are likely to include segregated pedestrian and cycle links. Cycling could therefore become even more of a realistic mode to travel to work for Whimple's residents. 10.40 Moreover, as outlined elsewhere in these representations, Whimple has a railway station, which is described in the Role and Function of Settlements background paper as being a strategic facility. The station is located on the West of England Railway Line and therefore services are provided to a range of destinations including Cranbrook and Exeter to the west and Axminster, Honiton, Crewkerne, Yeovil, Salisbury, Basingstoke and London to the east. Generally, services are provided at a twice hourly frequency. 10.41 The railway station is relatively well-used and proportionally more residents travel to work by the railway than in other areas of the District. Further growth around Whimple has the potential to encourage further patronage. 10.42 As well as reducing congestion on the highways network, the promotion of such sustainable modes of travel would reduce greenhouse gas emissions associated with the private vehicle, whilst health benefits would also result. 10.43 The conclusion presented in the assessment work also ignores more

modern methods of working, especially since the Covid-19 pandemic. In this regard we note that superfast broadband is available in Whimple. EAST DEVON LOCAL PLAN PUBLICATION DRAFT CONSULTATION 66 10.44 For the above reasons, DWH considers that the evidence base document is deficient. It has resulted in an unjustified strategy that has constrained levels of development at Whimple to an unreasonable level. 10.45 Future versions of the evidence base document and the other documents that the work has influenced, including the emerging Local Plan, should reconsider the role that Whimple could play in accommodating development, particularly given the need, for the reasons set out within these representations, to identify further housing allocations within the District.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: C H AN GE S R EQUIR E D T O ADD RE SS SO U ND NE SS I SSU ES

7.53 The analysis presented above demonstrates that Whimple has a comparable level of services and facilities to Tier 3 Local Centres. Excluding development associated with the Cobden's Expansion Area, a comparable level of development is proposed at Whimple to other Tier 3 settlements. Consequently, in all but name, Whimple is acting as a Tier 3 Local Centre. It is therefore not a justified proposition for it to continue to be designated as a Tier 4 Service Village; it should be redesignated as a Tier 3 Local Centre.

7.54 In such a circumstance, Whimple could be afforded a greater role in meeting the District's unmet housing needs, particularly as the settlement has a level of services and facilities that are capable of supporting a larger population. A greater focus of development at Whimple would also accord with the Plan's wider spatial strategy, which seeks to focus development in the western portion of East Devon.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : Due to the significant policy issues concerned.

Full name: Neil Mantell

Organisation (where relevant): LRM Planning

Other party name (if relevant): The Cherwell Group

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: Yes

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: Yes

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: *THE SPATIAL STRATEGY AND THE DISTRIBUTION OF DEVELOPMENT*

The following section of this representation considers the proposed spatial strategy and the distribution of development proposed within the consultation version of the Local Plan. Each topic is considered in turn below.

THE SPATIAL STRATEGY

The Local Plan's proposed spatial strategy is set out within Strategic Policy SP01 and its supporting text. The strategy seeks to direct new development to the most sustainable locations within the District. The Policy indicates that development will be focused at the West End of the District in the first instance, including a further new community, on-going development at Cranbrook and other strategic development close to Exeter. Significant development is then planned at the Principal Centre of Exmouth and the five other Main Centres, with development that meets local needs being supported at five Local Centres. Limited development is proposed at 23 Service Villages.

A strategy that seeks to focus strategic development in East Devon's West End in the first instance, represents a continuation of the spatial strategy used in the 2016 Local

Plan. It responds to the District's constraints and opportunities and those found within neighbouring areas.

In terms of constraints, there are three National Landscapes that are located within East Devon (the East Devon National Landscape, the Blackdown Hills National Landscape and a small extent of the Dorset National Landscape), which cover approximately two-thirds of the District. The designations cover most of the southern, south eastern, eastern and northern areas of East Devon.

Given the availability of land to accommodate housing outside of these designations and in other areas of the District, major development within the three National Landscapes is likely to conflict with national planning policy [Para 190 of the NPPF].

In terms of opportunities, the central and western areas of the District are also located in close proximity to the city of Exeter. A strategy which focuses growth in the western area of East Devon therefore ensures that new homes are provided in close proximity to the services, facilities, employment opportunities and infrastructure provided within Exeter city centre and those found within its more peripheral locations close to East Devon, including Sowton Industrial Estate. As this strategy has been one that has been employed within East Devon for a number of years, there are a number of strategic developments in the western portion of East Devon that now supplement the services, facilities, employment opportunities and infrastructure found within Exeter.

Given the above, the proposed spatial strategy will ensure that homes are provided closest to where most jobs are likely to arise, where there is the greatest potential to secure increased active and sustainable transport investment and usage, and where there exists the greatest range of services and facilities. Given these characteristics, it will result in a pattern of development which limits the need to travel and provides for a genuine choice of transport modes. In turn, this will help to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve air quality and public health.

A concentration of development within the West End of East Devon also responds to market demand; there remains strong developer and market interest for residential development in the western portion of East Devon.

As stated above, the proposed spatial strategy is a continuation of the spatial strategy contained within the 2016 Local Plan. It was subject of Independent Examination in 2014 and 2015 [Please refer to para. 22 of the Inspector's Report, January 2016] and was found to be a sound proposition. It is based on the principles of sustainable development, including those contained within the NPPF (including paras. 11(a) and 110).

EVIDENCE BASE

The proposed spatial strategy also provides a suiA response to addressing climate change. Research undertaken by the University of Exeter [Please refer to Section 2.3.1 of the 2020 Low Carbon and Climate Change Evidence Base for the Greater Exeter Strategic Plan Report]. has demonstrated that "location is the single most important factor in determining potential emissions arising from new development."

The work concluded that in general terms, transport related emissions were lower when development was located closer to existing major urban areas. Indeed, the work indicated that the location of development and the range of sustainable transport options available to residents would, on average, result in a greater carbon emission reduction than requiring all new dwellings to be constructed to 'zero carbon' for regulated emissions.

Consequently, a strategy that focuses development in the western portion of the District, in close proximity to Exeter city and existing developments on the western edge of East Devon, will, with additional sustainable transport measures, result in lower carbon emissions.

SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL

As indicated above, the proposed spatial strategy seeks, in general terms, to continue to follow that set out in the adopted Local Plan, which itself was prepared in the context of the 2012 version of the NPPF. Consequently, at Examination, it would have been necessary for the Local Planning Authority to demonstrate that it was "the most appropriate strategy, when considered against reasonable alternatives… [Para. 182 of the 2012 version of the NPPF]."

It follows that unless there has been a material change in circumstance since the Inspector's Report was published in January 2016, the proposed spatial strategy should again be considered as being appropriate (noting that for the emerging Plan to be justified and therefore a sound proposition, the 2023 version of the NPPF only requires the Local Plan to promote "an appropriate strategy," rather than "the most appropriate strategy" in the 2012 version of the NPPF).

The Cherwell Group is not aware of any material considerations that would suggest that a more appropriate spatial strategy should be adopted.

Indeed, the Sustainability Appraisal published alongside the consultation version of the Local Plan continues to suggest that the proposed spatial strategy is preferred as it:

"…promotes development at existing settlements where there is a range of jobs, services, and facilities; whilst also focussing development where there is good connectivity in close proximity to a much wider range of jobs, services, and facilities in the West End and Exeter. The scale of development proposed in the new town offers the greatest potential for a mix of uses, reducing the need to travel and providing opportunities sustainable travel links, which provides better accessibility and reduced carbon emissions (sic) [Page 140]."

THE DISTRIBUTION OF DEVELOPMENT

THE WEST END

As set out above, the emerging Plan's spatial strategy seeks a continuation of the spatial strategy adopted in the 2016 Local Plan, which, in the first instance, focused development within East Devon's West End. For the reasons set out above, this strategy continues to be the most appropriate.

Excluding windfall provision, Strategy 2 of the adopted East Devon Local Plan seeks to focus 10,563 dwellings out of the 16,393 dwellings planned for, in the West End. This equates to approximately 64% of the planned provision.

The Regulation 19 Sustainability Appraisal (CSD-003) confirms that the preferred option for the distribution of development is Option A, which is a continuation of the housing distribution in the current Local Plan. However, the preferred option considered a focus of only 60% of development within the West End (12,500 dwellings).

Whilst the emerging Local Plan sought to focus nearly two-thirds of provision within the West End, this level of provision has not materialised. Table 3 of the Council's latest Housing Monitoring Update confirms that 4,932 homes have been constructed in the West End in the period April 2013 to March 2024. This represents a shortfall of around 1,523 homes against the annualised requirement for the West End of 597 homes per annum. Over that same period, 50% of the District's total housing completions have occurred within the West End.

Moreover, the Monitoring Report forecasts again that there will be a shortfall in delivery within the West End against the distribution set out in Strategy 2 of the adopted Local Plan by the end of the plan period. Around 52% of forecast completions are to occur in the West End (7,882 dwellings are forecast to be completed in the West End, against total forecast completions of 15,216 homes). Whilst, prima facie, it could be argued that a lower housing apportionment should be afforded to the West End, it is noted that only around 25% of the overall anticipated delivery from the Cranbrook Expansion Areas is forecast to occur by the end of the plan period. Consequently, the majority of delivery from the Expansion Areas is likely to occur outside the plan period. The Local Planning Authority attributes the shortfall in the West End to the delay in the adoption of the Cranbrook Plan. This therefore justifies the approach being taken in the emerging Local Plan not to prepare a second development plan document for the new community.

However, it does suggest that the Local Planning Authority is correct to place less reliance on the West End in meeting objectively assessed needs, for such a focus is unlikely to be deliverable or effective. Consequently, there is a need, in order for the Plan to be both deliverable and effective, for a reduced focus within the West End, but to a level that does not undermine the achievement of the benefits of adopting such a strategy, as set out in the Sustainability Appraisal. The preferred distribution of development as set out in the Sustainability Appraisal strikes this appropriate balance.

Across the plan period, it would result in an average annual delivery rate for the West End of 568 homes, which is a rate of delivery that has been achieved in the West End before, suggesting that it is both a deliverable and an effective proposition.

As set out in Section 3 of these representations, land along the A3052 corridor has previously been identified as having the potential to accommodate strategic development, including a second new town. Its identification within the emerging Local Plan as a key element of the planned provision of housing in the West End is therefore supported by the Cherwell Group.

It should be noted that no equivalent table to that set out in Strategy 2 of the current Local Plan is provided within the emerging Local Plan. Moreover, this information cannot be obtained from the table contained within Strategic Policy SP03 or easily from Appendix 2 of the emerging Local Plan, as they:

do not encapsulate a full picture of supply over the plan period, as they exclude elements such as the Second New Community;

establish a requirement for neighbourhood planning areas, which are often wider than settlement level;

in some cases, attribute development to a designated neighbourhood area that principally relates to the West End. For instance, in Whimple's case, of its total requirement of 611 dwellings, 500 dwellings are attributable to a Cranbrook Expansion Area. Consequently, as set out in the Sustainability Assessment, the 500 units attributed to Whimple from the Cranbrook Expansion Areas would, in that apportionment, be associated with delivery in the West End, rather than at the Service Village.

Additionally, the housing supply information contained within Document KSD-009 is over two years old and therefore does not reflect the components of supply introduced into the emerging Plan since the Regulation 18 consultation.

The omission of a table that confirms whether the Plan provides for the distribution set out in the preferred distribution option in the Sustainability Appraisal is a significant omission that should be remedied in the second Regulation 19 consultation. It would help to demonstrate that the Plan is justified.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

4(a). If yes, and you wish to support this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter's compliance with the duty to co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.: *THE SPATIAL STRATEGY AND THE DISTRIBUTION OF DEVELOPMENT*

The following section of this representation considers the proposed spatial strategy and the distribution of development proposed within the consultation version of the Local Plan. Each topic is considered in turn below.

THE SPATIAL STRATEGY

The Local Plan's proposed spatial strategy is set out within Strategic Policy SP01 and its supporting text. The strategy seeks to direct new development to the most sustainable locations within the District. The Policy indicates that development will be focused at the West End of the District in the first instance, including a further new community, on-going development at Cranbrook and other strategic development close to Exeter. Significant development is then planned at the Principal Centre of Exmouth and the five other Main Centres, with development that meets local needs being supported at five Local Centres. Limited development is proposed at 23 Service Villages.

A strategy that seeks to focus strategic development in East Devon's West End in the first instance, represents a continuation of the spatial strategy used in the 2016 Local Plan. It responds to the District's constraints and opportunities and those found within neighbouring areas.

In terms of constraints, there are three National Landscapes that are located within East Devon (the East Devon National Landscape, the Blackdown Hills National Landscape and a small extent of the Dorset National Landscape), which cover approximately two-thirds of the District. The designations cover most of the southern, south eastern, eastern and northern areas of East Devon.

Given the availability of land to accommodate housing outside of these designations and in other areas of the District, major development within the three National Landscapes is likely to conflict with national planning policy [Para 190 of the NPPF].

In terms of opportunities, the central and western areas of the District are also located in close proximity to the city of Exeter. A strategy which focuses growth in the western area of East Devon therefore ensures that new homes are provided in close proximity to the services, facilities, employment opportunities and infrastructure provided within Exeter city centre and those found within its more peripheral locations close to East Devon, including Sowton Industrial Estate. As this strategy has been one that has been employed within East Devon for a number of years, there are a number of strategic developments in the western portion of East Devon that now supplement the services, facilities, employment opportunities and infrastructure found within Exeter.

Given the above, the proposed spatial strategy will ensure that homes are provided closest to where most jobs are likely to arise, where there is the greatest potential to secure increased active and sustainable transport investment and usage, and where there exists the greatest range of services and facilities. Given these characteristics, it will result in a pattern of development which limits the need to travel and provides for a genuine choice of transport modes. In turn, this will help to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve air quality and public health.

A concentration of development within the West End of East Devon also responds to market demand; there remains strong developer and market interest for residential development in the western portion of East Devon.

As stated above, the proposed spatial strategy is a continuation of the spatial strategy contained within the 2016 Local Plan. It was subject of Independent Examination in 2014 and 2015 [Please refer to para. 22 of the Inspector's Report, January 2016] and was found to be a sound proposition. It is based on the principles of sustainable development, including those contained within the NPPF (including paras. 11(a) and 110).

EVIDENCE BASE

The proposed spatial strategy also provides a suiA response to addressing climate change. Research undertaken by the University of Exeter [Please refer to Section 2.3.1 of the 2020 Low Carbon and Climate Change Evidence Base for the Greater Exeter Strategic Plan Report]. has demonstrated that "location is the single most important factor in determining potential emissions arising from new development."

The work concluded that in general terms, transport related emissions were lower when development was located closer to existing major urban areas. Indeed, the work indicated that the location of development and the range of sustainable transport options available to residents would, on average, result in a greater carbon emission reduction than requiring all new dwellings to be constructed to 'zero carbon' for regulated emissions.

Consequently, a strategy that focuses development in the western portion of the District, in close proximity to Exeter city and existing developments on the western edge of East Devon, will, with additional sustainable transport measures, result in lower carbon emissions.

SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL

As indicated above, the proposed spatial strategy seeks, in general terms, to continue to follow that set out in the adopted Local Plan, which itself was prepared in the context of the 2012 version of the NPPF. Consequently, at Examination, it would have been necessary for the Local Planning Authority to demonstrate that it was "the most appropriate strategy, when considered against reasonable alternatives… [Para. 182 of the 2012 version of the NPPF]."

It follows that unless there has been a material change in circumstance since the Inspector's Report was published in January 2016, the proposed spatial strategy should again be considered as being appropriate (noting that for the emerging Plan to be justified and therefore a sound proposition, the 2023 version of the NPPF only requires the Local Plan to promote "an appropriate strategy," rather than "the most appropriate strategy" in the 2012 version of the NPPF).

The Cherwell Group is not aware of any material considerations that would suggest that a more appropriate spatial strategy should be adopted.

Indeed, the Sustainability Appraisal published alongside the consultation version of the Local Plan continues to suggest that the proposed spatial strategy is preferred as it:

"...promotes development at existing settlements where there is a range of jobs, services, and facilities; whilst also focussing development where there is good connectivity in close proximity to a much wider range of jobs, services, and facilities in the West End and Exeter. The scale of development proposed in the new town offers the greatest potential for a mix of uses, reducing the need to travel and providing opportunities sustainable travel links, which provides better accessibility and reduced carbon emissions (sic) [Page 140]."

THE DISTRIBUTION OF DEVELOPMENT

THE WEST END

As set out above, the emerging Plan's spatial strategy seeks a continuation of the spatial strategy adopted in the 2016 Local Plan, which, in the first instance, focused development within East Devon's West End. For the reasons set out above, this strategy continues to be the most appropriate.

Excluding windfall provision, Strategy 2 of the adopted East Devon Local Plan seeks to focus 10,563 dwellings out of the 16,393 dwellings planned for, in the West End. This equates to approximately 64% of the planned provision.

The Regulation 19 Sustainability Appraisal (CSD-003) confirms that the preferred option for the distribution of development is Option A, which is a continuation of the housing distribution in the current Local Plan. However, the preferred option considered a focus of only 60% of development within the West End (12,500 dwellings).

Whilst the emerging Local Plan sought to focus nearly two-thirds of provision within the West End, this level of provision has not materialised. Table 3 of the Council's latest Housing Monitoring Update confirms that 4,932 homes have been constructed in the West End in the period April 2013 to March 2024. This represents a shortfall of around 1,523 homes against the annualised requirement for the West End of 597 homes per annum. Over that same period, 50% of the District's total housing completions have occurred within the West End.

Moreover, the Monitoring Report forecasts again that there will be a shortfall in delivery within the West End against the distribution set out in Strategy 2 of the adopted Local Plan by the end of the plan period. Around 52% of forecast completions are to occur in the West End (7,882 dwellings are forecast to be completed in the West End, against total forecast completions of 15,216 homes). Whilst, prima facie, it could be argued that a lower housing apportionment should be afforded to the West End, it is noted that only around 25% of the overall anticipated delivery from the Cranbrook Expansion Areas is forecast to occur by the end of the plan period. Consequently, the majority of delivery from the Expansion Areas is likely to occur outside the plan period. The Local Planning Authority attributes the shortfall in the West End to the delay in the adoption of the Cranbrook Plan. This therefore justifies the approach being taken in the emerging Local Plan not to prepare a second development plan document for the new community.

However, it does suggest that the Local Planning Authority is correct to place less reliance on the West End in meeting objectively assessed needs, for such a focus is unlikely to be deliverable or effective. Consequently, there is a need, in order for the Plan to be both deliverable and effective, for a reduced focus within the West End, but to a level that does not undermine the achievement of the benefits of adopting such a strategy, as set out in the Sustainability Appraisal. The preferred distribution of development as set out in the Sustainability Appraisal strikes this appropriate balance.

Across the plan period, it would result in an average annual delivery rate for the West End of 568 homes, which is a rate of delivery that has been achieved in the West End before, suggesting that it is both a deliverable and an effective proposition.

As set out in Section 3 of these representations, land along the A3052 corridor has previously been identified as having the potential to accommodate strategic development, including a second new town. Its identification within the emerging Local

Plan as a key element of the planned provision of housing in the West End is therefore supported by the Cherwell Group.

It should be noted that no equivalent table to that set out in Strategy 2 of the current Local Plan is provided within the emerging Local Plan. Moreover, this information cannot be obtained from the table contained within Strategic Policy SP03 or easily from Appendix 2 of the emerging Local Plan, as they:

do not encapsulate a full picture of supply over the plan period, as they exclude elements such as the Second New Community;

establish a requirement for neighbourhood planning areas, which are often wider than settlement level;

in some cases, attribute development to a designated neighbourhood area that principally relates to the West End. For instance, in Whimple's case, of its total requirement of 611 dwellings, 500 dwellings are attributable to a Cranbrook Expansion Area. Consequently, as set out in the Sustainability Assessment, the 500 units attributed to Whimple from the Cranbrook Expansion Areas would, in that apportionment, be associated with delivery in the West End, rather than at the Service Village.

Additionally, the housing supply information contained within Document KSD-009 is over two years old and therefore does not reflect the components of supply introduced into the emerging Plan since the Regulation 18 consultation.

The omission of a table that confirms whether the Plan provides for the distribution set out in the preferred distribution option in the Sustainability Appraisal is a significant omission that should be remedied in the second Regulation 19 consultation. It would help to demonstrate that the Plan is justified.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : Due to the significant policy issues concerned.

Full name: Alex Bullock

Organisation (where relevant): LVA

Other party name (if relevant): Clyst Honiton LVA LLP

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: Strategic Policy SP01: Spatial Strategy We support the approach of this policy noting that the focus of new development will be at the West End of the District and that includes the inclusion of a new community. It is clear that the Council has gained a great deal of experience from the development of Cranbrook and more recently with the Expansion Areas to Cranbrook and we are confident in the Council's ability to learn lessons from these previous experiences and that these will have a positive influence on the planning of the second new community. It is clear from the Sustainability Appraisal that of the three options considered in respect of the location of the new community the one identified by the Council is the most suitable option and location and LVA is working with other landowners and promoters in a collaborative way to move forward further evidence in support of bringing this strategically important component of the Council's Spatial Strategy forward and we will supplement this during the second consultation later this year.

Full name: James McMurdo

Organisation (where relevant): McMurdo Land Planning and Development Ltd

Other party name (if relevant): Stuart Partners Ltd

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: [McMurdo Land Planning & Development Ltd on Behalf of Stuart Partners Ltd relating to Strategic Land at the "West End" of East Devon District made in the context of significant land holdings in this area. Representation to be read in conjunction with representations made by Turley on behalf of our Stuart Partners Ltd and Bloor Homes Exeter on the proposed new and an expanded Hill Barton Business Park, and by Carney Sweeney on behalf of our Stuart Partners Ltd and Down, relating to land being promoted for a village for up to 2,000 houses between Clyst St George and Clyst St Mary]

Object

Reasons [With reference to Figure 1 from the Local Plan]

Figure 1 from the Local Plan below refers.

As the plan stands, against the vision, objectives and sustainability appraisal work, evidenced sub regional housing and employment land needs, and market forces, it proposes C50% of its housing and employment land needs in national landscapes and a significant majority of its "West End" housing and employment land as part of a future second stage plan making process, and does not even attempt to deal with Exeter's unmet need. The Council, in line with its vision, objectives, sustainability appraisal work, evidenced housing and employment land need, should continue to encourage

development away from national landscapes afforded the highest level of national planning policy direction within EDDC. Strategic housing and employment development should be focussed within the "West End" of East Devon and/or close to it where the vast majority of key physical, social and community and green infrastructure exists or is planned for. The "West End" of East Devon (which is where all of our client's land is), together with Exeter City is the area considered to be the economic driver for the subregion, and its growth cannot be constrained for social and economic reasons. However, the under supply of housing and employment land in the current plan period in EDDC, and ECC, (i.e. in the subregion) needs to be correctly addressed by the Council and the shortfall rectified within the emerging Local Plan by positively engaging with ECC, accommodating the development needs of the City which cannot be met there, in the "West End" of East Devon.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: Remove significant levels of housing and employment land allocations from national landscapes (which are not market facing in any case) and 14 Reallocate the deleted allocation numbers from national landscapes to the "West End" of East Devon and Allocate additional housing and employment land away from national landscapes to meet Exeter's unmet needs, on the area free from development constraints, the "West End" of the district.

Full name: Oliver Keates

Organisation (where relevant): OBK Land and Planning Ltd

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: Yes

2(a). If yes, and you wish to support the legal compliance of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: Clyst St Mary should be defined as a Service Village where some development should be allowed. I support for this policy.

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: Yes

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: Clyst St Mary should be defined as a Service Village where some development should be allowed. I support for this policy.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Stuart Houlet

Organisation (where relevant): PCL Planning Ltd

Other party name (if relevant): Waddeton Park Limited (Honiton)

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: OVERVIEW OF THE PLAN APPROACH

Some concerns do still exist regarding the overall strategy of the Plan, particularly in terms of approach to meeting housing needs and an inherent imbalance towards constraint and matters that ultimately constrain growth opportunities and the delivery of sustainable development.

This is despite the Government, through the updated NPPF published in December 2024, making it absolutely clear that there is a need to substantially increase housing delivery in the UK, setting a target of achieving 370,000 new homes each year. The focus of the updated NPPF is explicitly on overhauling the planning system to address the chronic housing crisis and to support “builders not blockers” and to deliver growth.

The implication of the updated NPPF on East Devon is a significantly increased challenge in the number of homes that are required to be built, significantly above past delivery rates. We recognise the scale of this challenge; however, it also must be recognised that historic and substantial undersupply of housing has contributed to the severe housing affordability issues across the South West, including in East Devon.

In this context it is disappointing that the Council are seeking to benefit from the updated NPPF’s transitional arrangements, particularly as it appears to have been used

with the sole purpose of enabling a lower housing requirement to be pursued. Which of course will simply continue to increase the gap between housing need and supply in the longer term. A matter that will be further impacted by the Council seeking what is an unjustified and inappropriate stepped housing delivery approach.

All this is before taking into account the Plan's over reliance on delivery from a new community that remains largely untested through the Plan process to date; an inconsistent site selection process and a proposed policy basis that seeks unreasonable requirements without any consideration of the viability and deliverability issues they will create.

Importantly until the emerging Plan is adopted, the Council will still be required to demonstrate a 5-year supply of housing land based on the new standard method (1188 dwellings per annum), which as the Council themselves recognise under current claimed supply would be less than 3 years. The need to deliver increased levels of housing must therefore be a priority for the Council both through development management and plan-making processes, requiring a step change in approach towards positively planning for growth rather than focussing on constraint and requirements.

We elaborate further on the above concerns which we consider will risk undermining the soundness of the Plan if not addressed, when discussing the individual policies and sections of the Plan below.

Strategic Policy SP01 – Spatial Strategy

We broadly support the spatial strategy outlined in Policy SP01 which recognises the role of the West End of the District in supporting the role of Exeter through strategic growth.

However, we do remain concerned regarding the reliance on the new community in respect of this Plan period. The experience of Cranbrook demonstrates the long lead-in times in respect of delivery, with first occupations at Cranbrook occurring some 20 years post allocation (having been arguably a more defined proposal than the new community at that stage). We provide additional comments on this in relation to Strategic Policy WS01.

Full name: Stuart Houlet

Organisation (where relevant): PCL Planning Ltd

Other party name (if relevant): Waddeton Park Limited (Honiton)

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: We broadly support the spatial strategy outlined in Policy SP01 which recognises the role of the West End of the District in supporting the role of Exeter through strategic growth. We also support that the Plan recognises the role of Exmouth as a Principal Centre with the capacity for high levels of growth, although we do consider that the level of actual provision is too low and is not sufficient to address the historic lack of delivery of new homes at Exmouth in the town. There are further site opportunities that have been overlooked as raised further below in these representations which could contribute to addressing these needs.

However, we do remain concerned regarding the reliance on the new community in respect of this Plan period. The experience of Cranbrook demonstrates the long lead-in times in respect of delivery, with first occupations at Cranbrook occurring some 20 years post allocation (having been arguably a more defined proposal than the new community at that stage). We provide additional comments on this in relation to Strategic Policy WS01.

We also consider it to be shortsighted not to consider further provision at Cranbrook beyond the adopted Cranbrook Plan area, given it clearly would be a sustainable option for delivering additional growth and infrastructure is already in place or planned.

Full name: Stuart Houlet

Organisation (where relevant): PCL Planning Ltd

Other party name (if relevant): Waddeton Park Limited (Honiton)

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Overview of the Plan Approach

We have through earlier representations made on the emerging Local Plan raised concerns regarding the overall strategy of the Plan, particularly in terms of approach to meeting housing needs and an inherent imbalance towards constraint and matters that ultimately constrain growth opportunities and the delivery of sustainable development. Some of those issues still remain apparent in the Regulation 19 Plan.

This is despite the Government, through the updated NPPF published in December 2024, making it absolutely clear that there is a need to substantially increase housing delivery in the UK, setting a target of achieving 370,000 new homes each year. The focus of the updated NPPF is explicitly on overhauling the planning system to address the chronic housing crisis and to support “builders not blockers” and to deliver growth.

The implication of the updated NPPF on East Devon is a significantly increased challenge in the number of homes that are required to be built, significantly above past delivery rates. We recognise the scale of this challenge; however, it also must be recognised that historic and substantial undersupply of housing has contributed to the severe housing affordability issues across the South West, including in East Devon.

As we have previously highlighted the continuing housing crisis requires a step change in planning for growth and a departure from traditional protectionism. The updated Framework provides councils with significant tools to maximise opportunities for accommodating the growth that is required.

It is noted that the Council are seeking to benefit from the updated NPPF's transitional arrangements by publishing a Regulation 19 version of the Plan in advance of the cut off of 12th March 2025. This will then enable the local plan to progress under the December 2023 NPPF. It is very disappointing that these transitional arrangements appear to have been used with the sole purpose of enabling a lower housing requirement to be pursued. Which of course will simply continue to increase the gap between housing need and supply in the longer term.

The Plan further fails to appropriately meet local housing needs by seeking to offset even that lower housing requirement by introducing what is an unjustified and inappropriate stepped housing delivery approach.

Also of concern and evidenced by the number of comments we have on the Plan, is whether the Plan has simply been rushed to Regulation 19 stage without full and reasonable assessment of the overall strategy. It was clear from the Strategic Planning Committee discussions on site selection that the urgency to allocate sufficient numbers to meet the lower requirements has led to politicised decision-making in respect of sites and a great deal of inconsistency. This does give rise to the significant risk of the Plan not being found sound.

All this is before taking into account the Plan's over reliance on delivery from a new community that remains largely untested through the Plan process to date; a site selection process that at best has been inconsistent and at worst, procedurally unfair; and a proposed policy basis that seeks unreasonable requirements without any consideration of the viability and deliverability issues they will create.

Importantly until the emerging Plan is adopted, the Council will still be required to demonstrate a 5-year supply of housing land based on the new standard method (1188 dwellings per annum), which as the Council themselves recognise under current claimed supply would be less than 3 years. The need to deliver increased levels of housing must therefore be a priority for the Council both through development

management and plan-making processes, requiring a step change in approach towards positively planning for growth rather than focussing on constraint and requirements. We are concerned the Plan currently fails to adequately demonstrate this.

We elaborate further on the above concerns, that we consider risks undermining the soundness of the Plan if not addressed, when discussing the individual policies and sections of the Plan below.

Chapter 3 - Spatial Strategy

Strategic Policy SP01 – Spatial Strategy

We broadly support the spatial strategy outlined in Policy SP01 which recognises the role of Honiton as a Main Centre where significant development can be accommodated, although we do consider that the level of actual provision is too low and is not sufficient to address the historic lack of delivery of new homes at the town. There are further site opportunities, including land at Heathfield Manor, that have been overlooked or not assessed correctly as raised further below in these representations which could contribute to addressing these needs.

We are concerned regarding the reliance on the new community in respect of this Plan period. The experience of Cranbrook demonstrates the long lead-in times in respect of delivery, with first occupations at Cranbrook occurring some 20 years post allocation (having been arguably a more defined proposal than the new community at that stage). We provide additional comments on this in relation to Strategic Policy WS01.

We also consider it to be shortsighted not to consider further provision at Cranbrook beyond the adopted Cranbrook Plan area, given it clearly would be a sustainable option for delivering additional growth and infrastructure is already in place or planned.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: As we have set out above the Plan's approach in setting a stepped

housing target is unjustified, goes against the spirit of the NPPF transitional arrangements and seeks to effectively push the matter of delivering housing to meet local needs into the next local plan cycle. The Government have been clear that in introducing the transitional arrangements they expect the progress of plans to be maintained, whilst maximising proactive planning for the homes communities need. We consider the stepped approach does not support the Government's intentions.

Therefore, currently this approach risks rendering the Plan unsound in our view. To address this the Plan will need to be the subject of fundamental modification. This will include removing all reference to the stepped approach within Policy SP02 and instead including a consistent housing requirement of 950.4 dwellings per annum over the entire Plan period.

In addition, to provide greater resilience against the delivery issues the Council has identified in relation to larger sites, modifications should be made to include a range of sites that can support greater resilience for Plan delivery. This includes reviewing and allocating opportunities already previously considered through the site selection process where sites were previously proposed to be allocated in earlier stages of the Plan and/or where they have not been discounted on deliverability grounds. This should include our client's site at Land at Heathfield Manor, Honiton.

These Modifications are essential for addressing the unjustified stepped approach towards housing delivery and ensuring the Plan can be found sound. Otherwise, the Plan as its stands would not be positively prepared in that it fails to deliver the housing required to meet local needs. Its approach is not justified by the evidence base nor is it consistent with national policy. The result will be an ineffective Plan that fails to deliver for the needs of its community.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : To have the opportunity to elaborate on these and our previous representations

Full name: Stuart Houlet

Organisation (where relevant): PCL Planning Ltd

Other party name (if relevant): Waddeton Park Limited (Honiton)

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: (PCL Planning on behalf of Waddeton Park Limited (Honiton)): We broadly support the spatial strategy outlined in Policy SP01 which recognises the role of Honiton as a Main Centre where significant development can be accommodated, although we do consider that the level of actual provision is too low and is not sufficient to address the historic lack of delivery of new homes at the town. There are further site opportunities, including land at Heathfield Manor, that have been overlooked or not assessed correctly as raised further [elsewhere] in these representations which could contribute to addressing these needs. We are concerned regarding the reliance on the new community in respect of this Plan period. The experience of Cranbrook demonstrates the long lead-in times in respect of delivery, with first occupations at Cranbrook occurring some 20 years post allocation (having been arguably a more defined proposal than the new community at that stage). We provide additional comments on this in relation to Strategic Policy WS01. We also consider it to be shortsighted not to consider further provision at Cranbrook beyond the adopted Cranbrook Plan area, given it clearly would be a sustainable option for delivering additional growth and infrastructure is already in place or planned.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: See other entries re. SP02

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : in order to provide greater elaboration of the detail of these representations

Full name: Will Ridalls

Organisation (where relevant): PCL Planning Ltd

Other party name (if relevant): Simon Stokes

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: Yes

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: We broadly support the spatial strategy outlined in Policy SP01 which recognises the role of Woodbury as a Local Centre although we do consider that there are further site opportunities, including land at Castle Lane that have been overlooked or not assessed correctly, as raised further below in these representations, which could contribute to addressing these needs. 3 Also at: 9 Western Road, Launceston, Cornwall, PL15 7AR t: +44 (0)1566 977000 The Keep, Creech Castle, Taunton, TA1 2DX t: +44 (0)1823 577998 Registered Office: 1A Parliament Square, Parliament Street, Crediton, Devon, EX17 2AW Registered in England and Wales No. 8300933 VAT No. 923955793 We are concerned regarding the reliance on the new community in respect of this Plan period. The experience of Cranbrook demonstrates the long lead-in times in respect of delivery, with first occupations at Cranbrook occurring some 20 years post allocation (having been arguably a more defined proposal than the new community at that stage). We provide additional comments on this in relation to Strategic Policy WS01.

Full name: Jeremy Gardiner

Organisation (where relevant): Pegasus Group

Other party name (if relevant): Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: This policy proposes a settlement hierarchy as the basis for the distribution of development land allocations which are intended to be proportionate to the scale and function of each settlement. No objection is raised to the proposed settlement hierarchy, which directs growth to the most sustainable locations in accordance with the NPPF.

Full name: Elliot Jones

Organisation (where relevant): Planning Potential

Other party name (if relevant): Bloor Homes

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:

4.6. The aim of the spatial strategy is to direct new development towards the most sustainable locations in East Devon. The spatial strategy seeks to focus new development at locations that are, or can be made, sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes. Bloor Homes is supportive of this approach.

4.7. However, it is their view that development sites in Exmouth should be given the same weight as those in the West End and that they should be positioned equally within the settlement hierarchy. Strategic Policy SPO1 outlines the distribution of development across East Devon based on a clear settlement hierarchy. In this hierarchy, development at the West End is given significant emphasis, which is not disputed, however, Exmouth, despite being the principal centre in East Devon with substantial potential for growth is not afforded the same level of importance.

4.8. Bloor Homes agrees with the hierarchical approach in principle. It is, however, vitally important that the hierarchy correctly reflects the existing characteristics of settlements within East Devon and assigns appropriate levels of growth to each.

4.9. In this regard, the NPPF does not prescribe a strict settlement hierarchy but emphasises the importance of sustainable development and the role of different settlements in meeting housing and economic needs. It encourages local planning authorities to develop their own hierarchy based on the characteristics of their area, taking into account factors such as accessibility, the capacity of infrastructure, and the need to support sustainable patterns of movement.

4.10. In the Local Plan Evidence Base, it is recognised that Exmouth has the largest population and is the most economically active town in East Devon. As such, development at this location will have significant sustainability benefits given the current role it plays in the settlement hierarchy in terms of serving a wide catchment area whilst benefiting from good public transport connections to the rest of East Devon and beyond.

4.11. Moreover, Exmouth benefits from existing infrastructure, amenities, and a wide range of services and facilities - all of which make it a critical location for further development. The West End's prioritisation over Exmouth seems slightly disproportionate when considering the potential for sustainable development in Exmouth. Both areas should be treated equally in the Local Plan to ensure balanced growth across the district. At present, Exmouth's potential contribution to the district's overall development strategy is undermined. A more balanced settlement hierarchy would promote equitable development, ensuring that Exmouth receives appropriate attention and investment alongside the West End, whilst creating a more balanced distribution of resources and amenities.

4.12. However, this view has not been translated into Strategic Policy SP1. The Local Plan currently places undue emphasis on development in the West End, focusing significant housing and employment growth in this location. While the West End is an important economic area, Exmouth is the largest town in East Devon, with substantial infrastructure, transport links, and amenities to accommodate sustainable growth.

4.13. The exclusion of Exmouth from the same strategic tier as the West End is unjustified given its size, economic role, and capacity to support development.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.:

4.14. If the underlying objective of the emerging Local Plan is to direct development towards the most sustainable locations, we consider that it is essential for the spatial

strategy to be amended to reflect the settlement hierarchy and acknowledge that Exmouth, a tier 1 settlement, should also be a 'focus' for new development akin to the new settlement and the western side of the district.

4.15. Bloor Homes raise concerns with the overall direction of the Spatial Strategy as set out in Strategic Policy SP01. The Council should reconsider the drafting of this policy to ensure that development opportunities in Exmouth are given the same weight as those in the West End. Adjusting the settlement hierarchy to reflect this would promote balanced growth, harness the full potential of Exmouth, and ensure equitable development across East Devon.

4.16. The Local Plan should distribute development more equitably across the district thereby ensuring Exmouth receives equal strategic weighting, which would allow for a fairer distribution of employment opportunities and housing, preventing over-reliance on one area. Accordingly, Exmouth should be at the top of the settlement hierarchy as set out in Strategic Policy SP01. This amendment would ensure that the settlement hierarchy focusses growth in the major development area of West End as well as the principal centre of Exmouth, this will result in a more balanced and justified approach to spatial development across East Devon.

4.17. Bloor Homes objects to the current wording of this policy.

Full name: Elliot Jones

Organisation (where relevant): Planning Potential

Other party name (if relevant): Bloor Homes

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: Please see Supporting Statement that has been submitted by Bloor Homes in respect of the Land to the South of Littleham, Exmouth. It makes representations to this policy and others.

2(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter legally compliant, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter legally compliant. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: Please see Supporting Statement.

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Please see Supporting Statement

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: Please see Supporting Statement

4(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.: Please see Supporting Statement

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : The matters raised in our representations affect matters of strategic importance that run to the heart of the East Devon Local Plan 2020

to 2042. In our capacity as a major housebuilder, we would welcome the opportunity to partake in the hearing session(s).

Full name: Nick Matthews

Organisation (where relevant): Savills

Other party name (if relevant): Mac Mic Strategic Land

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: Yes

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: Introduction

1. This representation is submitted by Savills on behalf of Mac Mic Strategic Land (from hereon referred to as 'Mac Mic'). Mac Mic is a strategic land promoter with a strong reputation for delivering planning permissions that lead to high-quality development.

2. Mac Mic has instructed Savills on their behalf to submit a series of representations to the relevant policies of the Regulation 19 Local Plan, including this policy.

Policy SP01

3. Mac Mic broadly support the proposed spatial strategy contained within Strategic Policy SP01. The West End of East Devon is closest to the employment opportunities, higher order services and facilities and supporting infrastructure which will enable the delivery of strategic scale sustainable development.

4. Whilst the West End is not a spatially defined policy area, the description clearly includes the land close to Exeter at Mosshayne Lane.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Nick Matthews

Organisation (where relevant): Savills

Other party name (if relevant): Mac Mic Strategic Land

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: Yes

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: Yes

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: See attached.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Nick Matthews

Organisation (where relevant): Savills

Other party name (if relevant): Mac Mic Strategic Land

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: Yes

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: Yes

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: See attached.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Dan Yeates

Organisation (where relevant): Savills

Other party name (if relevant): Sidbury LVA LLP

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: No

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: In general, we are supportive of the proposed spatial strategy, and agree that there is a need to focus the spatial strategy on development at the most sustainable towns in the district. However, it is clear that the most sustainable villages are capable of playing significant role within the spatial strategy.

To help with this we welcome the Council's decision to include allocations at a range of settlements, not only the larger towns in the District.

We do continue to maintain that reference within the Draft Plan to an allowance for only 'limited development to meet local needs at the Service Villages' should be carefully considered to ensure that the growth directed to those villages is proportionate. From reviewing the Regulation 19 plan it is clear that for a number of villages more than simply 'limited' development is directed to those settlements. This is a matter we support. Development at the sustainable towns and villages is important to ensure the delivery of affordable housing for those locally who really need it, as well as supporting local shops and services.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your

suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: We therefore consider that it is the wording 'limited' which should be reviewed in order to ensure that the important role the villages can play is strengthened within the draft plan.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: No

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : It is important that Sidbury LVA LLP is present to participate in the hearing session for Policy SP01 owing to their interest in Land South of Furzehill (Sidm_34). It is important that they are given the opportunity to make their case in relation to this policy.

Full name: Dan Yeates

Organisation (where relevant): Savills

Other party name (if relevant): 3West Group

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: Yes

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: Yes

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: In general we are supportive of the proposed spatial strategy, and agree that there is a need to focus the spatial strategy on development at the most sustainable towns in the district. However, it is clear that the most sustainable villages are capable of playing significant role within the spatial strategy.

To help with this we welcome the Council's decision to include allocations at a range of settlements, not only the larger towns in the District.

We do continue to maintain that reference within the Draft Plan to an allowance for only 'limited development to meet local needs at the Service Villages' should be carefully considered to ensure that the growth directed to those villages is proportionate. From reviewing the Regulation 19 plan it is clear that for a number of villages more than simply 'limited' development is directed to those settlements. This is a matter we support and we therefore consider that it is the wording 'limited' which should be reviewed in order to ensure that the important role the villages can play is strengthened within the draft plan.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : It is important that 3West Group is present to participate in the hearing session for Policy SP01 owing to their interest in the Land north and east of Exton Farm (Wood_28). It is important that they are given the opportunity to make their case in relation to this policy.

Full name: Richard Bailey

Organisation (where relevant): Stags

Other party name (if relevant): Hobart Land Ltd

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Strategic Policy SP01: Spatial Strategy sets out that "New development will be directed towards the most sustainable locations in East Devon, by: ...C. Promoting significant development at the Main Centres of Axminster, Honiton, Ottery St Mary, Seaton, and Sidmouth to serve their own needs and that of the wider surrounding areas; This overarching strategy for the Main Centres is welcomed. The levels of future housing development are outlined in Strategic Policy SP02. This states that "Housing provision will be made for at least 20,909 dwellings (net) to be delivered in the plan area between 1 April 2020 to 31 March 2042. The housing requirement will be delivered through a stepped trajectory, with an annual target of 850 homes from 2020/21 to 2031/32, increasing to 1,070 homes per year from 2032/33 to 2041/42." The level of housing identified is supported in the main, however, it only represents 80% of the housing requirement calculated using the new standard methodology introduced in December 2024 by the updated National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Although this approach is acceptable under the transitional arrangements set out in the NPPF (Annex 1 - Paragraph 234) it is questionable given the recognised housing crisis whether East Devon District Council should be looking to exceed this and plan for the full housing requirement, which would equate to 26,136 dwellings over the plan period, or at least a partially increased figure. Additionally, given that this is a minimum housing requirement, it is crucial that there are sufficient allocations made to achieve and exceed the target. Whilst there is expected to be some flexibility in the projected supply over the plan period (1705 units / 8.2% over the minimum target), as set out in the Council's Housing delivery technical note (February 2025), there is scope for this to be improved. Increasing the amount of land available for development will provide more choice and competition in the supply, which should have benefits for delivery. It would also provide greater flexibility and resilience to the supply. The amount of allocations put forward as whole could therefore be expanded to help ensure that levels of housing above the minimum target can be achieved.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: Given the pressing need to boost the supply of housing land, additional allocations (including land associated with the former showground site at Honiton) could be included to achieve this. In summary, we support the emerging Spatial Strategy in terms of the direction of growth to the Main Centres, however, we suggest that the Council could pursue a better alternative strategy with regard to the housing target and meeting the full housing need based on the revised NPPF, and bolstering the identified supply of land for housing to ensure that the minimum target is achieved and exceeded.

Full name: Cara Chambers

Organisation (where relevant): Stantec

Other party name (if relevant): KCS Development

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: Yes

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: Strategic Policy SP01

4.2.1 This policy outlines the settlement hierarchy and overall approach for focussing development. Development will be directed towards the most sustainable locations, and Ottery St Mary is included on the third tier of the settlement hierarchy and is designated as a Main Centre. It is stated that the Council will promote significant development in Main Centres to serve their own needs and that of the wider surrounding area.

4.2.2 The policy where it directs development to sustainable locations is considered sound. And the approach of focussing development to Ottery is sound. However, there are concerns with the amount of growth being directed to Ottery as additional growth beyond that identified can be sustainably accommodated.

Full name: Neal Jillings

Organisation (where relevant): Summerfield Homes Ltd

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: Yes

2(a). If yes, and you wish to support the legal compliance of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: Spatial distribution of development is supported

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: Yes

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: Clause E relating to service villages should include the same text at the end of the sentence referring to 'that meets local needs and those in the immediate surroundings'. This is just as relevant as it is in relation to the Local Centres.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Frances Lennon

Organisation (where relevant): Turley

Other party name (if relevant): Bloor Homes Exeter

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Strategic Policy SP01: Spatial strategy [Object]

2.1 The draft policy confirms Feniton as a 'Service Village', where limited development is permitted. We object to this designation as a Service Village rather than (or distinct from) a Local Centre.

2.2 Whilst the Council's spatial strategy and settlement hierarchy is based on a review of the role and function of settlements, there is no clear narrative that explains how the different settlements have been apportioned into the final tiers within policy SP01. Indeed, it is noted that the settlements of Lympstone and Woodbury have been designated as Local Centres despite having similar credentials as Feniton.

2.3 Supporting paragraph 3.4 set outs the definitions of the settlements:

• Local Centres: Settlements with reasonable population levels and a smaller but important selection of strategic and local facilities, playing a crucial role in supporting local community infrastructure.

• Service Villages: Settlements with good local facilities, providing essential services and infrastructure for their immediate rural areas and supporting more localised, sustainable development.

2.4 The accompanying Role and Function of Settlements report (GEV-001) confirms:

• Feniton benefits from one strategic facility & service (train station) and eight local facilities and services (less than hourly bus service, primary school, convenience shop, community hall, pub, allotments, sports playing pitch and a children's play area).

• Woodbury benefits from one strategic facility & service (hourly bus service) and ten local facilities and services (less than hourly bus service, primary school, convenience shop, post office, GP, community hall, pub, allotments, sports playing pitch and a

children's play area). At paragraph 4.8 of the evidence document, it states that "although it only has one strategic facility, Woodbury can be described as playing an important local role given the presence of 10 out of 11 local facilities".

• Lympstone benefits from two strategic facilities & services (train station & hourly bus service) and ten local facilities and services (less than hourly bus service, primary school, convenience shop, community hall, pub, allotments, sports playing pitch and a children's play area).

2.5 The above clearly demonstrates that Feniton has similar community facilities and services credentials than both Woodbury and Lympstone. In particular, Woodbury only benefits from a bus service, whilst Feniton benefits from a train station that provides a greater number of connections than the station in Lympstone. Indeed, it provides frequent key commuter routes to London Waterloo and Exeter St David's. This provides 8 excellent opportunities for commuting and for travelling to education facilities. It is considered that the fact Feniton has a train service that provides frequent connections to key commuter destinations should be recognised and given considerable advantage over other settlements in the District.

2.6 It is considered that Feniton be designated as a Local Centre on the basis that it benefits from a train station with connections to key commuter destinations and provides a similar number of local facilities and services than Woodbury Lympstone. At present, the Council has implemented an inconsistent approach to the settlement hierarchy that needs to be addressed.

2.7 The current failure to recognise Feniton as a local centre results in opportunity for sustainable development at the settlement not being maximised or realised. Indeed, the current designation as a Service Village has influenced other aspects of the plan, including the distribution of housing and selection of sites for development.

2.8 The delivery of just 109 homes over the 15 years of the plan period at Feniton (as housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of HOU-001) will unlikely be sufficient to meet local needs across the same period and is not a proportionate response to the role and function of Feniton as a local centre within East Devon. It will impede the future vitality and viability of the village and will impede the provision of much needed affordable homes for the village.

2.9 The Council has within the plan acknowledged that further land (located within designated landscapes, including the National Landscape) will need to be released for residential development. Feniton is not located with an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (where the East Devon AONB otherwise covers large parts of the District), or any other designated landscape. It therefore represents an opportunity for the Council to deliver sustainable development on unconstrained land.

Full name: Andrew Ross

Organisation (where relevant): Turley

Other party name (if relevant): Bloor Homes Exeter

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Strategic Policy SP01: Spatial strategy [Comments]

2.1 In respect of the component of the Spatial Strategy that confirms Sidmouth as a Main Centre this is supported, as Sidmouth is clearly a main town within East Devon (with strategic and local facilities) and a logical location meet a proportion of the District's development needs, and meet needs arising in the wider surrounding areas.

2.2 This position is supported by the Council's evidence, including the Role and Function of Settlements report (GEV-001), which records that Sidmouth benefits from all of the assessed strategic and local facilities and services, other than a train station. This very clearly distinguishes it (with some, but not all, of the other Main Centres) from the other lower tier settlements and suggests that the proportion of new development at Sidmouth should be elevated when compared to the other lower tier settlements.

2.3 It is not clear that the status and potential for development at Sidmouth has been reflected in the policies and allocations in the plan, where other lower tier settlements are being proposed for higher levels of development. This includes having regard to Sidmouth as an existing centre of population, with the second highest resident population in the District (only behind Exmouth), specific pressures on affordability (and so the need for further affordable housing delivery) and with demographics skewed towards an ageing population (with additional pressures on housing supply and the ability to provide housing for economically active residents to support the health and vibrancy of the town). In this respect it is not clear that the spatial strategy has been followed and is effectively informing the policies and approach for the plan as a whole.

2.4 The delivery of just 333 homes over the 15 years of the plan period at Sidmouth (as housing trajectory at Appendix 2 of HOU-001) will unlikely be sufficient to meet local

needs across the same period and is not a proportionate response to the role and function of Sidmouth as a key main centre within East Devon.

2.5 The Council has within the plan acknowledged that further land (located within designated landscapes, including the National Landscape) will need to be released for residential development. Sidmouth is a constrained settlement, surrounded by the designated National Landscape and other constraints (including Coastal Protection zones), with a lack of sufficient suitable development opportunities within the existing settlement, and/or on previously developed land. However, these constraints need to be balanced with the settlement's high sustainability credentials, it is therefore an area of suitable for additional growth, to support and in accordance with the spatial strategy at SP01.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : To elaborate on issues raised and respond as appropriate during hearings.

Full name: Richard Bailey

Other party name (if relevant): Hobart Land Ltd

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Strategic Policy SP01: Spatial Strategy sets out that "New development will be directed towards the most sustainable locations in East Devon, by: ... C. Promoting significant development at the Main Centres of Axminster, Honiton, Ottery St Mary, Seaton, and Sidmouth to serve their own needs and that of the wider surrounding areas;

This overarching strategy for the Main Centres is welcomed.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: In this context, and given the earlier comments about bolstering the allocated land for housing delivery, we consider that the land at the former showground site provides a good opportunity to deliver a mixed use residential and sports development on the edge of Honiton. This would assist in addressing both the need for more sports pitches and housing. If the former showground site was included in this then the total supply could be increased to approximately 988, as well as securing the delivery of 4 junior rugby sports pitches. This would be a positive addition to the development strategy for the town.

The site is located in an accessible location approximately 900 metres from the town centre. This is a reasonable walking and cycling distance. Also, the site has an existing access on Langford Road which can be improved as necessary alongside other highway

improvements, such as pedestrian crossing, extended footway and cycle route facilities, to provide improved connections.

The former showground site is available, suitable and achievable (as the findings of the HELAA [November 2022] found with regard to the part submitted for assessment - Honi_9) and could be developed with limited adverse impacts, it appears that there is reasonable alternative to the current

strategy that would help further to ensure that the necessary minimum levels of housing are achieved and exceeded, and that some playing pitch provision for the town of Honiton is delivered.

In summary, we support the emerging Spatial Strategy in terms of the direction of growth to the Main Centres, however, we suggest that the Council could pursue a better alternative strategy with regard to the housing target and meeting the full housing need based on the revised NPPF, and bolstering the identified supply of land for housing to ensure that the minimum target is achieved and exceeded.

Full name: Nathan Budd

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: No

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: The Spatial Strategy chapter is not legally compliant for the following reasons: * It fails to adequately integrate infrastructure delivery, particularly wastewater infrastructure, into its strategic policies. While the plan acknowledges the need for infrastructure, it does not provide sufficient detail or assurance that necessary infrastructure, including wastewater management, will be delivered alongside development. * The chapter does not demonstrate effective compliance with the Duty to Cooperate, especially concerning strategic, cross-boundary issues such as wastewater management. There is a lack of evidence of joint working with relevant bodies, such as Southwest Water, to address infrastructure deficits and ensure sustainable development. * The general statements regarding sustainable development are not substantiated with clear commitments and mechanisms for addressing known infrastructure deficits. The chapter relies on aspirational language without providing the necessary detail or certainty about how critical issues, such as inadequate wastewater infrastructure, will be resolved. * The chapter's policies do not ensure that development will not lead to unacceptable levels of pollution or environmental harm. The repeated discharge of raw sewage into the sea by Southwest Water highlights a significant environmental problem that the Spatial Strategy fails to adequately address.

2(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter legally compliant, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter legally compliant. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: To make the Spatial Strategy chapter legally compliant, the following modifications are necessary: * Strengthen Integration of Infrastructure Delivery: * Modification: Revise the chapter to explicitly articulate how infrastructure delivery, especially wastewater infrastructure, is integrated into the plan's

spatial strategy. * Suggested Revised Wording: "The spatial strategy of this Local Plan is fundamentally linked to the delivery of necessary infrastructure. The plan directs development to sustainable locations, but this direction is contingent on the provision of adequate infrastructure. In particular, the plan recognizes the critical importance of wastewater infrastructure. The spatial strategy prioritizes development in areas where infrastructure capacity exists or can be realistically provided. It also sequences development to align with infrastructure delivery, ensuring that development does not outpace the provision of essential services. Strategic policies within this chapter provide an overview of how infrastructure considerations have shaped the spatial strategy and how the plan will ensure that development and infrastructure are delivered in a coordinated manner."? * Why this modification will make the chapter legally compliant: This will demonstrate that infrastructure is a key driver of the plan's spatial strategy, ensuring that development is located in areas where it can be supported by necessary services. ? * Enhance Duty to Cooperate Evidence: * Modification: Expand the chapter to provide specific examples of how the Council has engaged or will engage with relevant bodies, particularly concerning strategic infrastructure and environmental issues. * Suggested Revised Wording: "East Devon District Council is committed to fulfilling its Duty to Cooperate. This commitment is central to addressing strategic issues that cross administrative boundaries. The Council has engaged and will continue to engage with [list specific bodies, e.g., Southwest Water, Environment Agency, neighbouring authorities] to ensure that the Local Plan effectively addresses strategic matters. This cooperation includes joint working on the planning and delivery of strategic infrastructure, including wastewater management solutions, and coordinated approaches to environmental protection and enhancement. Policies within this chapter provide further detail on the mechanisms for ongoing cooperation and how the outcomes of this cooperation have shaped the plan."? * Why this modification will make the chapter legally compliant: This will demonstrate that the plan is based on effective collaboration and that strategic issues have been properly considered and addressed through joint working. ? * Strengthen Policy SP01: * Modification: Include a detailed section in Strategic Policy SP01 that outlines a commitment to prioritizing and delivering necessary infrastructure, with a specific focus on addressing the wastewater infrastructure deficit. * Suggested Revised Wording: "Strategic Policy SP01: Spatial Strategy?New development will be directed towards the most sustainable locations in East Devon, by:?A. Focusing new development at the West End of the district, including a further new community, on-going development of Cranbrook and other major strategic developments close to Exeter. The West End is not a spatially defined policy area with a line on the Policies map, rather it is a term that applies to development proposals and site allocations referred to in this Chapter of the plan.?B. Promoting the most significant development levels, other than at the West End where the highest levels of growth are proposed, at the Principal Centre of Exmouth.?C. Promoting significant development at the Main Centres of Axminster, Honiton, Ottery St Mary, Seaton, and Sidmouth to serve

their own needs and that of the wider surrounding areas;?D. Supporting development at the Local Centres of Broadclyst, Budleigh Salterton, Colyton, Lympstone, and Woodbury that meets local needs and those in the immediate surroundings;?E. Allowing limited development at the Service Villages of Beer, Branscombe, Broadhembury, Chardstock, Clyst St Mary, Dunkeswell, East Budleigh, Exton, Feniton, Hawkchurch, Kilmington, Musbury, Newton Poppleford, Otterton, Payhembury, Plymtree, Sidbury, Stoke Canon, Tipton St John, Uplyme, Westclyst, West Hill and Whimple. Settlements not listed above, with the exception of Broadclyst Station which is addressed through the Cranbrook Plan, are defined as in 'open countryside' for the purposes of the Local Plan. The open countryside definition also excludes any location that falls in a defined settlement boundary or any site or area of land that is explicitly allocated or identified in the Development Plan for built development. In the open countryside more restrictive planning policies apply.?Infrastructure Delivery Commitment: > The Local Plan recognizes that sustainable development can only be achieved with adequate infrastructure. There are significant challenges in East Devon with regards to existing infrastructure capacity, most notably in the management of wastewater. To address this, the plan adopts an ‘Infrastructure First’ principle. Development will be strictly contingent on the delivery of necessary infrastructure improvements. This includes a commitment to work with Southwest Water and other relevant agencies to secure funding and implement a program of upgrades to wastewater infrastructure. The delivery of infrastructure will be monitored, and shortfalls will be addressed to ensure that development does not proceed without the necessary infrastructure in place."? * Why this modification will make the chapter legally compliant: This will provide a clear and strong commitment to addressing a critical infrastructure deficit. It will demonstrate that the plan is not only aspirational but also grounded in a realistic and deliverable strategy. ? * Include Measurable Targets and Monitoring Framework: * Modification: Add a section that outlines how the plan’s objectives, particularly those related to infrastructure and environmental improvements, will be monitored and measured, with clear targets and mechanisms for review and corrective action. * Suggested Revised Wording: "To ensure the effective delivery of the plan’s objectives, the Introduction establishes a framework for monitoring and review. This framework will include: * Specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound (SMART) targets for infrastructure delivery and environmental improvements, including targets for the reduction of sewage discharges. * * Regular monitoring of key indicators, such as infrastructure capacity, water quality, and environmental quality. * Annual publication of monitoring reports to ensure transparency and accountability. * Mechanisms for reviewing the plan and taking corrective action if targets are not being met or if new challenges arise. * This framework will ensure that the plan remains responsive and that progress towards its objectives is effectively tracked and managed."? * Why this modification will make the chapter legally compliant: This will ensure that the plan's objectives are not just aspirational but are

backed by a robust system of monitoring and accountability. It will provide confidence that the plan can adapt to changing circumstances and deliver its intended outcomes. ? These modifications will make the Spatial Strategy chapter legally compliant by: * Demonstrating a clear commitment to addressing infrastructure deficits. * Strengthening the plan's focus on environmental protection and improvement. * Establishing a framework for monitoring and review to ensure accountability and effectiveness. * Detailing compliance with the Duty to Cooperate by providing evidence of effective engagement with relevant bodies, particularly regarding strategic infrastructure issues such as wastewater management. * Explicitly referencing how infrastructure delivery, especially wastewater infrastructure, is integrated into the plan's strategy. * Substantiating general statements regarding national policy and sustainable development with clear commitments to addressing known infrastructure deficits.

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: The Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound for several reasons: * It does not provide a sufficiently robust framework for ensuring that development is sustainable and that infrastructure deficits are adequately addressed. The repeated discharge of raw sewage into the sea by Southwest Water highlights a significant infrastructure deficit that the Spatial Strategy fails to adequately plan for or address. * While the chapter includes general statements about aiming for sustainable development and aligning with national policy, these statements are not substantiated with clear, specific commitments and mechanisms for delivery, especially regarding infrastructure improvements. * There is a lack of explicit detail on how infrastructure delivery, especially wastewater infrastructure, will be integrated into the plan's overall strategy. The Spatial Strategy needs to demonstrate a clear commitment to an 'infrastructure first' approach, ensuring that necessary upgrades are in place to support new development. * The Spatial Strategy's treatment of the Duty to Cooperate is high-level and lacks the necessary detail to demonstrate how the Council has engaged effectively with relevant bodies to address strategic, cross-boundary issues, including those related to infrastructure. * The objectives outlined in the Spatial Strategy are aspirational but lack a clear implementation plan, making it difficult to assess how they will be achieved and measured. In summary, the Spatial Strategy chapter is unsound because it lacks the specificity, robust commitments, and clear mechanisms necessary to ensure that development is sustainable and that infrastructure deficits are adequately addressed.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the

Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: To make the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, the following modifications are necessary: * Strengthen the Infrastructure Commitment: * Modification: Include a detailed section that outlines a commitment to prioritizing and delivering necessary infrastructure, with a specific focus on addressing the wastewater infrastructure deficit. * Suggested Revised Wording:?"The Local Plan recognizes that sustainable development can only be achieved with adequate infrastructure. There are significant challenges in East Devon with regards to existing infrastructure capacity, most notably in the management of wastewater. To address this, the plan adopts an 'Infrastructure First' principle. Development will be strictly contingent on the delivery of necessary infrastructure improvements. This includes a commitment to work with Southwest Water and other relevant agencies to secure funding and implement a program of upgrades to wastewater infrastructure. The Spatial Strategy will also detail how the delivery of infrastructure will be monitored, and how shortfalls will be addressed to ensure that development does not proceed without the necessary infrastructure in place."? * Why this modification will make the Spatial Strategy sound: This will provide a clear and strong commitment to addressing a critical infrastructure deficit. It will demonstrate that the plan is not only aspirational but also grounded in a realistic and deliverable strategy. * Enhance the Duty to Cooperate Explanation: * Modification: Expand the Spatial Strategy to provide specific examples of how the Council has engaged or will engage with relevant bodies, particularly concerning strategic infrastructure and environmental issues. * Suggested Revised Wording:?"East Devon District Council is committed to fulfilling its Duty to Cooperate. This commitment is central to addressing strategic issues that cross administrative boundaries. The Council has engaged and will continue to engage with [list specific bodies, e.g., Southwest Water, Environment Agency, neighboring authorities] to ensure that the Local Plan effectively addresses strategic matters. This cooperation includes joint working on the planning and delivery of strategic infrastructure, including wastewater management solutions, and coordinated approaches to environmental protection and enhancement. The Spatial Strategy will provide further detail on the mechanisms for ongoing cooperation and how the outcomes of this cooperation have shaped the plan."? * Why this modification will make the Spatial Strategy sound: This will demonstrate that the plan is based on effective collaboration and that strategic issues have been properly considered and addressed through joint working. * Provide Measurable Targets and Monitoring Framework: * Modification: Include a section that outlines how the plan's objectives, particularly those related to infrastructure and environmental improvements, will be monitored and measured, with clear targets and mechanisms for review and corrective action. * Suggested Revised Wording:?"To ensure the effective delivery of the plan's objectives, the Spatial Strategy establishes a framework for monitoring and review. This framework will include: * Specific, measurable, achievable,

relevant, and time-bound (SMART) targets for infrastructure delivery and environmental improvements, including targets for the reduction of sewage discharges. * * Regular monitoring of key indicators, such as infrastructure capacity, water quality, and environmental quality. * Annual publication of monitoring reports to ensure transparency and accountability. * Mechanisms for reviewing the plan and taking corrective action if targets are not being met or if new challenges arise. * This framework will ensure that the plan remains responsive and that progress towards its objectives is effectively tracked and managed."? * Why this modification will make the Spatial Strategy sound: This will ensure that the plan's objectives are not just aspirational but are backed by a robust system of monitoring and accountability. It will provide confidence that the plan can adapt to changing circumstances and deliver its intended outcomes. * Strengthen Integration of Infrastructure in the Spatial Strategy: * Modification: Revise the Spatial Strategy to explicitly articulate how infrastructure delivery, especially wastewater infrastructure, is integrated into the plan's spatial strategy. * Suggested Revised Wording:?"The spatial strategy of this Local Plan is fundamentally linked to the delivery of necessary infrastructure. The plan directs development to sustainable locations, but this direction is contingent on the provision of adequate infrastructure. In particular, the plan recognizes the critical importance of wastewater infrastructure. The spatial strategy prioritizes development in areas where infrastructure capacity exists or can be realistically provided. It also sequences development to align with infrastructure delivery, ensuring that development does not outpace the provision of essential services. The Spatial Strategy will provide an overview of how infrastructure considerations have shaped the spatial strategy and how the plan will ensure that development and infrastructure are delivered in a coordinated manner."? * Why this modification will make the Spatial Strategy sound: This will demonstrate that infrastructure is a key driver of the plan’s spatial strategy, ensuring that development is located in areas where it can be supported by necessary services. By incorporating these changes, the Spatial Strategy chapter will be significantly strengthened, providing a sounder basis for the Local Plan and ensuring that it is more likely to achieve its objectives in a sustainable and effective manner.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: No

4(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.: The Spatial Strategy chapter fails to comply with the Duty to Cooperate for the following reasons:

The chapter's references to cooperation with other bodies are general and aspirational, lacking specific details of how the Council has engaged or will engage with relevant

authorities and stakeholders on strategic issues. There is insufficient detail on how the plan has been shaped by effective joint working with neighboring authorities, statutory bodies, and service providers, particularly concerning cross-boundary issues such as infrastructure delivery and environmental impacts. While the plan mentions the importance of working with partner bodies to secure better facilities, including schools and medical services, it does not provide evidence of effective cooperation to address existing deficits or ensure that new development is supported by necessary infrastructure. The Spatial Strategy's treatment of the Duty to Cooperate does not adequately demonstrate how the Council has worked with Southwest Water to address the significant issue of wastewater management and sewage discharges, a matter that requires strategic, collaborative solutions. The plan highlights the strategic implications of development, but it does not provide sufficient detail on how the Duty to Cooperate has been fulfilled in planning for this development, which necessitates close cooperation with various agencies and neighboring authorities. In summary, the Spatial Strategy chapter lacks the necessary evidence and specific commitments to demonstrate that the Duty to Cooperate has been properly addressed, particularly in relation to strategic matters that require ongoing collaboration and joint working.

Full name: Helen Dimond

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: Yes

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Places have not been placed in the correct tier of the settlement hierarchy. Lympstone is a village and should be in Tier 4. It has limited facilities ,a single shop, no proper playing fields and a school which has temporary classrooms and uses the village hall during the day so that it is not available for other community facilities on weekdays Paper GEV-001, Role and Function of settlements ,recognises that Lympstone should be in a lower tier to towns such as Budleigh Salterton yet they have been placed in the same tier, tier 3 The only reason for Lympstone's inclusion in Tier 3 seems to be that it has a railway station . This has only 13 parking spaces . The sites proposed for new dwellings are on the edge of the village and from which few residents will walk or cycle to the station

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: Place Lympstone in Tier 4 as a service village

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : I wish to make sure that I have done the most I can to ensure the level of future development is appropriate for Lympstone.

Full name: Richard John Eley

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: No

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: The Spatial Strategy concedes from the outset that it does not define the area that it describes as 'the West End'. Yet it has policies which it applies to this non-defined part of East Devon. It then absurdly tries to define the West End as the locations where these policies have been applied in the document. A classic 'chicken and egg' position, which is surely legally invalid.

The selection of communities suitable for development/expansion is not determined by their suitability but solely in accordance with their size.

It seems to me that site selection should be determined by the suitability of individual sites, rather than by categorizing communities as a whole within a meaningless 'hierarchy'.

The Strategic Planning Committee were preoccupied with the hierarchy of individual villages without any consideration as to their suitability for development.

This obsession with hierarchy and the rushed allocation of sites meant that the selection of sites took place before Built Up Area boundaries were determined. This meant that many suitable sites were not allocated despite being subsequently included within the BUABs. Effectively, this ensured an unnecessary over allocation. And the selection of sites that were clearly far less suitable than those identified within the newly extended BUABs. I cannot claim to know whether this muddled and illogical

procedure is not legally compliant, but I do know that it is irresponsible and unreasonable.

2(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter legally compliant, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter legally compliant. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: See above. The correct procedure should have been to establish a methodology that identified the best sites for development rather than the best communities for development. The Spatial Strategy should have identified a procedure for choosing sites rather than a hierarchy of settlements which would determine where development should occur. For example, villages were tiered for development irrespective of the road network that served them.

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: See above. The entire process was illogical and based upon a false hierarchical analysis.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: Individual sites should be selected in accordance with general planning policy. Each community within East Devon should have been looked at carefully to determine how much development is reasonable overall, and where that development should occur. Instead, 'blanket' allocations were effectively delivered as a result of a hierarchical structure determined almost entirely by the size of the community.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: No

4(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.: There is little evidence that the methodology employed by EDDC arose from any discussions with neighbouring authorities and/or organizations. Nor was the methodology explained properly to members or to the wider public. It was, of course, very rushed, although much time was wasted on pointless debates about hierarchy. In particular, officers imposed the second New Town (after Cranbrook) upon members of the Strategic Planning Committee, who were clearly unhappy to be 'bounced' into this

outcome. The majority of responses to the first consultation were broadly against another New Town, especially as it is going to be very close to Cranbrook, and will mean a huge increase in Greater Exeter sprawl.

The second New Town is supported by very little infrastructure, will have limited open space, and is clearly lacking in basic amenities and adequate roads.

The Clyst Valley Regional Park will no doubt be as elusive as Cranbrook's town centre, and as likely to work well as Cranbrook's much vaunted but malfunctioning central heating system. The Clyst Valley Regional Park is perhaps van attractive idea, but it is ill-defined and very costly to deliver. And it is not an ambitious 'park' but simply a hotch-potch of land largely owned by the National Trust, and so offers very little 'new' green space. The new community will be served largely by the A3052, which is already gridlocked on a regular basis. We simply do not have the infrastructure to support the new community, either in respect of roads, or with regard to, for example, sewerage. Anyone who watched SPC meetings will recall that almost every site allocation was offered little in the way of transport links other than the prospect of a Co-Bikes installation, whereupon the company providing this pathetic service promptly went bust.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : The rushed, ill-judged manner in which the Plan was delivered needs to be explained and discussed. In particular, council members did not challenge many of the policies and allocations, or the procedures that were employed. It was very much officer led.

Full name: Rosie Fox

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: Yes

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: I am supportive of many elements of the Local Plan and think you have done a great job at setting a vision for the area's future. I am particularly supportive of the growth of Cranbrook and the creation of a second new town in the area: I think this strategic, large-scale development, with beautiful and relatively high-density housing concentrated in a few strategic locations, is the best way to meet the high housing targets (which I also support) in the area.

Full name: Kerin Hamill

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: No

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: Exmouth is on a peninsula and although classed as a tier 1 town it is totally unsuitable for large growth. The southern part is the town centre and , therefore, making a 360 degree development is unsuitable. The existing development is already a long way from the town centre.

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Exmouth is on a peninsula and although classed as a tier 1 town it is totally unsuitable for large growth. The southern part is the town centre and , therefore, making a 360 degree development is unsuitable . The existing development is already a long way from the town centre.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: No

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : We were not consulted at the first stage of this plan and it went through without residents being informed. We were not listened to for the second consultation and I would hope that at this stage we can hear what the Inspector has to say.

Full name: Karime Hassan MBE

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: Yes

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: This representation is in support of the vision and spatial strategy set out in the Regulation 19 consultation document, and makes specific representation on an issue of concern that should be addressed in the text content for Strategic Policy WS01: Development of a second new community east of Exeter, the appropriate section falling under the sub-heading of Social, Community and Educational facilities, and/or to be identified as an issue to be addressed in the future "allocation-wide masterplan". Vision and Spatial Strategy The origin of the strategic policy approach to prioritising growth in the west end of East Devon arises from the Regional Strategy for the South West 1998 that directed future growth in Devon to the east of Exeter, recognising the need to support future employment and housing growth at the principal urban area. This was then incorporated into the Devon Structure Plan and this has successfully supported the growth of the Exeter area. Cranbrook, as one of two new communities in Devon (Sherford being the other) is a consequence of that policy direction. Bringing homes close to jobs with accessibility to good transport networks was seen as the most sustainable way of addressing the needs of growing the economy and supplying homes. Cranbrook functions as an urban extension of Exeter and it has been a significant contributing factor to the growth of the local economy providing family homes in good supply for the many businesses that have located in the wider Exeter area. The young demographic character of the local population is at odds with the rest of the county. The rest of the district, as the evidence shows, is getting older. The economy requires a plentiful supply of housing to meet the needs of the economy and the Vision and Spatial Strategy is a corollary of the current development plan's approach to how best to achieve that aim in the most sustainable form. The structural challenges of the local economy of Devon are best met by continuing to focus investment to support the strategic employment and housing strategy set out in the Emerging Local Plan. Investment in sites such as the Exeter Science Park, Skypark, and the Airport require continued support to sweat those assets to the benefit of the economy. Capitalising on the graduates attracted to the university of Exeter requires both employment

opportunities as well as somewhere to live. Young and economically active population also require things to do, things to see and to support the needs of people of all ages. Much of the cultural and sporting infrastructure is concentrated in or close to the city. The spatial strategy broadly recognises this in supporting the provision of a greater proportion of new homes in the West End of the District. There are clear landscape and environmental considerations to be addressed as part of the specific site selection and options, but the spatial strategy that underpins the strategic policies set out in the Regulation 19 consultation reflect what has been a long-term policy direction set by regional, strategic and district policy makers in the past.

Full name: Sylvia Meller

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: In a time of climate emergency we can not allow even more of our landscape to be destroyed by new housing developments which are not even afordable by locals

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: Before building up new areas we should first of all make sure all council flats/houses are used .Buildings/flats which stand empty need to be compulsory purchased and sold/rented out . The purchase of 2nd hoes needs to be limited to a minimum. If new developments need to be build , apartment blocks with affordable 1-2 bedroom flats to buy or rent should be prioritised over developments of individual houses. Developments should not be granted outside settlement boundaries or on areas of National Landscape

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: No

4(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.: See 3b and 3c

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Sylvia Meller

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: In a time of climate emergency we can not plaster our landscape with even more developments which are usually not affordable and do not help the locals with finding suitable places to live

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: Before building up new areas we should first of all make sure all council flats/houses are used .Buildings/flats which stand empty need to be compulsory purchased and sold/rented out . The purchase of 2nd hoes needs to be limited to a minimum. If new developments need to be build , apartment blocks with affordable 1-2 bedroom flats to buy or rent should be prioritised over developments of individual houses. Developments should not be granted outside settlement boundaries or on areas of National Landscape

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: No

4(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.: See 3b and 3c

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Andrew Minter

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: SP01 The spatial strategy states that it is to provide 'Sustainable Housing in the west' of the district. From Exmouth to Lympstone will be an urban sprawl with the current emerging plan proposals. The traditional and legal green wedge between the two to prevent coalescence and maintain Spirit of Place will be irretrievably lost and Exmouth will in turn subsume Exton, Ebford and link up with Topsham. EDDC should consider the nuclear option instead of developing on the 2/3 of the district that is National Landscape/AONB, instead of destroying the ecologically and historically important Estuary and villages along it.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: Make Lympstone a Service Village, NOT a local centre

State that EDDC will consider significant development of the National Landscape/AONB in order to meet Central Governments MISGUIDED and INCORRECT targets...(for goodness sake EDDC, be a bit more militant!)

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: No

4(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.: see comments above

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : I want my voice to be heard

Full name: David Morgan

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:

Strategic Policy SP01: Spatial Strategy (pages 25-28). Quote: "Main Centres – Axminster, Honiton, Ottery St Mary, Seaton, Sidmouth: Settlements with strategic and local facilities that serve both their immediate area and surrounding communities, offering a balanced mix of jobs, services, and growth potential." Comment: The objective for these towns does not explicitly identify the types of strategic and local facilities that serve these Tier 2 Main Centres'. Therefore, it is questionable whether a town such as Seaton is a Tier 2 'Main Centre' and provides the same level of strategic and local facilities to its residents and those living in surrounding areas. Seaton does not offer the same balance or abundance of mixed jobs compared to other 'main centres' such as Axminster, Honiton and Sidmouth. Nor does Seaton offer the same number of services, as it does not offer facilities for secondary or further education compared to the other Tier 2 main centres. Seaton also has limited medical support services (which have been reduced in the last ten years) whereby residents are required to travel outside of the town to access many day patient services. Moreover, compared to these other main centres, Seaton does not have the same level of public transport provision, particularly in the evenings and at weekends. Therefore, this limits residents' access to a number of key services, thereby putting the town on par with a smaller town such as Budleigh Salterton which itself is identified as a 'local Centre' in the Local Plan. Seaton's unique topography and landscape characteristics also limits its potential growth for delivering new housing and employment sites compared to other Tier 2 'main centres' such as Axminster, Honiton and Sidmouth. Therefore, I do not support the assertion in the East Devon Local Plan Regulation 19 Publication Draft that Seaton is a Tier 2 "Main Centre', as its obvious lack of services, job opportunities and growth potential due to its landscape constraints, means it is more aligned to being a 'local centre'. As such, Seaton needs to be reclassified as a Tier 3 'local centre' and its spatial strategy considered along the objectives of a 'local centre', including in relation to

reducing the amount of future housing development proposed in Strategy Policy SP03 ‘Housing requirement by Designated Neighbourhood area’ (page 34).

Full name: David Mountain

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: Yes

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: I, like the majority of respondents, have no experience of the legality of urban planning proposals so I, like most respondents will be unable to provide meaningful feedback to this survey as set up.

That does not mean I and others to not have meaningful feedback to provide.

I live in lympstone which currently has a population appropriate for its infrastructure and character. To increase its housing and associated populatin by more than 25% will fundamentally change the character and erode the character. It will cease to act as a distinct village, and instead become a suburn of Exmouth. With the current population the road and sewage/sewerage systems function reasonably well. Many roads lack pavements, but with the current car and pedestrian capacity, all road users respect each other and can accommodate waiting at pinchpoints. Increase this by 25% without asociated road infrastructure improvements, and Lympstone will grind to a halt at peak times. Likewise we have had plenty of sewerage spill incidents recently - increasing the population (water use / more run off) without a huge investment in sewerage will lead to use further outstripping capacity.

Full name: Helen S MUNDAY

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: Yes

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:

4. Adding additional 10s of houses to larger developments should be prioritised over free standing developments of 10s of houses that have a large negative impact on the location chosen. Infrastructure such as community assets, transport etc. can be much better met by making a large development slightly larger (e.g. 40 houses on a plan of 1000 houses), than on many smaller developments especially in small villages with poor infrastructure, and where even a small development can have a large negative impact on the community.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: An evaluation of the impact of developments on village communities due to physical factors e.g. flood risks, poor access or human factors such as local amenities, should be conducted and meeting housing needs through larger developments in either brown field or bespoke sites should be prioritised.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Helen S MUNDAY

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: Yes

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:

3. Some sites should simply not be included in the plan due to multiple and cumulative factors that make the site both economically and physically inappropriate for development. Steep sided valleys with heavy clay soils, difficult natural drainage, poor access and various other natural and manmade issues, should simply be discounted as sites that warrant development. Especially where the impact on existing properties e.g. lower down the hillsides, would be significant in a negative way.

The local plan should be bold enough to state that some areas are already at realistic capacity for economic and practical further development due to the nature of the environment e.g. steep sided valleys. In these cases, housing quotas imposed by central government/high authorities, are irrelevant and need to challenged as to their appropriateness.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: Certain areas should be 'blocked out' from the local plan as they are inappropriate for further significant development. Small ad hoc developments may occur in due course, but not be part of priority allocation.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : I have examples that I would be happy to share

Full name: Thomas Shillitoe

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: SP01 Point B sets out EDDC's strategy that significant development will be at the Principal Centre of Exmouth. This is becoming an issue as Exmouth has sprawled so much that many of the housing sites proposed are nowhere near the centre of the town, where services and facilities are predominantly located. A much more logical strategy should be a measure of local population per service/facility throughout the district, to see where there is over or under capacity currently in East Devon. To have continuous development on one peninsula town is unsustainable. All sites throughout the district should measure against the same requirement for proximity to services with capacity (or per capita ratio)(schools / doctors etc). Prioritising an existing town irrespective of whether it has spare service/infrastructure capacity or not does not seem strategic. Of note for Exmouth as due to its peninsula location and significant late 20th century sprawling suburbs, distances to services can be significant.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: All sites throughout the district should measure against the same requirement for proximity to services and per capita capacity assessed.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : To understand why EDDC believe the largest town, Exmouth should keep getting bigger and growing unsustainably.

Full name: John Thorne BA DipTP MRTPI(Rtd)

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: Yes

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: This part of the plan is entirely silent on the subject of registering and directing residential development towards brownfield land. Pursuant to Regulation 4 of the Town and Country Planning (Brownfield Land Register) Regulations 2017, the LPA is under a statutory obligation to identify and publish annually a register of brownfield land and to update it at least once a year. The register on the EDDC website states it was 'recently' updated in December 2021. It is therefore more than three years out of date.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: An additional Policy acknowledging and committing to meeting the LPAs statutory responsibility to register and promote the development of brownfield land in preference to open agricultural land or other open land. This should support the objectives of preserving the natural environment, enhancing nature conservation and biodiversity, and achieving early delivery and implementation of housing schemes to meet identified need. Available brownfield sites should be factored into the proposed housing delivery figures.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Andrew Tyerman

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: No

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: It would also appear that EEDC has failed to comply with section 33A of the PCPA which requires the LPA to engage constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis with neighbouring authorities and certain other bodies over strategic matters during the preparation of the plan.

We know that a follow up Water Cycle Report has been Commissioned by EDDC and was due to be completed last year but this does not appear in the draft Plan and has not been shared with the community. This new Water Cycle Study is a key part of the evidence required for the Local Plan going forward to reflect how this will ensure adequate capacity for waste water treatment in East Devon.

I would strongly urge the Planning Inspector to consider these omissions and request urgent action by EDDC in conjunction with South West Water to address and assess sewage infrastructure future capacity. If required I would be happy to submit further evidence to support this.

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: In conjunction with a large group of East Devon residents I am concerned the consultation may not be based on sound evidence in relation to the waste water infrastructure in the area.

A previous Water Cycle Study (circa 2010) commissioned by East Devon District Council (EDDC) was predicated on the building of a new waste water treatment works

(WWTW) to serve the new Cranbrook community. This plan was subsequently dropped by South West Water and the sewage diverted to Countess Wear. This study specifically assessed the projected capacity for waste water treatment over the coming years and (with the inclusion of the new works) concluded that several locations would be over capacity by 2025 including Maer Lane STW. Since the time of the study the new WWTW was not built, the population in East Devon has increased by more than twice the national average (Census data 2011 -21) and the published performance data in Exmouth shows a large increase in the use of storm overflows discharging untreated sewage into the sensitive estuary and designated bathing waters. This clear evidence, of an already inadequate sewerage infrastructure, is entirely missing from the draft Local Plan. The leader of the council wrote to Government last year citing the situation as an 'emergency' yet this is not reflected in the Local Plan.

Full name: Rob Wallbank

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: The strategic Policy SP01, para C, refers to “significant” development at the main centres of…Seaton…to serve their own needs and that of the wider surrounding areas.

Elsewhere this is referred to as “local areas” which demonstrates that the enquiries made in producing this document, recognise that Seaton does not have housing needs for it’s own residents, but employment lies elsewhere. That elsewhere isn’t anywhere near, as the other villages and towns named are all local to Seaton. This implies very clearly that housing will exceed local needs, and therefore commuting will be needed. This needs to be addressed as such a policy is contrary to the Local and wider Plan objectives and places the whole document at risk of failing in its green credentials and net zero Carbon ideas, let alone damage to the green countryside and impact on the Jurassic Coast and historic green areas, Roman remains, vital to town and village identities.

Full name: Martin Thurgood

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: The Policy, SP01, fails to address Objective 2 of The Vison, that is, tackling the climate emergency, Objective 6, high quality development, and Objective 9, encouraging walking & cycling. For Objective 2, it fails to recognise that Exeter is the major draw for employment and that most journeys will be made between there and the new housing areas. Placing all new development close to Exeter is essential to achieving Objective 2. Objective 6 will not be met by isolated developments on the peripheries of existing settlements. Only large-scale development can provide for high quality developments. The Cornish example of Nansledan shows what can be achieved towards Objectives 2, 6 and 9 through a comprehensive and carefully considered housing provision. East Devon District Council has the opportunity to demonstrate its abilities and commitments to truly delivering a world-beating vision through a major planned expansion through an enlarged proposed second new community, Policy SW01, rather than piecemeal relatively small-scale developments at the edges of existing communities. For Objective 9, permitting 'edge development sites' for new housing at existing communities fails to address the Objective. It is unrealistic to expect people to walk or cycle given the distances and the natural terrain. To give but one example, development on the edges of Ottery St Mary are too far for people to walk to the central shopping area (and other facilities) and the steep valleys further severely mitigate against foot and cycle travel for a number of the locations. Moreover, off-street vehicle parking in the central area is already used to capacity and your proposals fail to address the consequences or provide for any positive resolution.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: SP01 should be redrafted to address such matters. In particular, it

should advance the proposed second new community, WS01, as the solution and increase its size such that development on the edges of existing settlements are unnecessary.

Full name: Martin Thurgood

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: No

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: The Policy, SP01, fails to address Objective 2 of The Vison, that is, tackling the climate emergency, Objective 6, high quality development, and Objective 9, encouraging walking & cycling. For Objective 2, it fails to recognise that Exeter is the major draw for employment and that most journeys will be made between there and the new housing areas. Placing all new development close to Exeter is essential to achieving Objective 2. Objective 6 will not be met by isolated developments on the peripheries of existing settlements. Only large-scale development can provide for high quality developments. The Cornish example of Nansledan shows what can be achieved towards Objectives 2, 6 and 9 through a comprehensive and carefully considered housing provision. East Devon District Council has the opportunity to demonstrate its abilities and commitments to truly delivering a world-beating vision through a major planned expansion through an enlarged proposed second new community, Policy SW01, rather than piecemeal relatively small-scale developments at the edges of existing communities. For Objective 9, permitting 'edge development sites' for new housing at existing communities fails to address the Objective. It is unrealistic to expect people to walk or cycle given the distances and the natural terrain. To give but one example, development on the edges of Ottery St Mary are too far for people to walk to the central shopping area (and other facilities) and the steep valleys further severely mitigate against foot and cycle travel for a number of the locations. Moreover, off-street vehicle parking in the central area is already used to capacity and your proposals fail to address the consequences or provide for any positive resolution. SP01 should be redrafted to address such matters. In particular, it should advance the proposed second new community, WS01, as the solution and increase its size such that development on the edges of existing settlements are unnecessary.

2(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter legally compliant, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter legally compliant. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: SP01 should be redrafted to address matters identified in my answer to 2(b) above. In particular, it should advance the proposed second new community, WS01, as the solution to housing needs and increase its size such that development on the edges of existing settlements are unnecessary.

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Please see comments made at Q. 2.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: Please see comments made at Q. 2.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: No

4(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.: I am neutral on the point: but you do not give me that option.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Rachel Danemann

Organisation (where relevant): Home Builders Federation (HBF)

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: From the Home Builders Federation (HBF)

The policy is not considered to be sound as it is not positively prepared, effective, justified or con-sistent with national policy

21. HBF does not comment on individual sites, other than to say the Plan should provide for a wide range of deliverable and developable sites across the area in order to provide competition and choice to en-sure that housing needs are met in full. The soundness of strategic and non-strategic site allocations, whether brownfield or greenfield, will be tested in due course at the Local Plan Examination.

22. The spatial strategy seeks to concentrate development in the West End including a proposed new settlement but this is not explicitly mentioned within the wording of the policy. HBF recognises the Council's intention to undertake further consultation on the details of the new settlement. We would however still expect the Plan to set this approach out as a part of the spatial strategy in this policy.

26. HBF do not comment on individual sites. We would however expect the spatial strategy to follow a logical hierarchy that provides an appropriate development pattern and supports sustainable development within all market areas. HBF would request that the Plan's approach to the distribution of housing should ensure the availability of a sufficient supply of deliverable and developable land to de-liver the housing requirement in full.

27. HBF also notes that new settlements and large urban extensions can have long lead times. Reliance on one (or more) new settlement(s) and/or urban extension(s) for housing delivery may mean deliv-ery from these sources will occur later on in the Plan period. This increases the importance of the need for a range of other sites to be provided to ensure a Five-Year Land Supply and early delivery of much needed housing. It will be important for policies and allocation in the Plan to provide for a range of housing sites, and as such the site selection methodology needs to reflect this.

28. Therefore, although HBF do not comment on specific site allocations, we find this policy is unsound because additional housing allocations are required. We are of the view, for the reasons details else-where in our representation, and so not repeated here, there need to be more housing allocations. This will necessarily impact on the spatial strategy of the Plan.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: 23. As set out earlier, in our concerns about legal compliance section, in the HBF's view the housing requirement is too low and such additional development will be needed. This will require the allocation of additional sites across East Devon in order for the Plan to be sound.

24. The spatial strategy of the Plan should also recognise that there may be clusters of villages that pro-vide a range of services for that area within reasonable travelling distance of each other, so villages may need to be grouped together. These areas might be able to sustainably support a substantial level of development but may not have all the services within one particular village.

25. Similarly, the Plan should recognise that settlements that currently do not have services could expand to include those services if new development is allocated in those areas. The current range of village services should not be used as a basis for only locating development close to existing services, it could in fact also identify where services could be improved through new development. Allocating housing sites in rural areas can also provide opportunities for small sites which are particularly helpful for SME builders.

29. HBF would also request that the wording of this policy should clearly set out the different components that make up the housing supply, where it is to be located, and when it will be delivered, in much the same way this issue has been addressed in the policy for Employment Land delivery in Strategic Pol-icy SP04: Employment provision and distribution strategy. This would go some way to addressing our concerns about the lack of clarity of the housing delivery pipeline, sources of supply, and how this links into the Monitoring Framework, which we have raised in relation to other policies in the Plan and the overall approach to housing that the Council is pursuing.

Full name: Helene Jessop

Organisation (where relevant): RSPB

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Some of the proposed areas for new housing are not sustainable (conclusion of the the HRA (Footprint Ecology 30/1/25) re adverse effects on air quality (increased nitrogen from increased traffic emissions affecting the vegetation of East Devon Heaths SAC/SPA). Some allocations in the west (eg St John's, Marley's Drive, Courtlands (all Exmouth), land south of Littleham and land directly east of Liverton Business Park (both Exmouth) and Woodbury), are likely to have adverse impacts on the East Devon Heaths SAC/SPA because of urban effects (increase in recreational use of the heaths and the damage arising from that) and impacts on nightjar (designated feature of the SPA) foraging areas off the designated sites that will be lost to built development.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: The RSPB recommends that development does not proceed unless adverse impacts on statutory designated sites can be avoided or satisfactorily mitigated. We recommend decisions on some proposed allocations (including those mentioned above) are only made after the results of the 2025 heathland breeding bird survey are known, this will include nightjar, and all adverse impacts on the designated habitats and species can be avoided or satisfactorily mitigated. In respect of air quality, the RSPB view is that the plan cannot be judged sound unless an effective strategy relating to vehicle emissions and air quality is agreed and can be implemented effectively; there is currently no such strategy.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Jim Roberts (Clerk)

Organisation (where relevant): Aylesbeare Parish Council

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Aylesbeare Parish Council would like EDDC to consider the following points when considering housing development in the proposed Local Plan: Aylesbeare is a small village with very few local services. There has not been a shop in the village for many years and the (currently closed) pub's future is very precarious. There is one bus a day to Exeter that leaves mid-morning and returns mid-afternoon so transport links cannot sustain workers commuting and there are no cycle paths severely limiting active travel. There is no school in the village, the street lighting is poor and there is no GP Practice which makes the community non-viable for development or to accommodate social need and therefore not meet sustainability in the wider meaning. In the last decade Aylesbeare has already seen approx. 15 additional houses built in on top of the original 102 properties and Aylesbeare Parish Council supports the redevelopment of a farm property in the village that will provide 7 more properties in the next 1-2 years. In conclusion Aylesbeare and Perkins Village are the least suitable areas for development given the District & County Council's and Government's own guidelines and any additional properties beyond reasonable redevelopment of unused or derelict properties is clearly unsustainable.

Full name: Ian Tucker

Organisation (where relevant): Buckerell Parish Council

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: Yes

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: Buckerell Parish Council welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Regulation 19 Submission Version of the East Devon Local Plan. The Parish Council's overall conclusion is that it is a sound plan and has no reason to believe that it does not meet the legal requirements. In particular it notes that the village of Buckerell is not identified as a service village, and it agrees with that assessment. It also notes that no housing numbers have been ascribed to the village. The Parish Council does not wish to challenge the spatial distribution of new homes to the mixture of main centres, new settlements, towns and service villages. The Parish Council fully appreciates the challenges faced by the local plan in providing for an additional 20,909 new homes over the 22 years from 2020 to 2042. It is inevitable that this level of housing growth will have an impact on the services being provided by the public sector organisations and the Parish Council stresses the vital importance of ensuring that the necessary infrastructure and expansion of services is provided on a phased basis linked to the construction of the new homes. It particularly wishes to focus on the extra demands which will be imposed on the existing stressed medical facilities and school places in the area. It wishes to support the approach taken in respect of the delivery of infrastructure as set out in Policies SP 07 and SP 08.

Full name: Rob Martin

Organisation (where relevant): Clyst Honiton Parish Council

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: In relation to Clyst Honiton, it is apparent that it is not to be treated as a Service Village but is still defined as Open Countryside. The main reason this is the case is because it has lost the facilities necessary to make it sustainable as a service village when they closed down with Cranbrook being built (school, community hall, football pitch etc). Being in Open Countryside, however, the plan restricts it from putting any of these things back. The scene being outlined within this plan is that the Cranbrook Treasbeare expansion will continue, all of the Clyst Honiton land between the A30 and the A3052 will become part of the new settlement which will leave just the one part of the village, defined as open countryside. As such, Clyst Honiton becomes squeezed between development on three of it 4 sides with the River Clyst Regional Park on the fourth side. The identity of Clyst Honiton as a viable parish will just disappear, despite having been a village for several hundred years. It is the unique position of Clyst Honiton and its wish to keep its identity that raised the hope that CHPC might be given a special place in the consultations leading up to this point which it has not.

Full name: Martyn Smith

Organisation (where relevant): Feniton Parish Council

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: The Vision of the Local Plan states that "rural East Devon will retain its outstanding charm and character with modest and sensitively planned development to meet local needs". The Spatial Strategy of the plan is logically based on a hierarchy of settlements. In order to achieve the greatest sustainability, more development is to be concentrated in the Principal, Main and Local Centres where there are existing infrastructures and employment. The Parish Council supports this approach. In the Regulation 18 version of the Local Plan, the Strategy stated that for the smaller settlements in rural East Devon, the tier 4 "Service Villages", there would be "modest development to meet local needs" - in line with the Vision. When a member of the Strategic Planning Committee pointed out that the committee was allocating in Feniton housing numbers greater than necessary to meet local need the Chairman instructed the Officer to rewrite the Strategic Policy SP01 in the Regulation 19 version so that it now reads: "....E. allowing limited development at the Service Villages...." This was clearly a device to avoid the charge that the unsustainable proposals at Feniton are not in line with the plan's intended strategic policy of only meeting local housing need in rural villages. However, the Vision in the Regulation 19 Draft remains "modest....development to meet local needs". There is now a mis-match between Vision and Strategy because of the deception. As a result Feniton is burdened with housing proposals for 102 dwellings far exceeding the definition of modest development to meet local need. A Feniton housing need survey was funded by the District Council and undertaken by Devon Community Together in 2022. The identified local need then was for 13 dwellings in the following 5 years.

Full name: Lucy Tyrrell

Organisation (where relevant): Lympstone Parish Council

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: This is of particular concern to our response. The Parish Council on behalf of residents, and residents individually have challenged this designation in consultations. Lympstone has been designated a Local Centre, defined as "settlements with reasonable population levels, and a smaller but important selection of strategic and local facilities". Lympstone accepts that it must under the new plan have some new development, and identified 4 proposed sites out of those put forward where development could take place and the village still retain its identity and Spirit of Place. Lympstone has always questioned and challenged its designation as a Tier 3 settlement. The background evidence paper initially placed it in the village category (see Appendix A) but it was elevated to Tier 3 because of the train station. The train station has only 13 car parking spaces (see photo 1 below); bus services to Lympstone are limited, and do not carry passengers to the rail station, stopping instead at the Northern extremity of the village, a 20 minute walk to the train station (see Appendix B). People will not walk from the outer fringes of the village to the station, nor is it possible to do so safely, as there are no pavements on our lanes (see photos 2 and 3 below). The walking distance from the closest bus stop to Lympstone Village train station is 0.6 miles (source: Google Maps), and proposed developments are even further away. In all other respects, Lympstone is a small village of some 900 houses and 2,000 residents, with one shop, a cafe and 3 pubs. Exton, the next village along the Avocet Railway Line, has a train station and similar amenities - shop, pub, village hall and church. It is also served by the same bus route as Lympstone but is not designated in the same tier. We question why the criteria used to place Lympstone as a Tier 3 settlement have not applied to Exton. In addition to the justification of a railway station resulting in the tier placement and housing allocation, we feel it appropriate to draw your attention to the Avocet Line Railway Users Group assessment. This states that in order to meet the extra demands such expansion would bring, would necessitate longer trains and therefore increased platform lengths. Can a plan be judged sound

when such practicalities of its conclusions are glossed over? As a Local Centre (Tier 3), Lympstone has a minimum housing requirement of 323, equivalent to a 36% increase in housing. In comparison, Budleigh Salterton, with a population of 5,420 has a minimum housing requirement of 132; and the town of Sidmouth, with a population of 14,377 has a minimum housing requirement of 471. This undermines the categorisation and the basic philosophy of the plan, that of allocating sites to higher tier settlements. The criteria being used and applied by the Planning Team at EDDC seem illogical, especially when the larger town of Budleigh Salterton is tiered alongside Lympstone. How can the new plan be seen to be fair, and the processes for the decisions reached on each placing and housing requirement be seen to be sound with these allocations? Lympstone has consistently challenged its categorisation as a Tier 3 settlement, as evidenced in our previous consultation responses and in initial discussions with EDDC planning team on a new neighbourhood plan where Angela King EDDC Planning Officer states she will feed our views back to her colleagues (see Appendix C: EDDC first Regulation 18 consultation Lympstone 7-11-22 to 15-01-23).

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: We request the following modification: Reinstate the Tier 4 categorisation for Lympstone in the hierarchy of settlements.

Full name: Harriet Fuller

Organisation (where relevant): Environment Agency

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: We welcome the justification in para 3.2 that the local plan promotes sustainable development which is aligned with the need for infrastructure.

Full name: Craig Hatton

Organisation (where relevant): Network Rail

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP01

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: Yes

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: The spatial strategy priorities development at the new settlement in West End and the on-going development at Cranbrook. Network Rail supports this approach and is working to bring forward improved rail links via the Devon metro to support growth in these areas. The Devon Metro will connect with Cranbrook and the new settlement and therefore the Council's approach is positive. Where required, additional housing needs should be directed to these two areas. The metro will require funding contributions from development and should remain as a high priority in the Infrastructure Delivery Strategy/Plan

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

SP02

Full name: Robert Jones

Organisation (where relevant): River Otter Fisheries Association

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: SP02 / SP03 -We note that the plan proposes @1,600 additional houses in the Otter valley added to which during the plan period will be windfall gains from houses built within BUAB's.

Full name: Tristan Peat

Organisation (where relevant): Mid Devon District Council

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: Yes

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: The Local Plan includes provision to the meet at least 80% of the level of housing need for East Devon district based on the standard method, through the transitional arrangements set out in the December 2024 NPPF i.e. it being positively prepared.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

4(a). If yes, and you wish to support this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter's compliance with the duty to co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.: The Local Plan will meet East Devon district's housing need in full (through transitional arrangements) and East Devon District Council is not seeking other local authorities to help meet any of East Devon's housing need.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Jo Wilkins

Organisation (where relevant): Somerset Council

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: Yes

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: Somerset Council agrees that Annex 1, para 234 of the NPPF, December 2024 applies to this Local Plan consultation and notes that the LPA is seeking to meet their housing and employment needs within their own district boundary. On a general point it is noted that the Housing Delivery Technical paper mistakenly refers to an annual local housing need figure of 1,146 homes instead of the 1,188 homes referred to in the publication Plan.

8. Somerset Council confirms that it raises no issues regarding the soundness of the East Devon Local Plan 2020 to 2042.

Full name: David Pickhaver

Organisation (where relevant): Torbay Council

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: No

4(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.: Clearly, the local planning system is in a state of change with the implications of the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act, the Planning and Infrastructure Bill and Local Government Reorganisation all likely to affect spatial planning across Devon. I also appreciate that cross-boundary issues are being discussed at Senior Officer and Member level. This email is not intended to cut across, or prejudice these issues.

Nevertheless, since East Devon has opted prepare its Local Plan under the transitional arrangements set out in Paragraph 234 of the (2024) NPPF, it is necessary for me to make an officer level representation of the Local Plan on behalf of Torbay Council. Please can this email be treated as a duly made representation under Regulation 19. Given that the issues are more properly addressed through our mutual Duty to Cooperate/ Statements of Common Ground, I considered that an email was a more useful tool than the Commonplace Form.

Torbay Council has repeatedly advised neighbour councils in the adjoining Housing Market Areas /Functional Economic Market Areas that Torbay will not be able to meet the local housing need target set by the Government's Standard Method. This is dues to NPPF footnote 7 constraints that provide a strong reason for restricting the overall scale of development that Torbay can accommodate. This is likely to apply to LHN calculated by either the previous or most recent Standard Method; although the 2024 Standard Method has exacerbated the shortfall. The main driver of housing growth in Devon, and Torbay in particular, is domestic inwards migration into the sub-region and should be addressed at a larger than local level. The two most relevant areas are Greater Exeter

and the Plymouth Joint Local Plan. Although Torbay and East Devon are not contiguous, East Devon is within the Greater Exeter HMA/FEMA.

In this context, it is disappointing that the Regulation 19 East Devon Local Plan makes no reference to unmet housing need from Torbay. Nor does the 2022 ORS housing need evidence appear to make reference to Torbay, even though the predecessor study was carried out across both HMAs. The issue of unmet housing needs from adjoining areas is part of the Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development at paragraph 11(b) and a Test of Soundness at paragraph 36 (formerly 35) of the Framework. It is further noted in paragraph 62. Whilst I realise that the transitional arrangements at paragraph 234 of the Framework allow the Plan to be considered under the "relevant previous version of the framework", you will be aware that the Duty to Cooperate is a legal duty, and has bee reiterated by recent Ministerial Statements by the Secretary of State. This is alongside the expanded text at paragraphs 24-28 of the Framework. The additions to paragraph 28 may be especially relevant.

East Devon's effective housing target is set out in Policy SP02 for 20,909 net new dwellings from 2030-42, with a stepped delivery of 850 dwellings per annum between 2020/21-2031/32, increasing to 1070 dpa from 2032/33 to 2041/42. According to my calculations East Devon's LHN at 2023 was 893 dwellings per year; rising to 1,188dpa under the 2024 Standard Method. This appears to be within the tolerances of the NPPF transitional arrangements, but makes no allowance for unmet need from neighbours.

Torbay looks forward to working with East Devon to address these issues under the Duty to Cooperate/Statement of Common Ground. However, as the East Devon Local Plan is at Regulation 19, I must raise a holding objection that no account has been made about the need to accommodate unmet needs from neighbouring areas, specifically Torbay.

Full name: Amy Roberts

Organisation (where relevant): Bell Cornwell LLP

Other party name (if relevant): Waddeton Park Ltd

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Please refer to the attached sheet.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: Please refer to the attached sheet.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Dan Trundle

Organisation (where relevant): Black Box Planning Ltd

Other party name (if relevant): of Greenhayes (Greendale Group / Crealy Farms)

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:

5.1 NPPF Paragraph 36 sets out that local plans are examined to assess whether they have been prepared in accordance with legal and procedural requirements, and whether they are sound. Plans are 'sound' if they are: a. Positively prepared – providing a strategy which, as a minimum, seeks to meet the area's objectively assessed needs; and is informed by agreements with other authorities, so that unmet need from neighbouring areas is accommodated where it is practical to do so and is consistent with having achieved sustainable development; b. Justified - an appropriate strategy, taking into account the reasonable alternatives, and based on proportionate evidence; c. Effective - deliverable over the plan period, and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic matters that have been dealt with rather than deferred, as evidenced by the statement of common ground; and d. Consistent with national policy – enabling the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in this Framework and other statements of national planning policy, where relevant.

5.2 As set out earlier within this representation, the Plan has not fully met the Transitional Arrangements as set out in Annex 1 of the December 2024 NPPF and should be meeting its full housing requirement, having regard to the up-to-date Standard Methodology.

5.3 Unfortunately, as plan preparation has been accelerated to circumnavigate having to plan for a higher housing requirement, the plan currently only manages to incorporate a maximum of 80% of its needs numerically, albeit it is considered there is insufficient evidence (as recognised in the Plan) to reasonably demonstrate whether the emerging strategic allocations will be deliverable.

5.4 For example, the absence of an Infrastructure Delivery Plan for the Second New Community to understand the extent and cost of necessary infrastructure is a major failing at this stage of the Plan. Evidently, the Plan has not been positively prepared and is therefore not consistent with national policy.

5.5 Furthermore, the plan is not currently meeting the areas full affordable housing needs. Strategic Policy HN02 explains that bespoke viability work is required to define the exact affordable housing provision to be expected from the Second New Community through policy and that it will be defined through further Regulation 19 consultation to follow. Affordable housing delivery is an express component of Objectively Assessed Needs. How much affordable housing a Plan delivers should be informed by a Housing Needs Assessment, as set out at NPPF Paragraphs 61 and 62.

5.6 As set out, under normal circumstances, the Plan would not have proceeded to Regulation 19 in its current premature and incomplete state and has evidently been published to seek to comply with the Transitional Arrangements. This is completely contrived position which wholly disregards the policy and procedural requirement to plan positively.

5.7 Furthermore, the Plan as set out is not currently based upon proportionate evidence base. As explained, not all of the evidence base documents are yet published, with some very clearly not having been undertaken at the time of writing. Yet, the main components of the spatial strategy appear to have been decided upon. This is in clear conflict with national policy requirement to develop an appropriate strategy based on proportionate evidence.

5.8 There is currently little evidence to demonstrate that the Second New Community will realistically contribute to housing delivery within the plan period. Alongside the failure to objectively conclude how much affordable housing it will contribute, the Plan is also not effective in its current form. As set out in Section 4, the failure to assess the reasonable alternatives on a consistent basis, whilst not being legally compliant, also undermines the justification for the spatial strategy, as currently set out.

5.9 The conclusions, in respect of matters of soundness, are broadly reached on the basis that the evidence base is currently not sufficiently advanced to support the spatial strategy set out. This will require a Plan to be prepared to meet its full needs and assessed in full, necessary, detail.

Full name: Alistair Macdonald

Organisation (where relevant): Blue Fox Planning Ltd

Other party name (if relevant): Persimmon Homes South West

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: Yes

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: This representation is made on behalf of Persimmon Homes South West ("Persimmon"). As will be note from other representations submitted on its behalf, Persimmon also own the allocation proposed under Strategic Policy SD06 Land south west of Woolbrook (Sidm_01).

Persimmon has reviewed the emerging Plan's proposed approach to meeting the housing requirement, including the stepped trajectory, and believes it to be unsound insofar as it is not positively prepared, is not justified and, consequently, is unlikely to be effective.

As currently drafted, the emerging Plan proposes a stepped trajectory as follows:

- 2020/21 to 2031/32 - 850 homes per annum; and

- 2032/33 to 2041/42 - 1,070 homes per annum

Persimmon does not object specifically to the stepped trajectory approach but feels that its adoption must be fully justified and based on robust and relevant evidence including at a local level.

Whilst paragraph 3.12 of the emerging Plan states that the stepped trajectory results from a "...recognition of the complexities inherent in delivering major development sites, particularly the proposed new community...". It would appear that it is also a consequence of assumptions made on the delivery of other sites identified in the Plan.

The published evidence base for the Regulation 19 Plan includes the Housing Delivery Technical Report (HOU_001). Section 5 of that report seeks to justify the "Stepped Delivery Requirement" and refers to research conducted by Lichfields. Unfortunately, that research is not specifically named and does not appear to form part of the Plan's evidence base and therefore it is difficult to know what its basis was although we assume it is the "Start to Finish" research last updated in September 2024.

If we are correct in that assumption, it should be noted that the latest edition of "Start to Finish" predates the current version of the National Planning Policy Framework and the current standard method for calculating housing need. It is also based on monitoring data up to 1st April 2023.

"Start to Finish" is also a national study based on a wide range of sites (including both greenfield and brownfield), locations (including major cities and rural areas) and sizes and types of developments including apartments. Therefore, whilst "Start to Finish" is an extremely valuable and useful study, it may be considered something of a "blunt tool" to underpin an individual Local Plan's delivery strategy particularly in the absence of any attempt to refine its findings at a local level.

We can find no evidence that the Local Plan has attempted to consider the deliverability of proposed allocations on the basis of individual circumstances. For example, in respect of Persimmon's Sidm_001 site, HOU_001 (Appendix 4: "Allocated sites projections") suggests that first completions will not be achieved until 2032. This is presumably based on Lichfield's findings that, nationally, sites of 100+ dwellings have a median time frame of just under 5 to nearly 7 years from application validation to first completions.

There does not appear, however, any attempt in the Local Plan's evidence base to test these national findings against the performance of East Devon District Council as Local Planning Authority. In short, Persimmon does not agree that it must take 5 years from

the point of validation to achieve first completions and to simply accept this without locally based evidence demonstrates that the Plan is not positively prepared.

It also appears to suggest that an application would not be prepared or submitted before the formal adoption of the Plan which the current Local Development Scheme (February 2025) suggests will be in "late 2026".

It is, however, not uncommon for developers to prepare and submit applications to coincide with a Local Plan Examination in order to demonstrate the suitability of the proposed allocation. This is an approach that Persimmon will consider for the land south west of Woolbrook (Sidm_001).

Subject to the comments set out above, we consider a reasonable, possibly conservative, delivery programme for the site as follows:

1. Application Submitted in line with Local Plan Examination - mid 2026
2. Application determined (12 months allowed) - mid 2027
3. Pre-commencement conditions discharged - end 2027
4. Start on site and pre-occupation conditions discharged - Q2 2028
5. First completions - mid/end 2028.

Based on the above first completions on the site would therefore be achieved approximately 4 years before the date assumed by the Plan and in HOU_001.

If this scenario was replicated in respect of other proposed allocations, then this would impact on the proposed stepped trajectory and, potentially, remove the need for such an approach altogether.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your

suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: In order to demonstrate that the Plan is positively prepared and justified by a robust evidence base, a detailed examination of the likely delivery profile of proposed allocations of 100+ dwellings should be carried out.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : Persimmon is a national house builder and has vast experience in delivering new homes across the country.

Persimmon also owns the Land south west of Woolbrook (Sidm_01) allocation which is intended to deliver the majority of new homes identified for the Town and it is therefore considered that Persimmon's participation at the Hearing Sessions would be useful for the appointed Inspector(s).

Full name: Bethan Haigh

Organisation (where relevant): Boyer Planning

Other party name (if relevant): Vistry Group

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: While Vistry support the principles set out in Plan's spatial strategy it is considered that for the Plan to be effective:

*The stepped trajectory should be uplifted within the first half of the Draft LP period to avoid a significant shortfall within the Draft LP up until 2031/32;

*Additional site allocations should be included within the Draft LP in addition to those already allocated to meet the delivery of at least 20,909 homes within the plan period of 2020 – 2042, which should include land at Addlepool Farm;

*The Council should provide compelling evidence to justify the reliance on housing delivery within the new settlement.

Strategic Policy SP02 proposes that housing provision be made for at least 20,909 dwellings (net) to be delivered in the plan area between 1 April 2020 to 31 March 2042.

While we welcome the uplift in housing delivery in line with the standard methodology Local Housing Need (LHN) figure - to ensure the Plan is positively prepared, the full housing needs of East Devon should be met. At present the Plan only meets 80% of the communities housing needs.

Paragraph 3.12 of the Draft LP states that the proposed "new community provision of new homes will come forward under a stepped trajectory that will provide an annual average of 850 dwellings per year from 2020/21 to 2031/32 and 1,070 per year from 2032/33 to plan end at 2023/24."

Whilst the principle of Policy SP02 is supported, Vistry strongly object to the proposed stepped trajectory approach utilised within the Draft LP due to the following reasons:

1. We consider that the use of a stepped trajectory approach does not represent effective plan-making, as it places a significant level of reliance on EDDC's cumulative housing supply shortfall from 2029 onwards.

2. It is noted that the delivery of Cranbrook has historically been associated with supply issues. The over reliance on housing delivery from a single new settlement is therefore not justified as the Council has not provided proportionate evidence to justify this approach.

An assessment of the cumulative shortfall created by the proposed stepped housing trajectory approach has been prepared by Boyer within the table below (Table 2.1).

The table above (Table 2.1) illustrates that with use of the stepped trajectory, EDDC will have a 6-year period from 2025/26 to 2030/31 where is it anticipated that there is a housing shortfall. This shortfall is particularly significant in the years 2028/29 totalling 1,192 dwellings. Vistry consider that the shortfall and failure to meet the adopted housing requirement of 20,900 until 2031/32 is neither positively prepared nor effective.

While it is acknowledged that other local authorities have adopted a similar stepped approach, EDDC's circumstances differ. Unlike other authorities with stepped housing trajectories, East Devon doesn't have Green Belt constraints and is able to accommodate development through plan making.

It is considered that the draft LP must uplift its housing supply, particularly within the first half of the draft LP period.

AFFORDABLE RATIO IN EDDC

The December 2024 draft Housing Strategy published by EDDC confirmed that Devon Home Choice had almost 6,000 people on the waiting list for social housing, and 3,000 with a housing need at the time of publication. In addition, the Devon Housing Commission report has provided evidence to demonstrate that East Devon is amid a housing crisis.

It must be acknowledged that EDDC has faced significant issues with affordability, with recent ONS data published in 2024 confirming the affordability ratio for EDDC was 9.98. This was higher than the South West (at 9.27) and considerably higher than England (8.26).

This clearly demonstrates that the use of a stepped trajectory within the Draft LP is not justified, will exasperate an existing affordability issue within EDDC, and will not effectively address the existing housing needs.

OVER-SUPPLY / HEADROOM

We have concerns regarding the Plan's housing supply contingency, which amounts to only 9.8%. This is considered too low to ensure the Plan remains effective in delivering its housing requirement before 2042. This is particularly pertinent noting the Plan's reliance on a new settlement to deliver approximately 15% of the proposed housing requirement.

We consider that the Plan should provide at least a 20% headroom to ensure the consistent delivery of homes throughout the plan period. This should include the allocation of land at Addlepool Farm.

OVER RELIANCE ON THE NEW SETTLEMENT'S HOUSING DELIVERY

It is understood that EDDC's justification for the stepped trajectory is due to a reliance on the delivery of a new settlement (draft LP policy WS01), which, as set out above, comprises over 15% of EDDC's housing requirement.

The allocation of a new town on the edge of Exeter is not disputed and it is agreed that the Western edge of East Devon is a sustainable location for development, meeting housing need close to jobs and services at Exeter.

Whilst we do not oppose the principle of allocating land for a new settlement within the Draft LP, we do object to the delivery assumptions that have been applied; and the over-reliance on this draft allocation to deliver housing within the second half of the plan period.

The new settlement is proposed to accommodate 3,300 homes over the plan period, and is reliant on the creation of an agreed, 'whole community' masterplan, with delivery of the Site to be on an agreed phased basis.

The draft LP proposes the delivery of 3,300 homes in the new settlement, an increase of over 1,000 homes compared to the 2,500 homes projected in the previous Regulation 18 Draft LP.

However, we have not seen robust evidence published since the Regulation 18 Draft LP consultation to justify this uplift in housing delivery assumptions.

At present, we consider that the assumption that housing delivery will commence within the new settlement from 2030 is not justified and the housing trajectory (which informs SP02) is unsound.

Evidence demonstrates that developments of significant scale (including new towns) are characterised by the protracted delivery times of new homes.

A report by Colin Buchanan (2005) noted that new towns are likely to need to be delivered via a Development Plan Document (DPD), which would secure a framework within which planning applications should be prepared. Indeed, this would align with the Strategic Policy WS01 policy text, which states that a 'whole community' masterplan must be prepared. Such a document would need to be adopted post-Draft LP adoption, and it is noted that the Draft LP is not due to be adopted until 2026.

Indeed, the risks of bringing forward the development of a new town in the absence of such a document is already apparent in East Devon, noting the infrastructure delivery issues associated with Cranbrook.

To ensure that a future DPD is effective, it is not considered that any subsequent planning applications could be determined until the DPD is formally adopted, to ensure that any development aligns with the relevant DPD.

Several factors also influence the delivery of strategic sites, including site conditions, local market, joint working (including partnership between local authorities).

The Buchanan Report also sets out the likely timescales between first application submission and first build year. The report states:

"…given the need for pre-application discussions and the need to support strategic applications with rigorous and comprehensive information and the complexity of securing onsite and off-site improvements, including provision of infrastructure (community, social, utilities and transport) it is difficult to envisage that the time between an allocation in a local development framework and first year of build reducing."

For site capacities of 3,000 dwellings or greater, this lag time is approximately 5.5 years.

A more recent report, produced by Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners analysed the deliverability of strategic sites. The report identified that the planning approval period increases in step with the size of the development. The report confirmed that schemes

of 2,000 dwellings or more averaged approximately 6.9 years from validation of application to the construction of first house.

The Draft LP adoption, preparation and adoption of a DPD and submission and approval of an Outline Application and subsequent Reserved Matters and Discharge of Conditions application demonstrate that it is highly unlikely that the new town could deliver 3,300 dwellings within the Draft LP period. Previous evidence would suggest that delivery is unlikely to commence until the latter end of 2030s at the earliest.

To ensure the consistent delivery of dwellings, the Draft LP should allocate additional sites, to provide a greater contingency of supply, should there be any delays with delivery of the new town.

HISTORIC DELIVERY ISSUES RELATING TO CRANBROOK

East Devon have previously over-relied on housing delivery within new settlements, a most notable example of this is housing delivery within Cranbrook.

The adopted Local Plan anticipated that a significant quantum of development would be delivered within the West End Strategic Allocations across the adopted Plan period, particularly within Cranbrook and the identified Cranbrook Expansion Areas. However, housing delivery within the expansion areas has not progressed at the rate envisaged, which is highlighted within the table below (Table 2.2). This illustrates the actual housing delivery rates for the West End when compared against the far more ambitious housing trajectory that was anticipated by the Council at the time Local Plan was adopted.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: It's clear that the Plan must take a more pragmatic and realistic approach to the housing delivery assumptions relied upon for new settlement to ensure that the Plan does not repeat the same delivery issues and is effective and sound.

To meet the test of soundness and ensure the Plan is effective and positively prepared additional housing allocations must be included alongside the new settlement, which would ensure the consistent delivery of homes throughout the Draft LP period. This should include the allocation of land at Addlepool Farm.

Land at Addlepool Farm offers an opportunity to deliver a high quality, self-contained, and sustainable new village, creating homes and a neighbourhood which complements the existing character and needs of the local area. The proposals will include approximately 700 homes (including both market and affordable homes), local centre, land for a 2-form entry primary school (2.4ha), allotments, sports pitches and public open space.

One of the key benefits to the scheme relates to its delivery. The Site lies entirely within a single ownership and is within the control of Vistry, the largest housebuilder in the UK, who can deliver the scheme in the short to medium term.

Vistry have the experience and resource to deliver this site in full and will not be reliant on other parties to bring forward the development. This will ensure consistent delivery of homes throughout the Draft LP period.

Vistry would welcome further discussion with the Council regarding the allocation of the Addlepool Farm site, which would help ensure the Plan can be found sound.

Full name: Bethan Haigh

Organisation (where relevant): Boyer Planning

Other party name (if relevant): Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd. C/O Boyer

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Strategic Policy SP02 – Levels of future housing development

2.5 Strategic Policy SP02 states that housing provision will be made for at least 20,909 homes between 2020 and 2042. This housing requirement equates to an annual housing delivery of 950 dpa across the draft Plan period, representing 80% of East Devon's Local Housing Need (LHN) as calculated using the Standard Method (NPPF 2024). East Devon claims that this allows the local community to benefit from the NPPF transitional arrangements by building approximately 238 fewer homes each year.

2.6 Strategic Policy SP02 outlines a stepped trajectory, setting an annual target of 850 homes from 2020/21 to 2031/2032, which then increases to 1,070 homes per annum from 2032/33 to 2041/42.

2.7 We object to this policy for the following reasons:

- Reason 1 – The stepped trajectory places a significant reliance on meeting EDDC's cumulative housing supply shortfall in the second half of the plan period. This approach does not represent effective plan-making;
- Reason 2 – The Plan over-relies on housing delivery within the new settlement. Historical housing supply issues associated with the delivery of Cranbook affirm that this approach is not justified;

2.8 These reasons are discussed in further detail below.

Reason 1 - Stepped Housing Requirement/Trajectory

2.9 We object to EDDC's strategy of adopting a stepped housing trajectory.

2.10 East Devon faces significant challenges by relying on a stepped housing trajectory.

2.11 Firstly, it is important to remember that the Plan's housing requirement does not meet the district's housing need and falls approximately 238 homes per annum short.

2.12 Secondly, by providing only 80% of housing need, it is essential that as many homes are delivered as quickly as possible. However, the Plan proposes a cumulative housing shortall over 6 years (2025/26 – 2030/31), with a notable deficit of 1,192 homes in 2028/29. Over the

first four years of the plan period, at best, this represents the delivery of only 55% of East Devon's housing needs. This backlog is not proposed to be addressed for 7 years, until 2031/32.

2.13 While it is acknowledged that other local authorities have adopted a similar stepped approach, EDDC's circumstances differ. Unlike other authorities with stepped housing trajectories, East Devon doesn't have Green Belt constraints and is able to accommodate development through plan making.

2.14 It is considered that the draft LP must uplift its housing supply, particularly within the first half of the draft LP period.

Affordability Ratio in EDDC

2.15 EDDC has significant affordability issues. ONS Data published in 2024 confirmed that East Devon's house price to income ratio was 9.98. This is a significant affordability ratio which means the price of an average house in East Devon costs around ten-times average earnings. This is higher than the South West (at 9.27) and considerably higher than the average for England (8.26).

2.16 EDDC published a draft Housing Strategy in December 2024, which confirmed that Devon Home Choice had, at the time of publication almost 6,000 people on its waiting list for social housing, 3,000 with a current housing need. Furthermore, the Strategy confirmed that East Devon is experiencing a significant housing crisis.

2.17 This clearly emphasises that a stepped trajectory approach is not justified and will exasperate an existing affordability issue in East Devon.

Reason 2 - Over reliance of housing delivery within the new settlement

2.18 It is noted that the Plan's stepped trajectory approach is due to a reliance on the delivery of Strategic Policy WS01: Development of a second new community east of Exeter.

2.19 While we do not object to the principle of allocating a new settlement, we do object to the delivery assumptions that have been applied; and the over-reliance on this draft allocation to deliver housing within the second half of the plan period.

2.20 The new settlement is proposed to accommodate 3,300 homes over the plan period, and is reliant on the creation of an agreed, 'whole community' masterplan, with delivery of the site to be on an agreed phased basis.

2.21 The draft LP proposes the delivery of 3,300 homes in the new settlement, an increase of over 1,000 homes compared to the 2,500 homes projected in the previous Regulation 18 draft LP. However, we have not seen robust evidence published since the Regulation 18 draft LP consultation to justify this uplift in housing delivery assumptions.

2.22 The draft LP relies on the new settlement to commence housing delivery in 2030 (para 4.8), with an average build out rate of 300 homes+ per annum. The proposed step change in the

Plan's housing delivery between 2028/29 and 2029/30 is evidently because of housing delivery assumptions associated with the construction of the new settlement.

2.23 We remain concerned regarding the Plan's over-reliance on the ambitious delivery assumption associated with the new settlement, given the significant infrastructure required to support the new settlement's growth. Based on our experience, the delivery of new towns is a slow and protracted process, with delays in delivery of housing common place. We would expect that the delivery of a new town of approximately 8,000 homes to be guided by the preparation of a separate Development

Plan Document (DPD). Indeed, this would align with the Strategic Policy WS01 policy text, which states that a 'whole community' masterplan must be prepared.

2.24 The preparation of such a masterplan could not be prepared in advance of the draft LP being adopted. It is anticipated that the earliest that the draft LP would be adopted is in 2026, therefore providing less than four years to: prepare a Development Plan Document (assuming the 'whole community' masterplan would be secured in this way); preparation, submission and responses relating to EIA Screening/Scoping; preparation, submission, approved of Outline Planning Applications; preparation, submission, approval of Reserved Matters Applications; and discharging of all relevant planning conditions.

2.25 In the previous Draft LP (Regulation 18), which was published in 2023, the Draft LP stated, "it is unlikely that any new homes will be completed until around 2030. On this basis, and at build out rates climbing to around 300 new homes per year, we can expect to see around 2,500 new homes built at the new town by the 2040 end date of the local plan". At the time of the Regulation 18 Consultation, the LDS stated that the Draft LP was due to be adopted in 2025. The Draft LP has not progressed at the rate it was anticipated. The current LDS expects the Draft LP to be adopted by late 2026 (12 months later) and yet proposes to allocate in excess of 1,000 additional homes within the new settlement. The delivery assumptions associated with the new settlement are not justified and must, therefore, be revised accordingly.

2.26 It is considered that housing delivery within the new town is unlikely to commence until mid- 2030s. Consequently, to ensure the Plan remains deliverable and effective, the Council must reduce the overall housing numbers allocated to the new town within the plan period to ensure the Plan can be found sound.

Cranbook New Settlement – East Devon's Historic Delivery Issues

2.27 Historically, EDDC have over-relied upon housing delivery from new settlements.

2.28 The adopted LP identified a housing requirement of 17,100 homes within the plan period (2013-2031), of which 10,563 homes were anticipated to be delivered within the West End. This included 5,270 homes to be delivered within the West End Strategic Allocations. Strategy 2 identified 4,370 homes to be delivered via Strategic Allocations within Cranbrook within the Plan period (2013-2031), with the new settlement delivering peak build out rates of "500 homes a year".

2.29 The following table compares the quantum of homes that were previously projected to be delivered from the West End (including the Strategic Allocations) (as set out within the adopted LP Appendix 2 Schedule of Housing Sites) against the actual delivery rates from the West End as published within the latest Annual Monitoring Report (November 2024).

2.30 The above table confirms that EDDC have consistently failed to meet their adopted LP projections for the West End. This is due to the adopted Plan's over-reliance on optimistic housing delivery assumption for Strategic Allocations during the plan period.

2.31 This underscores that EDDC's reliance on the new community to significantly contribute to the emerging LP's housing requirement is not justified; and will result in an ineffective Plan; therefore, failing to meet the tests of soundness.

2.32 The Council should prioritise meeting its housing requirement of 950dpa on a consistent, annual basis. It is, therefore, considered that the Plan's proposed stepped housing trajectory will not deliver its housing requirement, and it is not effective or positively prepared and, therefore, unsound.

Full name: Nick Guildford

Organisation (where relevant): C G Fry & Son

Other party name (if relevant): Mr & Mrs Cowling

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Up to 2031/32, the Council indicate a trajectory to deliver 850 dwellings per year on average, with the remaining plan period from 2032/33 onwards to deliver an annual average of 1,070 dwellings per year. Whilst this averages out to provide for the required housing need, it means that for the first part of the plan-period, the council will be under-delivering against their identified housing need and more than likely unable to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply within the early parts of the plan-period, as evidenced by Appendix 1 of the Draft Local Plan. This approach appears to be at odds with the Framework, in particular, the requirement to "meet the area's objectively assessed needs". It is, effectively, a workaround, where the council will only be delivering 70% of the housing requirement, which would be averaged out by delivery later in the plan period, for the Plan to continue to be assessed against the previous version of the Framework and therefore requiring 80% of the housing requirement to be planned for.

Full name: Simon Coles

Organisation (where relevant): CarneySweeney

Other party name (if relevant): C R Down Farming Ltd and Stuart Partners Ltd

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: CarneySweeney acts for CR Down Farming Ltd and Stuart Partners Ltd in connection with land south of A3052 and east of A376, Clyst St Mary, East Devon.

Up to 2031/32, the draft EDLP sets a trajectory to deliver 850 dwellings per year on average, with the remaining plan period from 2032/33 onwards to deliver an annual average of 1,070 dwellings per year. Whilst this averages out to provide for the required housing need, it means that for the first part of the plan-period, the draft EDLP will be under-delivering against their identified housing need and more than likely unable to demonstrate a five year housing land supply within the early parts of the plan-period, as evidenced by Appendix 1 of the draft EDLP.

This approach appears to be at odds with the Framework, in particular, the requirement to meet an area's objectively assessed needs as a minimum. It is, effectively, a workaround, where the LPA will only be delivering 70% of the housing requirement, which would have to be averaged out by delivery later in the plan period, for the Plan to continue to be assessed against the previous version of the Framework and therefore requiring 80% of the housing requirement to be planned for.

The planned shortfall in the East Devon needs to be considered in the context of the recorded shortfall in housing delivery in the adjoining Exeter City Council's administrative area of about 2,400 new homes against its current Local Plan requirement. This will be compounded by the extreme vulnerability of its proposed draft LP strategy of locating most of the new homes required in the next Local Plan period on brownfield land.

We are also concerned at the over-reliance on the contribution that windfall sites are anticipated to make to meeting housing need. The Framework is clear that there should be “compelling evidence” that windfall sites will provide a reliable source of supply. The current wording of Policy SP06 does not provide confidence that development on windfall sites will be a reliable source of supply.

Full name: Simon Coles

Organisation (where relevant): CarneySweeney

Other party name (if relevant): C G Fry & Son Ltd

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Elsewhere in the Draft Local Plan, notably in Strategic Policy HN02 (Affordable Housing), it is referenced that 35% affordable housing would be a target for windfall development outside settlement boundaries. This appears at odds with Policy SP06 which restricts development outside settlement boundaries, presenting concerns about the level of contribution that windfall sites will provide to meeting housing need. Paragraph 75 of the Framework is clear that there should be "compelling evidence" that windfall sites will provide a reliable source of supply. The current wording of Policy SP06 does not provide confidence that development on windfall sites will be a reliable source of supply.

In combination, the restrictive nature of Policy SP06, and the reliance of larger sites to deliver the required housing need later in the plan-period cemented by Policy SP02, presents the prospect of a deteriorating housing supply position from the point of adoption within the first half of the plan period. The Framework is clear that planning policies "should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services". The restrictive nature of Policies SP02 and SP06 is at odds with the clear intention of what the Framework is aspiring to achieve. Furthermore, the Framework is clear that strategic policies should provide for objectively assessed needs "as a minimum".

Full name: Simon Coles

Organisation (where relevant): CarneySweeney

Other party name (if relevant): C G Fry & Son Ltd

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: HOUSING TARGETS DELIVERY

Up to 2031/32, the Council indicate a trajectory to deliver 850 dwellings per year on average, with the remaining plan period from 2032/33 onwards to deliver an annual average of 1,070 dwellings per year. Whilst this averages out to provide for the required housing need, it means that for the first part of the plan-period, the LPA will be under-delivering against their identified housing need and more than likely unable to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply within the early parts of the plan-period, as evidenced by Appendix 1 of the Draft Local Plan. This approach appears to be at odds with the Framework, in particular, the requirement to “meet the area’s objectively assessed needs”.

It is, effectively, a workaround, where the LPA will only be delivering 70% of the housing requirement, which would be averaged out by delivery later in the plan period, for the Plan to continue to be assessed against the previous version of the Framework and therefore requiring 80% of the housing requirement to be planned for.

Full name: Jess Perminter

Organisation (where relevant): CarneySweeney

Other party name (if relevant): CR Down Farming Ltd and Stuart Partners Ltd

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: CarneySweeney acts for CR Down Farming Ltd and Stuart Partners Ltd in connection with land south of A3052 and east of A376, Clyst St Mary, East Devon. National Planning Policy Framework (December 2023)

- Paragraph 31 states that "The preparation and review of all policies should be underpinned by relevant and up-to-date evidence. This should be …focussed tightly on supporting and justifying the policies concerned and take account of relevant market signals."

- Paragraph 35 identifies the tests of soundness as being:

a) Positively prepared: As a minimum, seeking to meet the area's objectively assessed needs and informed by agreements with other authorities so that unmet need from neighbouring areas is accommodated where it is practical to do so and is consistent with sustainable development. b) Justified: An appropriate strategy based on taking account of reasonable alternatives and proportionate evidence. c)

Effective: Deliverable, based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic matters, evidenced in a Statement of Common Ground. d) Consistent with national policy.

LOCAL PLAN PREPARATION - TRANSITIONAL ARRANGEMENTS It is considered that splitting consultation on two parts of the same plan to enable the draft EDLP as a whole to take advantage of having to meet only at least 80% of the District's identified need does not meet the transitional arrangements in the December 2024 Framework. This is in circumstances where the forthcoming consultation on the second new community will in effect be a Regulation 18 consultation and where the draft EDLP is only planning for up to 80% of the District's needs.

In tis respect, the draft EDLP is ducking the ambition and challenges in the December 2024 Framework and presented in two Written Ministerial Statements of 30 July 2024 (Angela Rayner MP) and 12 December 2024 (Matthew Pennycook MP), setting out the need to address the national housing crisis and in so doing, to turbo- charge the national economy. It is also delaying important strategic decisions on the scale and location of new development, including at the proposed second new community, which should be addressed now.

HOUSING DELIVERY AND TRAJECTORY Up to 2031/32, the draft EDLP sets a trajectory to deliver 850 dwellings per year on average, with the remaining plan period from 2032/33 onwards to deliver an annual average of 1,070 dwellings per year. Whilst this averages out to provide for the required housing need, it means that for the first part of the plan-period, the draft EDLP will be under-delivering against their identified housing need and more than likely unable to demonstrate a five-

This land is being promoted by our clients for a strategic sustainable residential-led mixed use development.

CarneySweeney hereby submits representations on behalf of our clients on the draft East Devon Local Plan 2020- 2042 (draft EDLP), which comprise:

1. This letter, which addresses a range of strategic matters including the strategy for the West End and Strategic Policies SP01: Spatial Strategy and WS01: Development of a second new community east of Exeter, as well as legal and procedural matters relating to the Council's approach to plan making, the allocation of sufficient sites to meet the District's needs and the housing trajectory.

2. A Vision Statement for the strategic development being promoted by our clients.

3. Detailed representations on a range of draft EDLP policies in tabular format entitled EDLP Reg 19 Policy Reps.

Policy Context for Plan Making Provisions for plan making are set out within the NPPF and NPPG. Plan makers are required to take account of the following points when preparing their Local Plan.

Under the transitional arrangements of the December 2024 NPPF, the new Local Plan will be considered under the provisions of the December 2023 NPPF. National Planning Policy Framework (December 2023)

- Paragraph 31 states that "The preparation and review of all policies should be underpinned by relevant and up-to-date evidence. This should be …focussed tightly on supporting and justifying the policies concerned and take account of relevant market signals."

- Paragraph 35 identifies the tests of soundness as being:

a) Positively prepared: As a minimum, seeking to meet the area's objectively assessed needs and informed by agreements with other authorities so that unmet need from neighbouring areas is accommodated where it is practical to do so and is consistent with sustainable development. b) Justified: An appropriate strategy based on taking account of reasonable alternatives and proportionate evidence. c) Effective: Deliverable, based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic matters, evidenced in a Statement of Common Ground. d) Consistent with national policy.

LOCAL PLAN PREPARATION - TRANSITIONAL ARRANGEMENTS It is considered that splitting consultation on two parts of the same plan to enable the draft EDLP as a whole to take advantage of having to meet only at least 80% of the District's identified need does not meet the transitional arrangements in the December 2024 Framework. This is in circumstances where the forthcoming consultation on the second new community will in effect be a Regulation 18 consultation and where the draft EDLP is only planning for up to 80% of the District's needs.

In tis respect, the draft EDLP is ducking the ambition and challenges in the December 2024 Framework and presented in two Written Ministerial Statements of 30 July 2024 (Angela Rayner MP) and 12 December 2024 (Matthew Pennycook MP), setting out the need to address the national housing crisis and in so doing, to turbo- charge the national economy. It is also delaying important strategic decisions on the scale and location of new development, including at the proposed second new community, which should be addressed now.

HOUSING DELIVERY AND TRAJECTORY Up to 2031/32, the draft EDLP sets a trajectory to deliver 850 dwellings per year on average, with the remaining plan period from 2032/33 onwards to deliver an annual average of 1,070 dwellings per year. Whilst this averages out to provide for the required housing need, it means that for the first part of the plan-period, the draft EDLP will be under-delivering against their identified housing need and more than likely unable to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply within the early parts of the plan-period, as evidenced by Appendix 1 of the draft EDLP. This approach appears to be at odds with the Framework, in particular, the requirement to meet an area's objectively assessed needs as a minimum.

It is, effectively, a workaround, where the LPA will only be delivering 70% of the housing requirement, which would have to be averaged out by delivery later in the plan period, for the Plan to continue to be assessed against the previous version of the Framework and therefore requiring 80% of the housing requirement to be planned for.

The planned shortfall in the East Devon needs to be considered in the context of the recorded shortfall in housing delivery in the adjoining Exeter City Council's administrative area of about 2,400 new homes against its current Local Plan requirement. This will be compounded by the extreme vulnerability of its proposed draft LP strategy of locating most of the new homes required in the next Local Plan period on brownfield land.

We are also concerned at the over-reliance on the contribution that windfall sites are anticipated to make to meeting housing need. The Framework is clear that there should be "compelling evidence" that windfall sites will provide a reliable source of supply. The current wording of Policy SP06 does not provide confidence that development on windfall sites will be a reliable source of supply.

Full name: Jess Perminter

Organisation (where relevant): CarneySweeney

Other party name (if relevant): DAAB Partnership

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Up to 2031/32, the Council indicate a trajectory to deliver 850 dwellings per year on average, with the remaining plan period from 2032/33 onwards to deliver an annual average of 1,070 dwellings per year. Whilst this averages out to provide for the required housing need, it means that for the first part of the plan-period, the LPA will be under-delivering against their identified housing need and more than likely unable to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply within the early parts of the plan-period, as evidenced by Appendix 1 of the Draft Local Plan. This approach appears to be at odds with the Framework, in particular, the requirement to "meet the area's objectively assessed needs".

It is, effectively, a workaround, where the LPA will only be delivering 70% of the housing requirement, which would be averaged out by delivery later in the plan period, for the Plan to continue to be assessed against the previous version of the Framework and therefore requiring 80% of the housing requirement to be planned for.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: In combination, the restrictive nature of Policy SP06, and the reliance of larger sites to deliver the required housing need later in the plan-period cemented by Policy SP02, presents the prospect of a deteriorating housing supply position from the point of adoption within the first half of the plan period. The Framework is clear that planning policies "should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services". The restrictive nature of Policies SP02 and SP06 is at odds with the clear intention of what the Framework is

aspiring to achieve. Furthermore, the Framework is clear that strategic policies should provide for objectively assessed needs “as a minimum”.

Full name: Samantha Thomas

Organisation (where relevant): CarneySweeney

Other party name (if relevant): Obsidian Strategic Asset Management

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: HOUSING TARGETS / DELIVERY

Up to 2031/32, the Council indicate a trajectory to deliver 850 dwellings per year on average, with the remaining plan period from 2032/33 onwards to deliver an annual average of 1,070 dwellings per year. Whilst this averages out to provide for the required housing need, it means that for the first part of the plan-period, the LPA will be under-delivering against their identified housing need and more than likely unable to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply within the early parts of the plan-period, as evidenced by Appendix 1 of the Draft Local Plan. This approach appears to be at odds with the Framework, in particular, the requirement to "meet the area's objectively assessed needs".

It is, effectively, a workaround, where the LPA will only be delivering 70% of the housing requirement, which would be averaged out by delivery later in the plan period, for the Plan to continue to be assessed against the previous version of the Framework and therefore requiring 80% of the housing requirement to be planned for.

Elsewhere in the Draft Local Plan, notably in Strategic Policy HN02 (Affordable Housing), it is referenced that 35% affordable housing would be a target for windfall development outside settlement boundaries. This appears at odds with Policy SP06 which restricts development outside settlement boundaries, presenting concerns about the level of contribution that windfall sites will provide to meeting housing need. Paragraph 75 of the Framework is clear that there should be "compelling evidence" that windfall sites will provide a reliable source of supply. The current wording of Policy SP06

does not provide confidence that development on windfall sites will be a reliable source of supply.

In combination, the restrictive nature of Policy SP06, and the reliance of larger sites to deliver the required housing need later in the plan-period cemented by Policy SP02, presents the prospect of a deteriorating housing supply position from the point of adoption within the first half of the plan period. The Framework is clear that planning policies “should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services”. The restrictive nature of Policies SP02 and SP06 is at odds with the clear intention of what the Framework is aspiring to achieve. Furthermore, the Framework is clear that strategic policies should provide for objectively assessed needs “as a minimum”.

Full name: Samantha Thomas

Organisation (where relevant): CarneySweeney

Other party name (if relevant): WainHomes (South West) Ltd

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Housing Targets / Delivery

Up to 2031/32, the Council indicate a trajectory to deliver 850 dwellings per year on average, with the remaining plan period from 2032/33 onwards to deliver an annual average of 1,070 dwellings per year. Whilst this averages out to provide for the required housing need, it means that for the first part of the plan-period, the LPA will be under-delivering against their identified housing need and more than likely unable to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply within the early parts of the plan-period, as evidenced by Appendix 1 of the Draft Local Plan. This approach appears to be at odds with the Framework, in particular, the requirement to "meet the area's objectively assessed needs".

It is, effectively, a workaround, where the LPA will only be delivering 70% of the housing requirement, which would be averaged out by delivery later in the plan period, for the Plan to continue to be assessed against the previous version of the Framework and therefore requiring 80% of the housing requirement to be planned for.

Elsewhere in the Draft Local Plan, notably in Strategic Policy HN02 (Affordable Housing), it is referenced that 35% affordable housing would be a target for windfall development outside settlement boundaries. This appears at odds with Policy SP06 which restricts development outside settlement boundaries, presenting concerns about the level of contribution that windfall sites will provide to meeting housing need. Paragraph 75 of the Framework is clear that there should be "compelling evidence" that windfall sites will provide a reliable source of supply. The current wording of Policy SP06

does not provide confidence that development on windfall sites will be a reliable source of supply.

In combination, the restrictive nature of Policy SP06, and the reliance of larger sites to deliver the required housing need later in the plan-period cemented by Policy SP02, presents the prospect of a deteriorating housing supply position from the point of adoption within the first half of the plan period. The Framework is clear that planning policies “should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services”. The restrictive nature of Policies SP02 and SP06 is at odds with the clear intention of what the Framework is aspiring to achieve. Furthermore, the Framework is clear that strategic policies should provide for objectively assessed needs “as a minimum”.

Full name: Ollie Thorogood

Organisation (where relevant): CarneySweeney

Other party name (if relevant): Jackson-Stops

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Whilst we agree with the contents of Strategic Policy SP01 and the consideration of Woodbury as a 'Local Centre' within the settlement hierarchy, we are concerned with the proposed 'stepped trajectory' for delivering the identified housing requirement, set out at Policy SP02. There is very little certainty in the evidence to suggest that the proposed trajectory is robust, with a reliance on overdelivery in the latter period of the plan and on windfall sites. Up to 2031/32, the Council indicate a trajectory to deliver 850 dwellings per year on average, with the remaining plan period from 2032/33 onwards to deliver an annual average of 1,070 dwellings per year. Whilst this averages out to provide for the required housing need, it means that for the first part of the plan-period, the LPA will be under-delivering against their identified housing need and more than likely unable to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply within the early parts of the plan-period, as evidenced by Appendix 1 of the Draft Local Plan. This approach appears to be at odds with the Framework, in particular, the requirement to "meet the area's objectively assessed needs". It is, effectively, a workaround, where the LPA will only be delivering 70% of the housing requirement, which would be averaged out by delivery later in the plan period, for the Plan to continue to be assessed against the previous version of the Framework and therefore requiring 80% of the housing requirement to be planned for.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: The stepped trajectory approach appears to be at odds with the Framework, in particular, the requirement to "meet the area's objectively assessed needs".

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Simon Collier

Organisation (where relevant): Collier Planning

Other party name (if relevant): Eagle One MMIII Ltd

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: We write on behalf of Eagle Investments (SW) Ltd to make representations on the Local Plan Regulation 19 Publication Draft consultation with reference to land which it owns to the west of Hulham Road, Exmouth. It is unclear why it is proposed for the plan period to start from 2020, some five years ago now, when the plan is not expected to become an adopted one until 2026 at the earliest. That would not seem to be Justified taking account of the reasonable alternatives. We recognise that the Council has sought to take advantage of the provisions of paragraph 234 (a) of the revised NPPF and has therefore proposed to plan for only 80% of the local housing need for East Devon now identified under the standard method, published on 12 December 2024. This has two significant implications which needs to be borne in mind now at the plan making stage. Having regard to paragraph 78 (c) of the NPPF it means that almost from adoption of the plan, the Council will need to effectively demonstrate a six year housing land supply for the purposes of decision making. This does raise important questions as to how Positively Prepared the draft plan is and how Effective it will be over the plan period.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: It would seem far more logical and straightforward for the proposed plan period to commence in 2025. The plan will require a very significant update within five years of adoption in order to otherwise bring it in line with the revised NPPF. There is nothing in the draft plan, including in Chapter 17, Implementation and Monitoring to indicate the need for this or when and how it will be undertaken. This is a

key omission requiring modifications in order to make the plan sound in respect of all of the tests identified above.

Full name: Simon Collier

Organisation (where relevant): Collier Planning

Other party name (if relevant): Eagle One MMIII Ltd

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:

We write on behalf of Eagle Investments (SW) Ltd to make representations on the Local Plan Regulation 19 Publication Draft consultation with reference to land which it owns at St Johns, Exmouth, which is included as part of the draft allocation Exmo_20. It is unclear why it is proposed for the plan period to start from 2020, some five years ago now, when the plan is not expected to become an adopted one until 2026 at the earliest. That would not seem to be Justified taking account of the reasonable alternatives. We recognise that the Council has sought to take advantage of the provisions of paragraph 234 (a) of the revised NPPF and has therefore proposed to plan for only 80% of the local housing need for East Devon now identified under the standard method, published on 12 December 2024. This has two significant implications which needs to be borne in mind now at the plan making stage. Firstly, it means that the plan will require a very significant update within five years of adoption in order to otherwise bring it in line with the revised NPPF. There is nothing in the draft plan, including in Chapter 17, Implementation and Monitoring to indicate the need for this or when and how it will be undertaken. This is a key omission requiring modifications in order to make the plan sound in respect of all of the tests identified above. Secondly, having regard to paragraph 78 (c) of the NPPF it means that almost from adoption of the plan, the Council will need to effectively demonstrate a six year housing land supply for the purposes of decision making. This does raise important questions as to how Positively Prepared the draft plan is and how Effective it will be over the plan period.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the

Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: It would seem far more logical and straightforward for the proposed plan period to commence in 2025.

Full name: Simon Collier

Organisation (where relevant): Collier Planning

Other party name (if relevant): Eagle One MMIII Ltd

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: We write on behalf of Eagle Investments (SW) Ltd to make representations on the Local Plan Regulation 19 Publication Draft consultation with reference to land which it owns to the south of Hulham Road, Exmouth. It is unclear why it is proposed for the plan period to start from 2020, some five years ago now, when the plan is not expected to become an adopted one until 2026 at the earliest. That would not seem to be Justified taking account of the reasonable alternatives. We recognise that the Council has sought to take advantage of the provisions of paragraph 234 (a) of the revised NPPF and has therefore proposed to plan for only 80% of the local housing need for East Devon now identified under the standard method, published on 12 December 2024. This has two significant implications which needs to be borne in mind now at the plan making stage. Firstly, it means that the plan will require a very significant update within five years of adoption in order to otherwise bring it in line with the revised NPPF. There is nothing in the draft plan, including in Chapter 17, Implementation and Monitoring to indicate the need for this or when and how it will be undertaken. This is a key omission requiring modifications in order to make the plan sound. Secondly, having regard to paragraph 78 (c) of the NPPF it means that almost from adoption of the plan, the Council will need to demonstrate a six year housing land supply for the purposes of decision making. This does raise important questions as to how Positively Prepared the draft plan is and how Effective it will be over the plan period.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as

precise as possible.: It would seem far more logical and straightforward for the proposed plan period to commence in 2025.

Full name: Simon Collier

Organisation (where relevant): Collier Planning

Other party name (if relevant): Eagle One MMIII Ltd

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: We write on behalf of Mr and Mrs Parks to make representations on the Local Plan Regulation 19 Publication Draft consultation with reference to land which they own at Meeting Lane, Lympstone. It is unclear why it is proposed for the plan period to start from 2020, some five years ago now, when the plan is not expected to become an adopted one until 2026 at the earliest. That would not seem to be Justified taking account of the reasonable alternatives. We recognise that the Council has sought to take advantage of the provisions of paragraph 234 (a) of the revised NPPF and has therefore proposed to plan for only 80% of the local housing need for East Devon now identified under the standard method, published on 12 December 2024. This has two significant implications which needs to be borne in mind now at the plan making stage. Firstly, it means that the plan will require a very significant update within five years of adoption in order to otherwise bring it in line with the revised NPPF. There is nothing in the draft plan, including in Chapter 17, Implementation and Monitoring to indicate the need for this or when and how it will be undertaken. This is a key omission requiring modifications in order to make the plan sound in respect of all of the tests identified above. Secondly, having regard to paragraph 78 (c) of the NPPF it means that almost from adoption of the plan, the Council will need to effectively demonstrate a six year housing land supply for the purposes of decision making. This does raise important questions as to how Positively Prepared the draft plan is and how Effective it will be over the plan period. Opportunities for allocating more land for housing that can be delivered in the early years of the plan period should not be passed up as a consequence.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your

suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: It would seem far more logical and straightforward for the proposed plan period to commence in 2025.

Full name: Simon Collier

Organisation (where relevant): Collier Planning

Other party name (if relevant): Eagle One MMIII Ltd

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: We recognise that the Council has sought to take advantage of the provisions of paragraph 234 (a) of the revised NPPF and has therefore proposed to plan for only 80% of the local housing need for East Devon now identified under the standard method, published on 12 December 2024. This has two significant implications which needs to be borne in mind now at the plan making stage. Firstly, it means that the plan will require a very significant update within five years of adoption in order to otherwise bring it in line with the revised NPPF. There is nothing in the draft plan, including in Chapter 17, Implementation and Monitoring to indicate the need for this or when and how it will be undertaken. Secondly, having regard to paragraph 78 (c) of the NPPF it means that almost from adoption of the plan, the Council will need to demonstrate a six year housing land supply for the purposes of decision making. This does raise important questions as to how Positively Prepared the draft plan is and how Effective it will be over the plan period.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: The lack of detail on how the plan will be updated to be in line with the revised NPFP is a key omission requiring modifications in order to make the plan sound.

Full name: Simon Collier

Organisation (where relevant): Collier Planning

Other party name (if relevant): Eagle One MMIII Ltd

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: It is unclear why it is proposed for the plan period to start from 2020, some five years ago now, when the plan is not expected to become an adopted one until 2026 at the earliest. That would not seem to be Justified taking account of the reasonable alternatives.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: It would seem far more logical and straightforward for the proposed plan period to commence in 2025.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Alex Munday

Organisation (where relevant): Kitchener Land and Planning

Other party name (if relevant): Mr Lillie and Ms Blundell

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Draft Policy SP02 sets out the proposed housing requirement for the plan period. It states that at least 20,909 dwellings will be delivered between 1 April 2020 and 31 March 2042. However, this is proposed to be split into two phases with 850 dwellings per annum in the first phase from 2020/21 to 2031/32 and 1,070 dwellings per annum in the second phase from 2032/33 to 2041/42.

We have concerns over the approach taken in draft Policy SP02 for the following reasons:

• Uncertainty over whether the Local Plan can proceed under the transitional arrangements

• The proposed stepped trajectory

We address each of the two matters in turn below:

Uncertainty over whether the Local Plan can proceed under the transitional arrangements:

From our reading of the Forward to the Plan and the Justification for Policy SP02, it is clear that the Council has commenced consultation on the Plan before it is ready, with the intention to try and take advantage of the transitional arrangements contained in

Annex 1 of the NPPF, and proceed with a housing requirement that falls below the Government's revised Standard Method output.

This intention is very clear when reading how the proposed housing requirement has been described in paragraph 3.11 of the Plan. The justification for the policy in this paragraph explains that the requirement has been set at a level which just, by less than one dwelling per annum, exceeds the 80% threshold in paragraph 234(a) of the NPPF.

In our view this approach is not in accordance with the purpose of the transitional arrangements. These provisions are intended to enable Local Plans to progress where an emerging local plan has advanced but not yet reached the Regulation 19 stage, not to set a minimum threshold for Local Plans for plans which are at Regulation 18 stage. This is unfortunately how the Regulation 19 plan reads.

However, more fundamentally, we are concerned over whether the Local Plan consultation is even able to proceed on the basis of the transitional arrangements. The relevant extract from Paragraph 234(a) of the Framework is copied below:

"234. For the purpose of preparing local plans, the policies in this version of the Framework will apply from 12 March 2025 other than where one or more of the following apply:

a. the plan has reached Regulation 19 82 (pre-submission stage) on or before 12 March 2025, and its draft housing requirement meets at least 80% of local housing need 83."

This is supported by two related footnotes. The first of these – Footnote 82 – is as follows:

"Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. In this context "reached Regulation 19" refers to when Regulation 19 has been complied with (i.e. when the planning authority has made a copy of each of the proposed submission documents and a statement of the representations procedure available, and the statements required in Regulation 19(b) have been sent to consultation bodies)." (emphasis added) The reference to "each of the proposed

submission documents" is very important. In order to be considered to have reached Regulation 19, the whole of the Plan, i.e. each component part of a Regulation 19 local plan, must have been made available. This is a very deliberate piece of drafting by Government intended to preclude circumstances where a local planning authority could progress under the transitional arrangement contrary to their spirit and purpose.

On the basis of the above we consider there is significant risk that the Local Plan may not be able to proceed under the transitional arrangements and that none of the exceptions contained within paragraph 234 of the Framework apply.

Stepped Housing Trajectory:

In very simple terms, we consider that there is absolutely no justification for adopting a stepped trajectory in the draft plan for that reduces the housing requirement for the five years (approx.) post-adoption and pushes the resultant backlog that this creates to the later years of the plan period.

The Planning Practice Guidance helpfully attends directly to the question of 'When is a stepped housing requirement appropriate for plan-making?'. In so doing it provide the following guidance: "A stepped housing requirement may be appropriate where there is to be a significant change in the level of housing requirement between emerging and previous policies and / or where strategic sites will have a phased delivery or are likely to be delivered later in the plan period. Strategic policy-makers will need to identify the stepped requirement in strategic housing policy, and to set out evidence to support this approach, and not seek to unnecessarily delay meeting identified development needs. Stepped requirements will need to ensure that planned housing requirements are met fully within the plan period. In reviewing and revising policies, strategic policy-makers should ensure there is not continued delay in meeting identified development needs." The guidance also advises that evidence must be provided to support a stepped approach if one is proposed. There is no such evidence in the draft plan or the evidence base.

Overall, the Council needs to play its part in addressing the housing crisis. Rather than trying to do the bare minimum to scrape through under the transitional arrangements, the Council could and should have positively and proactively sought to update the

policies and proposals of the Local Plan to reflect the local housing need as defined by the revised Standard Method.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: Uncertainty over whether the Local Plan can proceed under the transitional arrangements:

In these circumstances, it is our view that the housing requirement must reflect paragraph 62 of the Framework: "To determine the minimum number of homes needed, strategic policies should be informed by a local housing need assessment, conducted using the standard method in national planning practice guidance. In addition to the local housing need figure, any needs that cannot be met within neighbouring areas should also be taken into account in establishing the amount of housing to be planned for".

The Standard Method output for East Devon from the revised methodology of the PPG is 1,188dwellings per annum (dpa) as acknowledged in paragraph 3.11 of the draft Local Plan. For the reasons set out above, it is this figure which the Plan must put in place in order to satisfy the 'Positively Prepared' test of soundness in paragraph 36(a) of the NPPF. As it stands, our view is the draft Local Plan is unsound and may require significant Main Modifications to allocate a minimum of an additional 5,227 dwellings during the plan period to redress this shortcoming.

Stepped Housing Trajectory:

As it stands, the transitional arrangements may not apply to EDDC as not all of the Local Plan has been published for consultation. In accordance with the paragraph 36 of the Framework, the housing requirement and related elements of the Local Plan should therefore be updated to reflect the revised Standard Method.

In our view, the housing requirement for the draft Local Plan should therefore be increased in order to reflect the updated Standard Method.

Full name: Zoe Mason

Organisation (where relevant): Lichfields

Other party name (if relevant): Church Commissioners

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: [Representation on behalf of Church Commissioners who own land at Clyst Honiton] The Commissioners consider that the housing provision identified within the Policy SP02 is in contrast with the requirements of the December 2024 National Planning Policy Framework and its updated Standard Method. The December 2024 NPPF sets out that plans that are at Regulation 19 consultation stage by 12 March 2025 will be examined under the December 2023 version of the Framework. Paragraph 236 of the NPPF states where exempt plans demonstrate a housing requirement meets less than 80% of local housing need under the new standard method, work on a new plan must commence immediately following adoption of the plan currently under preparation in order to address housing needs. The Regulation 19 Consultation document identifies at paragraph 3.11 establishes that the new standard method generates an average housing need of 1,188 dwellings as of February 2025. East Devon District Council (EDDC) in its justification for Policy SP02 identifies the authority's housing need to be 80% of the figure produced by the new standard method, a requirement of 950.4 dwellings per annum. Policy SP02 proposes to address a housing need of 20,909 dwellings, which is equivalent to provision of 950.4 dwellings per annum. The document also identifies a 'surplus' (para. 3.11-3.12) of 1,707 dwellings when accounting for projected delivery including built dwellings, permitted, projected future windfalls and allocations (as of April 2024). Through its approach, EDDC inaccurately identifies its need to be 80% of its actual need, and states any provision over 80% of need to be 'surplus'. This demonstrates EDDC's unwillingness to engage with the real housing need presented in the district by the new NPPF, does not represent positive preparation, and is not a justified approach to housing need. Policy SP02 takes a bare minimum approach to the requirements of the NPPF, seeking to achieve only 80% of housing requirement, utilising a further 1,705 dwellings only in the event of non-delivery of

dwellings as opposed to accommodating the availability of land within the housing targets. Policy SP02, in this case, is unsound

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: The Commissioners recommend EDDC review this policy to identify and provide for 100% of the housing need required by the December 2024 NPPF and its transitional arrangements in Annex 1. The Commissioners acknowledge that the Office for National Statistics has published its affordability ratio for 2024 on 24 March 2025. This impacts the calculated housing requirement under the new standard method, reducing need. Whilst the need is reduced from the figure of 1,188 to 1,146, the need is still calculated to be greater than EDDC's proposed annual need of 950.4 dwellings and therefore the principles outlined above still apply.

Full name: Zoe Mason

Organisation (where relevant): Lichfields

Other party name (if relevant): Mr M.J. Nancekivell and Mr R.P. Nancekivell

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:

2.1 The adopted East Devon Local Plan (2013-2031) identified an annual housing need of 950 dwellings per annum; 17,100 dwellings over the plan period. The 2023 housing delivery test established that 118% of housing need had been delivered in East Devon (need for 2,482 dwellings vs delivery of 2,940). Table 1 below shows that the number of homes required was exceeded by those delivered in years 2020/21, 2021/22 and 2022/23. The most recent two years in particularly (2021-2023) clearly demonstrate that East Devon is capable of delivering at rates beyond those set in the Local Plan and this has been a successful Plan strategy.2.2 East Devon has progressed its Draft Plan to Regulation 19 to accord with the 'transitional arrangements' set out in the December 2024 NPPF. Para. 234a states that, if "…the plan has reached Regulation 19 (pre-submission stage) on or before 12 March 2025, and its draft housing requirement meets at least 80% of local housing need" then the plan will be examined under the relevant previous version of the Framework i.e. the 2023 NPPF. Page 5 of the Draft Plan confirms this: "this plan, and policies within it, are drafted to accord with the December 2023 National Planning Policy Framework and all references in the plan are to this document, unless specifically stated otherwise".

2.3 This is critical to considering East Devon's housing need. In summary: 1 The new standard method sets an annual local housing need for East Devon of 1,188 dwellings per annum. Projecting this over a 22 year Plan period (2020-2042) generates a minimum housing need of 26,136 dwellings. Even if the period 2020-2024 was assumed at the adopted Local Plan level of need (950 dwellings, or 4 years at 3,800 dwellings), increasing to 1,188 for 2025-2042 (18 years so 21,384), this would total 25,184 dwellings over the 22 year Plan period. 2 The 2023 version of the standard method generated a local housing need for East Devon of 893 dwellings per annum, or 19,646

dwellings over the Plan period. 3 East Devon commissioned ORS to prepare a Local Housing Needs Assessment in September 2022 which confirmed the "…minimum Local Housing Need figure across

Pg 3

East Devon is 918 dwellings per annum" (para. 6.2). At that time a 20-year Plan was anticipated, but based on the 22 year Draft Plan, this totals 20,196 dwellings.

2.4 The 2023 standard method and the locally assessed housing figures (i.e. no.2 and 3 above) equate to less than 80% (75 - 77%) of the new standard method figure and therefore fail the NPPF's 'transitional arrangements'. Instead, the Draft Plan will simply deliver 80% of the new standard method which "…generates the annual average housing level of 950.4 new homes, a 22-year plan requirement of 20,909" (para. 3.11). On this basis, 'Strategic Policy SP02: Levels of future housing development' states "…housing provision will be made for at least 20,909 dwellings (net) to be delivered in the plan area between 1 April 2020 to 31 March 2042. The housing requirement will be delivered through a stepped trajectory, with an annual target of 850 homes from 2020/21 to 2031/32, increasing to 1,070 homes per year from 2032/33 to 2041/42".

2.5 Whilst the 'transitional arrangements' exist to enable Plans to progress where they have got to Regulation 19 by 12 March 2025, this is where they have been prepared in accordance with the previous Framework i.e. the 2023 NPPF, and meet 'at least' 80% of local housing need. Para. 234a was not intended as a tool to simply 'cut the numbers' that would otherwise be required and plan for -20% of up-to-date need. Further, the 80% is a minimum, not a target to plan for.

2.6 The 'justification' text for policy SP02 states: 1 "Projected delivery from all sources, from a monitoring base position of 1 April 2024…provide for 22,614 homes. 2 Of these 3,514 have been built which if deducted from gross projections leaves a net delivery of 19,100 and a net need, with the same subtraction, of 17,395. 3 Deducting

the net need from net delivery generates a 'surplus' of 1,705, this... gives a healthy headroom surplus of 9.8% that will account for any possible non-delivery".

2.7 This 'surplus' / 'headroom' is an arbitrary figure which does not reflect real 'need' – it cannot therefore be considered a surplus. By planning for precisely 80% of up-to-date need (i.e. the new standard method), the Draft Plan immediately fails to meet 'need', and even with the 'surplus' of 1,705 dwellings it still falls well short.

2.8 It is therefore concluded that the Draft Plan has failed to be positively prepared, and takes an unjustified approach to its housing numbers. When East Devon concluded that its local housing need as assessed under the previous Framework, and/or by ORS in 2022, was less than 80% of the new standard method, it should have resolved to prepare a Local Plan to meet up-to-date need, planning for the full new standard method requirement i.e. 1,188 dwellings per annum, and a minimum of 26,136 dwellings over the plan period. Seeking to get to Regulation 19 by the 12th March 2025 deadline with an unsound plan, simply to secure agreement to delivery of 20% less than identified housing need, should be firmly rebutted. Distribution Over Time

2.9 The Plan's soundness is further undermined by the approach in Policy SP02 to a 'stepped housing trajectory' where delivery targets only 850 homes per annum from 2020/21 to 2031/32, increasing to 1,070 homes per year from 2032/33 to 2041/42. The first 11 years of

Pg 4

the Plan (and 5 years from adoption i.e. the five year housing land supply) fall well short of meeting minimum need, whether under the new or old standard method, or indeed the need assessed by ORS in 2022. This is a fundamentally unsound approach and raises various significant issues.

2.10 Firstly, the proposal for a stepped trajectory 'backloads' a significant proportion of housing delivery. In years 1-4 post adoption (where it assumes 850 units a year from 2026/27- 2031/32) this totals only 4,250 dwellings (89% of the Draft Plan minimum requirements, and only 72% of the new standard method). Even more concerning is how this is further compounded by the housing trajectory at Appendix 1 to the Draft Plan, which identifies delivery of: 1 2025/26: 781 dwellings 2 2026/27: 660 dwellings 3 2027/28: 645 dwellings 4 2028/29: 448 dwellings

2.11 Applying the above, in the next 4 years delivery would be only 67% of the Draft Plan minimum requirement, or 53% of the new standard method. In 2028/29, delivery wouldn't even reach 50% of the minimum Draft Plan requirement, or 40% of the new standard method. This is profoundly unsound.

2.12 Delivery is then stated to jump dramatically to 1,078-1,494 dwellings in 2029/30-2038/39, before dropping down again to 646-911 in the final 3 years of the Plan (the reason for the latter is unclear, particularly given this is when one would assume the new settlement is at its peak delivery). This shows a huge overreliance on large strategic sites coming online in years c.10-20 i.e. 5 years post adoption, at the expense of meeting immediate housing need; there is also significantly more risk and uncertainty in delivery of these large sites, as accepted in the Draft Plan; para. 3.12 states "in recognition of the complexities inherent in delivering major development sites, particularly the proposed new community provision of new homes will come forward under a stepped trajectory…". This is not a sound reason for a stepped trajectory.

2.13 Planning for delivery to fall well short of recent trends and identified need is a flawed and unsound approach and will have significant economic and social implications for East Devon. This is not taking a positive approach to plan-making.

2.14 EDDC must therefore revisit its overall housing numbers and how these feed into the delivery trajectory, with amendments to Strategic Policy SP02 and Appendix 1. This will also have implications for Strategic Policy SP03 (currently unsound as drafted, as additional numbers must be planned for in the Designated Neighbourhood Areas) and then Chapter 5, as a number of new/expanded site allocations will be required; EDDC must allocate land to increase its supply for the 5 years of the Plan post adoption i.e. unconstrained and deliverable small/medium sized sites, such as those under the control of the Landowner in Ottery St Mary, as well as – fundamentally – planning for its true housing need over the full plan period.

Pg 5

Five Year Housing Land Supply

2.15 The Draft Plan must identify a 5 year housing land supply (5YHLS) from the intended date of adoption; this is a requirement of the NPPF. Critically for East Devon, para. 78c of the NPPF will immediately apply as the Local Plan is not due for adoption until late 2026/early '27. By planning for an annual average housing need of 950 new homes, which is precisely 80% of new standard method figures (arguably below 80% as a need for 950.4 should be rounded up to 951), the 20% buffer will be required.

2.16 The Draft Plan must address this now. Beyond increasing its allocated housing land/associated trajectory for 2026/27 – 2031-32 to address actual housing need, it must add a 20% buffer to this. The implications are significant. Applying a housing need figure of 950 dwellings per annum + 20% equates to 1,140 per annum, or 5,700 dwellings over 5 years; a total increase of 1,450 dwellings. When considering this in the context of the current 850 dwelling stepped trajectory, the increase to what is currently being planned for becomes even more significant.

2.17 The Draft Plan is supported by a "Technical Assessment of Housing Delivery" (Feb 2025). This states at Section 5 that the 20% buffer has been applied and from adoption the Plan will have a 6.22 year supply. Appendix 5 is flawed (see copy at Table 2 below); it is based on an annual housing need of 850 dwellings, with the buffer increasing this to 1,020 (5,080 total). Based on a Local Plan annual housing target of 950 dwellings (not 850) this must be increased to 1,140 dwellings, or 5,700 over 5 years.2.18 It is clear from this trajectory that the land supply in the first two years will fall well short – in year 1 supply is just 57% of need, and in year 2 only 39%. The significant jump from year 2 (448 dwellings) to year 3 (1,471 dwellings) is not justified. Whilst it is agreed that some of the allocations set out in the Draft Plan will deliver within the first 5 year period, it is highly unlikely this will reflect Appendix 4 of the Technical Assessment of Housing Delivery paper which shows almost all the Draft Plan's allocations suddenly delivering units in years 2029/30 (having delivered none beforehand).

2.19 Based on Lichfields Start to Finish research, delivery would come from some of the small site allocations, yet the Council's projections have the 10,000 unit new settlement delivering 144 units from year 2029/30, increasing to 216 units from 2031/32. This is unsound. Large sites of 2,000 units plus take on average 5.1 years for the planning approval period, plus 1.6 years from planning to delivery; that is almost 7 years. This settlement is

Pg 6

not yet subject to a planning application and is unlikely to be until the Plan is at Examination/adopted (2026/27). Even this would be ambitious given the Council is at vision/early consultation stage; planning submission post Plan adoption appears more likely. In its first delivery year, units/numbers are generally low given supporting infrastructure required to service the first parcel. The first year is likely to start at 50-100 dwellings and ramp up to 200 per annum over 1-2 years, depending on the number of housebuilder outlets.

2.20 This new settlement is therefore highly unlikely to deliver units in the first 5 years of the Plan period, and it is not feasible for it to have delivered 144 units on site within 3 years; it should be a 'Y' for 'challenging' at Appendix 4 and pushed back to at least 32/33. This immediately removes 504 units from the 5YHLS and calls into question the assumptions made on other allocations. It also raises significant concern regarding the Draft Plan's assumption that 3,300 dwellings will be delivered at this new settlement by 2042, which has wider implications for the plan's wider land supply.

2.21 The approach to 5YHLS and NPPF para. 78 is therefore flawed, as are the general assumptions around delivery at the new settlement. Additional small/medium site allocations must be made in the Draft Plan to demonstrate a 5YHLS with appropriate buffer, and wider land supply must be reviewed to avoid overreliance on the new settlement delivering 3,300 units by 2042. Supply Breakdown and Geographic Delivery

2.22 The evidence base document "Housing Need, Supply and Requirement Interim Topic Paper" (November 2022) refers to a land supply of approximately 20,441 dwellings for the years 2020-2040, which is less than the Draft Plan's identified (albeit under cooked) need of 20,909. It is noted that this does not accommodate 2040-2042. Table 1 of the paper identifies supply to include: 1 Completions and existing commitments: 6,295 dwellings 2 Cranbrook DPD Expansion Area Allocations: 4,170 dwellings 3 New Town allocation: 2,500 dwellings 4 Other allocations: 5,141 dwellings 5 Windfall allowance: 2,335 dwellings

2.23 Without interrogating the numbers, there are some fundamental issues with this approach: 1 Over 50% of need being planned for in the Draft Plan is already completed/an existing commitment, or forms part of the Cranbrook expanded community; 2 Cranbrook and the new town address 33% of need (and including completed/committed development, 63% of need). This shows a significant reliance

moving forwards on the large and complex strategic sites; 3 Beyond this, only 25% of need is to be met from new/other allocations. This is less than double that from windfalls and should be increased, to first address the distribution of supply (geographically and trajectory), secondly provide headroom (see 5 below) and thirdly spread risk of non-delivery;

Pg 7

4 'Other allocations' accounted for 5,141 dwellings in the 2022 paper, when the Plan period was 2 years shorter; it does not appear that 'other allocations' have been increased/extended despite the plan period being extended, albeit without an update to the "Housing Need, Supply and Requirement Interim Topic Paper" this cannot be clearly understood; and, 5 The 2022 Paper acknowledges it is "…not enough simply to identify sufficient housing for forecast supply, including new site allocations, to match the housing requirement. The local plan should also manage the risks relating to the uncertainties of future housing delivery. The Council cannot guarantee delivery so it is realistic to acknowledge that some approved or planned sites may not come forward. An effective way to manage uncertainty is to reduce this risk by allowing for supply 'headroom'." Whilst this approach is commended, and the Draft Plan notes some headroom (c. 1,700 units), the assumptions it has made to inform this e.g. for the new town are not sound and will affect that headroom materially.2.29 Whilst the spatial approach to housing delivery across the settlements in East Devon is supported, including the recognition that Ottery St Mary is a Main Centre and should support significant development over the Plan period, the approach taken to assessing and then planning to meet housing need, both in distribution and trajectory, is unsound because: 1 EDDC is proposing to reduce its rate of housing delivery below that achieved over recent years; 2 The approach to the NPPF's 'transitional arrangements' is flawed and EDDC cannot simply plan for 80% of its up-to-date housing need – the Draft Plan must be revisited to plan for its full need i.e. 1,188 dwellings per annum, over the plan period; 3 The approach to a phased housing trajectory does not comply with national policy. Planned delivery must meet or exceed the annual housing need figure; EDDC cannot plan to underdeliver for the first 11 years of its Plan and then make up for this in the latter years – this has significant implications for social and economic growth

and will have resultant impacts on, for example, affordable housing and the wider housing crisis; 4 The Draft Plan does not deliver a 5YHLS with requisite buffer (20%) and will therefore immediately fail NPPF para. 78(c); 5 There is an overreliance on the large/complex sites, particularly the new settlement. This also includes a flawed approach to its assumed delivery rates (too soon in plan period, with implications for 5YHLS, and overestimated total delivery across the plan period).

2.30 In conclusion, the Draft Plan is (i) not planning for sufficient housing across the full plan period and (ii) is therefore not positively prepared.

2.31 It must be amended to plan for its full up-to-date housing need, with additional housing allocations identified, particularly to deliver earlier in the plan period and feed into 5YHLS.

Full name: Zoe Mason

Organisation (where relevant): Lichfields

Other party name (if relevant): Mr M.J. Nancekivell and Mr R.P. Nancekivell

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:

2.24 Notwithstanding the above significant issues with housing numbers, the general spatial strategy set out at Strategic Policy SP01 is supported in so far as development is directed to the West End (Cranbrook / new community), the Principal Centre of Exmouth and then the Main Centres, which include Ottery St Mary.

2.25 The Landowner is supportive of the recognition that Ottery St Mary can take 'significant development' to serve its own need as well as that of the wider area, given it is a settlement "…with strategic and local facilities that serve both their immediate area and surrounding communities, offering a balanced mix of jobs, services, and growth potential" (Draft Plan para. 3.4).

2.26 In this context, the focus should remain on these settlements to accommodate the additional housing numbers required over the Plan period, looking to the Principal and Main Centres first for additional and/or expanded allocations to accommodate need, before looking at the Local Centres and Service Villages. Ottery St Mary is a highly sustainable settlement and we support it as a geographic focus for significant development.

Full name: Owen Jones

Organisation (where relevant): LRM Planning

Other party name (if relevant): David Wilson Homes

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: No

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: Unmet need from neighbouring authorities

6.38 As set out above, para. 11(b) of the 2023 version of the NPPF confirms that strategic policies should, as a minimum, provide for objectively assessed needs for housing and other uses, as well as any needs that cannot be met within neighbouring areas, unless the application of parts (b)(i) and (ii) apply. This is reiterated at para. 26. In addition, para. 61 confirms that in addition to the local housing need figure, any needs that cannot be met in neighbouring areas should also be taken into account in establishing the amount of housing to be planned for.

6.39 The neighbouring authorities to East Devon are: ? Exeter City; ? Teignbridge; ? Mid Devon; ? Dorset; and ? Somerset.

6.40 All the Local Authorities listed above, aside from Dorset and Somerset, are located within the Greater Exeter Housing Market Area.

6.41 Key Supporting Document 002, which relates to the duty to co-operate, confirms that, in East Devon's view, the Local Planning Authority can meet its housing need7 . Moreover, it is also confirmed that there are no requests for East Devon to accommodate any unmet housing needs from neighbouring authorities at the present time.

6.42 With regard to the former, Key Document 002 cites the Housing Need, Supply and Requirement Interim Topic Paper (November 2022) (Key Supporting Document 017) as evidence that East Devon can meet their housing need. However, given the age of the document (over two years old), the standard method used within the evidence base is the previous version and does not reflect the more up-to-date approach published in

December 2024. Consequently, the evidence base document suggests that the local housing need figure was, at November 2022, 946 dwellings per annum, whereas, as set out above, it is now 1,146 dwellings per annum. Consequently, it is not the case, as is suggested by Key Supporting Document 002, that the emerging Local Plan has met East Devon's local housing need figure. As has been outlined above, the Local Planning Authority is reliant on the transitional arrangements provided in the 2024 version of the NPPF to justify their 7 Para. 4.3.

EAST DEVON LOCAL PLAN PUBLICATION DRAFT CONSULTATION 22 housing requirement. It does not appear, given the conclusions of Key Document 002, that any discussion has been held with neighbouring authorities as to how that shortfall could be met.

6.43 In terms of neighbouring authorities, Table 3 below provides an assessment of the current objectively assessed need for each authority against their emerging housing requirement. TABLE 3: OBJECTIVELY ASSESSED NEEDS AGAINST EMERGING HOUSING REQUIREMENTS LOCAL AUTHORITY PLAN-MAKING STAGE HOUSING REQUIREMENT (DPA) OBJECTIVELY ASSESSED NEED FOR HOUSING (DPA) SURPLUS/DEFICIT East Devon Regulation 19 950.4 1,146 -196 Exeter Regulation 19 642 804 -162 Teignbridge Examination 720 1,078 -358 Mid Devon Regulation 18 365 567 -202 Dorset Regulation 18 1,793 3,221 -1,428 Somerset Evidence gathering

- - -

6.44 Whilst it is acknowledged that the plan-making process is ongoing for all the above authorities, which could result in an increase to the housing requirements stated in the above table and that transitional arrangements in the 2024 version of the NPPF could apply, it shows that at present, the shortfall in planned housing provision for East Devon and its neighbouring authorities, aside from Somerset, against the locally assessed need for housing, is 2,346 homes per annum. Not only does it demonstrate that no local planning authority is planning to provide a greater level of housing than the standard method indicates is necessary, which could be used to meet unmet needs from neighbouring authorities, but that a significant shortfall is currently predicted. It also demonstrates that at the present time, no neighbouring authority is planning to accommodate any of East Devon's unmet need.

6.45 The analysis demonstrates that East Devon District Council has not fulfilled their duty to cooperate, as the basis on which the duty to cooperate discussions were undertaken on, predates existing objectively assessed levels of need. As a result, the Plan is inconsistent with national planning policy (para. 26 of the NPPF). It follows that it also cannot be considered to be either positively prepared or justified.

[Table for this section is available in the attached PDF]

Unmet need from neighbouring authorities

6.38 As set out above, para. 11(b) of the 2023 version of the NPPF confirms that strategic policies should, as a minimum, provide for objectively assessed needs for housing and other uses, as well as any needs that cannot be met within neighbouring areas, unless the application of parts (b)(i) and (ii) apply. This is reiterated at para. 26. In addition, para. 61 confirms that in addition to the local housing need figure, any needs that cannot be met in neighbouring areas should also be taken into account in establishing the amount of housing to be planned for.

6.39 The neighbouring authorities to East Devon are: ? Exeter City; ? Teignbridge; ? Mid Devon; ? Dorset; and ? Somerset.

6.40 All the Local Authorities listed above, aside from Dorset and Somerset, are located within the Greater Exeter Housing Market Area.

6.41 Key Supporting Document 002, which relates to the duty to co-operate, confirms that, in East Devon's view, the Local Planning Authority can meet its housing need7 . Moreover, it is also confirmed that there are no requests for East Devon to accommodate any unmet housing needs from neighbouring authorities at the present time.

6.42 With regard to the former, Key Document 002 cites the Housing Need, Supply and Requirement Interim Topic Paper (November 2022) (Key Supporting Document 017) as evidence that East Devon can meet their housing need. However, given the age of the document (over two years old), the standard method used within the evidence base is the previous version and does not reflect the more up-to-date approach published in December 2024. Consequently, the evidence base document suggests that the local housing need figure was, at November 2022, 946 dwellings per annum, whereas, as set out above, it is now 1,146 dwellings per annum. Consequently, it is not the case, as is suggested by Key Supporting Document 002, that the emerging Local Plan has met East Devon's local housing need figure. As has been outlined above, the Local Planning Authority is reliant on the transitional arrangements provided in the 2024 version of the NPPF to justify their 7 Para. 4.3.

EAST DEVON LOCAL PLAN PUBLICATION DRAFT CONSULTATION 22 housing requirement. It does not appear, given the conclusions of Key Document 002, that any

discussion has been held with neighbouring authorities as to how that shortfall could be met.

6.43 In terms of neighbouring authorities, Table 3 below provides an assessment of the current objectively assessed need for each authority against their emerging housing requirement. TABLE 3: OBJECTIVELY ASSESSED NEEDS AGAINST EMERGING HOUSING REQUIREMENTS LOCAL AUTHORITY PLAN-MAKING STAGE HOUSING REQUIREMENT (DPA) OBJECTIVELY ASSESSED NEED FOR HOUSING (DPA) SURPLUS/DEFICIT East Devon Regulation 19 950.4 1,146 -196 Exeter Regulation 19 642 804 -162 Teignbridge Examination 720 1,078 -358 Mid Devon Regulation 18 365 567 -202 Dorset Regulation 18 1,793 3,221 -1,428 Somerset Evidence gathering

- - -

6.44 Whilst it is acknowledged that the plan-making process is ongoing for all the above authorities, which could result in an increase to the housing requirements stated in the above table and that transitional arrangements in the 2024 version of the NPPF could apply, it shows that at present, the shortfall in planned housing provision for East Devon and its neighbouring authorities, aside from Somerset, against the locally assessed need for housing, is 2,346 homes per annum. Not only does it demonstrate that no local planning authority is planning to provide a greater level of housing than the standard method indicates is necessary, which could be used to meet unmet needs from neighbouring authorities, but that a significant shortfall is currently predicted. It also demonstrates that at the present time, no neighbouring authority is planning to accommodate any of East Devon's unmet need.

6.45 The analysis demonstrates that East Devon District Council has not fulfilled their duty to cooperate, as the basis on which the duty to cooperate discussions were undertaken on, predates existing objectively assessed levels of need. As a result, the Plan is inconsistent with national planning policy (para. 26 of the NPPF). It follows that it also cannot be considered to be either positively prepared or justified.

2(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter legally compliant, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter legally compliant. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: Unmet need from neighbouring authorities

6.38 As set out above, para. 11(b) of the 2023 version of the NPPF confirms that strategic policies should, as a minimum, provide for objectively assessed needs for housing and other uses, as well as any needs that cannot be met within neighbouring areas, unless the application of parts (b)(i) and (ii) apply. This is reiterated at para. 26. In addition, para. 61 confirms that in addition to the local housing need figure, any needs

that cannot be met in neighbouring areas should also be taken into account in establishing the amount of housing to be planned for.

6.39 The neighbouring authorities to East Devon are: ? Exeter City; ? Teignbridge; ? Mid Devon; ? Dorset; and ? Somerset.

6.40 All the Local Authorities listed above, aside from Dorset and Somerset, are located within the Greater Exeter Housing Market Area.

6.41 Key Supporting Document 002, which relates to the duty to co-operate, confirms that, in East Devon's view, the Local Planning Authority can meet its housing need7 . Moreover, it is also confirmed that there are no requests for East Devon to accommodate any unmet housing needs from neighbouring authorities at the present time.

6.42 With regard to the former, Key Document 002 cites the Housing Need, Supply and Requirement Interim Topic Paper (November 2022) (Key Supporting Document 017) as evidence that East Devon can meet their housing need. However, given the age of the document (over two years old), the standard method used within the evidence base is the previous version and does not reflect the more up-to-date approach published in December 2024. Consequently, the evidence base document suggests that the local housing need figure was, at November 2022, 946 dwellings per annum, whereas, as set out above, it is now 1,146 dwellings per annum. Consequently, it is not the case, as is suggested by Key Supporting Document 002, that the emerging Local Plan has met East Devon's local housing need figure. As has been outlined above, the Local Planning Authority is reliant on the transitional arrangements provided in the 2024 version of the NPPF to justify their 7 Para. 4.3.

EAST DEVON LOCAL PLAN PUBLICATION DRAFT CONSULTATION 22 housing requirement. It does not appear, given the conclusions of Key Document 002, that any discussion has been held with neighbouring authorities as to how that shortfall could be met.

6.43 In terms of neighbouring authorities, Table 3 below provides an assessment of the current objectively assessed need for each authority against their emerging housing requirement. TABLE 3: OBJECTIVELY ASSESSED NEEDS AGAINST EMERGING HOUSING REQUIREMENTS LOCAL AUTHORITY PLAN-MAKING STAGE HOUSING REQUIREMENT (DPA) OBJECTIVELY ASSESSED NEED FOR HOUSING (DPA) SURPLUS/DEFICIT East Devon Regulation 19 950.4 1,146 -196 Exeter Regulation 19 642 804 -162 Teignbridge Examination 720 1,078 -358 Mid Devon Regulation 18 365 567 -202 Dorset Regulation 18 1,793 3,221 -1,428 Somerset Evidence gathering

- - -

6.44 Whilst it is acknowledged that the plan-making process is ongoing for all the above authorities, which could result in an increase to the housing requirements stated in the above table and that transitional arrangements in the 2024 version of the NPPF could apply, it shows that at present, the shortfall in planned housing provision for East Devon and its neighbouring authorities, aside from Somerset, against the locally assessed need for housing, is 2,346 homes per annum. Not only does it demonstrate that no local planning authority is planning to provide a greater level of housing than the standard method indicates is necessary, which could be used to meet unmet needs from neighbouring authorities, but that a significant shortfall is currently predicted. It also demonstrates that at the present time, no neighbouring authority is planning to accommodate any of East Devon's unmet need.

6.45 The analysis demonstrates that East Devon District Council has not fulfilled their duty to cooperate, as the basis on which the duty to cooperate discussions were undertaken on, predates existing objectively assessed levels of need. As a result, the Plan is inconsistent with national planning policy (para. 26 of the NPPF). It follows that it also cannot be considered to be either positively prepared or justified.

[Table for this section is available in the attached PDF]

Unmet need from neighbouring authorities

6.38 As set out above, para. 11(b) of the 2023 version of the NPPF confirms that strategic policies should, as a minimum, provide for objectively assessed needs for housing and other uses, as well as any needs that cannot be met within neighbouring areas, unless the application of parts (b)(i) and (ii) apply. This is reiterated at para. 26. In addition, para. 61 confirms that in addition to the local housing need figure, any needs that cannot be met in neighbouring areas should also be taken into account in establishing the amount of housing to be planned for.

6.39 The neighbouring authorities to East Devon are: ? Exeter City; ? Teignbridge; ? Mid Devon; ? Dorset; and ? Somerset.

6.40 All the Local Authorities listed above, aside from Dorset and Somerset, are located within the Greater Exeter Housing Market Area.

6.41 Key Supporting Document 002, which relates to the duty to co-operate, confirms that, in East Devon's view, the Local Planning Authority can meet its housing need7 . Moreover, it is also confirmed that there are no requests for East Devon to accommodate any unmet housing needs from neighbouring authorities at the present time.

6.42 With regard to the former, Key Document 002 cites the Housing Need, Supply and Requirement Interim Topic Paper (November 2022) (Key Supporting Document 017) as evidence that East Devon can meet their housing need. However, given the age of the document (over two years old), the standard method used within the evidence base is the previous version and does not reflect the more up-to-date approach published in December 2024. Consequently, the evidence base document suggests that the local housing need figure was, at November 2022, 946 dwellings per annum, whereas, as set out above, it is now 1,146 dwellings per annum. Consequently, it is not the case, as is suggested by Key Supporting Document 002, that the emerging Local Plan has met East Devon's local housing need figure. As has been outlined above, the Local Planning Authority is reliant on the transitional arrangements provided in the 2024 version of the NPPF to justify their 7 Para. 4.3.

EAST DEVON LOCAL PLAN PUBLICATION DRAFT CONSULTATION 22 housing requirement. It does not appear, given the conclusions of Key Document 002, that any discussion has been held with neighbouring authorities as to how that shortfall could be met.

6.43 In terms of neighbouring authorities, Table 3 below provides an assessment of the current objectively assessed need for each authority against their emerging housing requirement. TABLE 3: OBJECTIVELY ASSESSED NEEDS AGAINST EMERGING HOUSING REQUIREMENTS LOCAL AUTHORITY PLAN-MAKING STAGE HOUSING REQUIREMENT (DPA) OBJECTIVELY ASSESSED NEED FOR HOUSING (DPA) SURPLUS/DEFICIT East Devon Regulation 19 950.4 1,146 -196 Exeter Regulation 19 642 804 -162 Teignbridge Examination 720 1,078 -358 Mid Devon Regulation 18 365 567 -202 Dorset Regulation 18 1,793 3,221 -1,428 Somerset Evidence gathering

- - -

6.44 Whilst it is acknowledged that the plan-making process is ongoing for all the above authorities, which could result in an increase to the housing requirements stated in the above table and that transitional arrangements in the 2024 version of the NPPF could apply, it shows that at present, the shortfall in planned housing provision for East Devon and its neighbouring authorities, aside from Somerset, against the locally assessed need for housing, is 2,346 homes per annum. Not only does it demonstrate that no local planning authority is planning to provide a greater level of housing than the standard method indicates is necessary, which could be used to meet unmet needs from neighbouring authorities, but that a significant shortfall is currently predicted. It also demonstrates that at the present time, no neighbouring authority is planning to accommodate any of East Devon's unmet need.

6.45 The analysis demonstrates that East Devon District Council has not fulfilled their duty to cooperate, as the basis on which the duty to cooperate discussions were undertaken on, predates existing objectively assessed levels of need. As a result, the Plan is inconsistent with national planning policy (para. 26 of the NPPF). It follows that it also cannot be considered to be either positively prepared or justified.

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: The following section of this representation sets out DWH response to the emerging Local Plan's housing requirement. It also establishes East Devon District Council's current housing need.

Assessment of alternative levels of housing provision 10.24 As set out in Section 6 above, three options were tested for the most appropriate housing requirement, as follows: ? Option A – 950 dwellings per annum (20,909 dwellings over the plan period); ? Option B – 1,045 dwellings per annum (22,990 dwellings over the plan period); and ? Option C – 1,188 dwellings per annum (26,136 dwellings over the plan period). 10.25 Option A represents the housing requirement contained within the emerging Local Plan, whilst Option C represents the local housing need figure at the time the Regulation 19 Plan was published. 10.26 Having undertaken an assessment of the options against the SA Objectives, the Sustainability Appraisal concludes that Option A is the preferred option. However, DWH note that there are a 35 East Devon District Council, Site Selection Report Whimple (February 2025), para. 1.6. EAST DEVON LOCAL PLAN PUBLICATION DRAFT CONSULTATION 64 number of technical deficiencies with this approach. These concerns are set out in detail in Section 6 of this representation and for brevity, are not repeated here. 10.27 A re-assessment of Options A to C, which is provided at Appendix 5 of these representations, would suggest that Option C is preferrable. 10.28 This revised analysis would suggest that by failing to plan for Option C, which is the preferred outcome, the emerging Local Plan is ineffective. To ensure that the Plan is effective and sound, there is a need for the Local Plan to incorporate a housing requirement that, as a minimum, meets local housing needs.

6.2 Summarily, DWH note that the Local Planning Authority is planning to adopt a housing requirement that is only 82.9% of the identified local housing need. It will fail to provide for one in six homes required and will not result in Objective 5 of the Plan being met. It will neither address the significant shortfall in housing from the 2016 Local Plan or housing affordability. By failing to meet identified local housing needs and planning for the same annualised requirement as established in the 2016 Local Plan, it is not consistent with the national policy objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes. No discussions with neighbouring authorities under the duty to cooperate

arrangements have been made to address the shortfall. The application of the stepped trajectory proposed within the Policy would worsen these concerns for the first 12 years of the Plan.

6.3 Consequently, DWH consider that the housing requirement established in Strategic Policy 2 is not positively prepared, justified or consistent with national planning policy. As drafted, it is therefore unsound.

6.4 To address these soundness concerns, and on the basis of a plan period covering 2020 to 2042, the housing requirement should be increased to meet the local housing need figure of 1,146 homes per annum/25,212 homes over the Plan period. There is an adequate theoretical supply of housing land to meet this higher requirement and it is a deliverable proposition. It is therefore effective. None of the Local Planning Authority's evidence suggests that it would be an unjustified strategy. Indeed, analysis provided in Appendix 5 of these representations suggests that a requirement that aligns with the local housing need figure should have been the preferred option.

6.5 Should the Local Planning Authority continue to Plan on the basis of a lower housing requirement, then there will be a need to incorporate the shortfall from the 2016 Local Plan (approximately 3,500 dwellings). EST A BLI SHING T HE LO CAL HOU SI N G NE ED - T HE AP PLI C ATI ON O F T HE ST A ND ARD MET HO D

6.6 As confirmed above and on page 5 of the consultation document, the Local Planning Authority consider that the emerging Local Plan will, due to the transitional arrangements set out in the December 2024 version of the NPPF, be examined against the requirements of the December 2023 version of the NPPF. As set out in Section 5 above, this is disputed by DWH.

6.7 In any event, para. 61 of the 2023 version of the NPPF confirms that in order to determine the minimum number of homes needed in an area, strategic policies should be informed by a local housing needs assessment, conducted using the standard method. The outcome of the standard method is the starting point for establishing a housing requirement for an area.

6.8 The 2023 version of the NPPF acknowledged that there may be exceptional circumstances that justify an alternative approach to calculating housing need. However, since the publication of the 2023 version of the NPPF, a revised standard method has been published, which regardless of the iteration of the NPPF that the Plan is being prepared to accord with, supersedes earlier versions of the standard method. EAST DEVON LOCAL PLAN PUBLICATION DRAFT CONSULTATION 18

6.9 The revised standard method employs differing inputs to earlier versions, including the existing dwelling stock within an area and an adjustment to take account of affordability. The revised approach provides "a stable and predictable baseline that

ensures that all areas, as a minimum, are contributing a share of the national total that is proportionate to the size of their current housing market2."

6.10 Given this revised position, the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) confirms that the standard method should be used to assess housing needs and that only in the following limited circumstances should an alternative approach be considered: ? where the strategic policy-making authorities boundaries do not align with the local authorities boundaries; ? the data required for the standard method is not available for the area; or ? the data sample size is too small3.

6.11 None of these circumstances are relevant to East Devon; the emerging Local Plan will cover the whole of East Devon, the data is available and the data sample size for all inputs is sufficiently large. Accordingly, as set out in the Plan, the 2024 version of the standard method should be used for calculating the objectively assessed need.

6.12 Consequently, it would, in the case of the emerging Local Plan, be inappropriate to use any other approach to calculating housing need, other than the latest version of the standard method.

6.13 As rightly confirmed at para. 3.11 of the consultation document, the objectively assessed need for housing within East Devon at the time that the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan was published was 1,188 dwellings per annum. However, since the publication of the Plan, revised affordability ratios have been published. Their application within the standard method suggests that the local housing need is now 1,146 dwellings per annum. Extrapolated over a 22 year plan period, the objectively assessed need would be 25,212 dwellings (net) over the period 2020 to 2042. THE NE ED FO R A HI G HER H OUSI N G R E QUIREME NT

6.14 As set out above, the objectively assessed need for housing within East Devon is presently 1,146 dwellings per annum. Despite this level of local housing need, the Local Planning Authority is proposing to utilise the provisions established within para. 234 of the 2024 version of the NPPF to plan to meet only 82.9% of this identified need. Notwithstanding DWH significant concerns with this approach, the implications of establishing a housing requirement that is lower than the established objectively assessed need for housing is set out below. Not addressing needs

6.15 As set out above, the Local Planning Authority has, over the 22 year plan period, established a housing requirement that seeks to address only 82.9% of local housing need. Consequently, the housing requirement will result in 4,303 homes fewer than the standard method considers is necessary. This equates to a failure to provide just over one in every six homes identified as being needed.

6.16 Whilst this is permissible if the transitional arrangements provided by the 2024 version of the NPPF apply, it is modestly over the minimum level of housing required to

enable the Plan to proceed 2 MHCLG, Planning Practice Guidance, Housing and Economic Needs Assessment, Paragraph: 005 Reference ID: 2a-005-20241212. 3 MHCLG, Planning Practice Guidance, Housing and Economic Needs Assessment, Paragraph: 014 Reference ID: 2a-014-20241212 EAST DEVON LOCAL PLAN PUBLICATION DRAFT CONSULTATION 19 through the plan-making process, without the provisions of para. 237 of the NPPF applying. As set out in Section 5 above, it is DWH view that the transitional arrangements do not apply in this case.

6.17 Moreover, even in the event that the transitional arrangements apply, it will mean that the Plan will be Examined against the 2023 version of the NPPF. There remains in that version of the NPPF, as is described in Section 3 above, a requirement to provide, as a minimum, the objectively assessed needs for housing (paras. 11(b) and 61 refer), unless the provisions of para. 11(b) (i) and (ii) apply. DWH are not aware of any evidence to suggest that the provisions of para. 11(b) (i) and (ii) apply in East Devon.

6.18 Consequently, the Plan, as currently drafted, cannot be considered to be consistent with national planning policy. Indeed, without alteration, given the shortfall between the local housing need and the housing requirement, the emerging Local Plan cannot, also, be considered to be positively prepared or justified.

6.19 In addition, DWH fails to see how such a housing requirement, which will result in such a shortfall in comparison to the objectively assessed need, will help to deliver Objective 5 of the Plan, which seeks to "meet people's needs." The operation of the transitional arrangements with a stepped trajectory

6.20 Alongside setting a housing requirement that seeks to meet only 82.9% of the identified housing need over the Plan period, Strategic Policy SP02 also seeks to employ a stepped trajectory, as follows: ? over the period 2020/21 to 2031/32 – 850 homes per annum; and ? over the period 2032/33 to 2041/42 – 1,070 homes.

6.21 For the first 12 years of the Plan, it is proposed that the housing requirement will be set at a level that is 100.4 homes per annum lower than the proposed annualised housing requirement (950.4 homes). As set out above, the annualised housing requirement itself has been set at a level that seeks to meet only 82.9% of the established housing need.

6.22 Consequently, over the period 2020 to 2032, the requirement is proposed to be just 74% of the objectively assessed need for housing. In comparison to the local housing need figure, over the period 2020 to 2032, the requirement would be just 10,200 homes, against a local housing need of 13,752 homes. It would mean that over the first 12 years of the Plan, the requirement would be 3,552 fewer homes than the objectively assessed need would suggest is required.

6.23 It is also instructive to note that neither element of the stepped trajectory will provide a housing requirement that meets the objectively assessed need for housing.

6.24 Consequently, the use of a stepped trajectory, which will widen the gap further between the local housing need and the housing requirement in the first 12 years of the Plan, further strengthens the view that the emerging Local Plan cannot be considered to be positively prepared, justified or consistent with national planning policy. Boost significantly the supply of homes

6.25 Para. 60 of the 2023 version of the NPPF confirmed that it was the Government's objective to significantly boost the supply of homes. This objective has been reconfirmed at para. 61 of the 2024 version of the NPPF.

6.26 The current East Devon Local Plan, which was adopted in 2016 and therefore before the 2023 and 2024 versions of the NPPF were published, seeks, as a minimum, to provide 17,100 homes over its 18 year plan period. This is the same housing requirement that is currently being proposed in the emerging Local Plan Review as an annualised average. As stated above, over the first 12 years of the EAST DEVON LOCAL PLAN PUBLICATION DRAFT CONSULTATION 20 Plan, the requirement is proposed to be lower than the requirement contained within the adopted Local Plan.

6.27 Given the above, in DWH view, the proposed housing requirement is not consistent with the national planning policy objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, for, at best, it seeks a continuation of the current requirement.

6.28 Moreover, DWH note that the PPG confirms that the affordability adjustment is applied in order to ensure that the standard method for assessing local housing need is consistent with the national policy objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes4. It follows that a requirement that was set lower than the local housing need figure would not be consistent with the national policy objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes. Shortfall in housing delivery against the adopted Local Plan requirement

6.29 As stated in the PPG, the affordability adjustment is applied in the standard method to take account of past under-delivery5. However, as set out above, the emerging Local Plan is seeking to meet only 82.9% of local housing need. Consequently, by not meeting the affordability uplift in full, it cannot be argued that, in the case of the emerging Local Plan, past under-delivery has been taken into account.

6.30 Table 17 of the Local Planning Authority's latest housing monitoring information confirms that the under-delivery of homes in comparison to the 2016 Local Plan trajectory was, at the end of monitoring year 2023/24, 3,555 dwellings. This is forecast to reduce to 3,477 dwellings at the end of the monitoring period that the Local Plan is envisaged to be adopted (2026/27).

6.31 It is DWH view that by not adopting a housing requirement that seeks to meet the full affordability adjustment, which itself addresses past under-delivery, the shortfall in delivery achieved over the Plan period should, as a minimum, be added to the housing requirement (approximately 3,500 dwellings).

6.32 Assuming that the emerging Local Plan's housing requirement seeks to meet the required increase to the housing stock in full, then it would only be meeting just over 64% of the affordability adjustment (354 homes per annum, out of an affordability adjustment of 550 homes per annum). Housing affordability

6.33 The PPG confirms that the affordability adjustment within the standard method is made to ensure that "the minimum annual housing need starts to address the affordability of homes6" (our emphasis).

6.34 Analysis shows that without the affordability adjustment, the requirement for East Devon would be just 596 homes per annum. However, the application of the affordability adjustment would suggest that in order to start to address the affordability of homes within East Devon, there is a need for a further 550 homes per annum, to provide an overall annual objectively assessed need for housing of 1,146 dwellings per annum.

6.35 The emerging Local Plan, however, only seeks to provide an average annual requirement of 950 homes per annum, which means that over the plan period, each year, there would be a shortfall of 196 homes than the standard method would suggest is necessary in order to start to address the 4 MHCLG, Planning Practice Guidance, Housing and Economic Needs Assessment, Paragraph: 006 Reference ID: 2a-006-20241212 5 MHCLG, Planning Practice Guidance, Housing and Economic Needs Assessment, Paragraph: 011 Reference ID: 2a-011-20241212 6 MHCLG, Planning Practice Guidance, Housing and Economic Needs Assessment, Paragraph: 006 Reference ID: 2a-006-20241212. EAST DEVON LOCAL PLAN PUBLICATION DRAFT CONSULTATION 21 affordability of homes in East Devon. Rather than seeking to address affordability, it is likely that such a shortfall will, instead, exacerbate housing unaffordability.

6.36 Consequently, as drafted, the emerging Local Plan would not provide a housing requirement that would start to address housing affordability. It is therefore inconsistent with national planning policy and cannot, as currently drafted, be considered to be a justified proposition. Implications of increasing the plan period

6.37 If, as is suggested in Section 4 above, there is a need to extend the plan period by a further monitoring year, then there would be the need to increase the housing requirement by: ? Local Planning Authority approach – 950 homes; ? Local housing need approach – 1,146 homes. Unmet need from neighbouring authorities

6.38 As set out above, para. 11(b) of the 2023 version of the NPPF confirms that strategic policies should, as a minimum, provide for objectively assessed needs for housing and other uses, as well as any needs that cannot be met within neighbouring areas, unless the application of parts (b)(i) and (ii) apply. This is reiterated at para. 26. In addition, para. 61 confirms that in addition to the local housing need figure, any needs that cannot be met in neighbouring areas should also be taken into account in establishing the amount of housing to be planned for.

6.39 The neighbouring authorities to East Devon are: ? Exeter City; ? Teignbridge; ? Mid Devon; ? Dorset; and ? Somerset.

6.40 All the Local Authorities listed above, aside from Dorset and Somerset, are located within the Greater Exeter Housing Market Area.

6.41 Key Supporting Document 002, which relates to the duty to co-operate, confirms that, in East Devon's view, the Local Planning Authority can meet its housing need7. Moreover, it is also confirmed that there are no requests for East Devon to accommodate any unmet housing needs from neighbouring authorities at the present time.

6.42 With regard to the former, Key Document 002 cites the Housing Need, Supply and Requirement Interim Topic Paper (November 2022) (Key Supporting Document 017) as evidence that East Devon can meet their housing need. However, given the age of the document (over two years old), the standard method used within the evidence base is the previous version and does not reflect the more up-to-date approach published in December 2024. Consequently, the evidence base document suggests that the local housing need figure was, at November 2022, 946 dwellings per annum, whereas, as set out above, it is now 1,146 dwellings per annum. Consequently, it is not the case, as is suggested by Key Supporting Document 002, that the emerging Local Plan has met East Devon's local housing need figure. As has been outlined above, the Local Planning Authority is reliant on the transitional arrangements provided in the 2024 version of the NPPF to justify their 7 Para. 4.3. EAST DEVON LOCAL PLAN PUBLICATION DRAFT CONSULTATION 22 housing requirement. It does not appear, given the conclusions of Key Document 002, that any discussion has been held with neighbouring authorities as to how that shortfall could be met.

6.43 In terms of neighbouring authorities, Table 3 below provides an assessment of the current objectively assessed need for each authority against their emerging housing requirement. TABLE 3: OBJECTIVELY ASSESSED NEEDS AGAINST EMERGING HOUSING REQUIREMENTS LOCAL AUTHORITY PLAN-MAKING STAGE HOUSING REQUIREMENT (DPA) OBJECTIVELY ASSESSED NEED FOR HOUSING (DPA) SURPLUS/DEFICIT East Devon Regulation 19 950.4 1,146 -196 Exeter Regulation 19 642 804 -162 Teignbridge

Examination 720 1,078 -358 Mid Devon Regulation 18 365 567 -202 Dorset Regulation 18 1,793 3,221 -1,428 Somerset Evidence gathering

- - -

6.44 Whilst it is acknowledged that the plan-making process is ongoing for all the above authorities, which could result in an increase to the housing requirements stated in the above table and that transitional arrangements in the 2024 version of the NPPF could apply, it shows that at present, the shortfall in planned housing provision for East Devon and its neighbouring authorities, aside from Somerset, against the locally assessed need for housing, is 2,346 homes per annum. Not only does it demonstrate that no local planning authority is planning to provide a greater level of housing than the standard method indicates is necessary, which could be used to meet unmet needs from neighbouring authorities, but that a significant shortfall is currently predicted. It also demonstrates that at the present time, no neighbouring authority is planning to accommodate any of East Devon's unmet need.

6.45 The analysis demonstrates that East Devon District Council has not fulfilled their duty to cooperate, as the basis on which the duty to cooperate discussions were undertaken on, predates existing objectively assessed levels of need. As a result, the Plan is inconsistent with national planning policy (para. 26 of the NPPF). It follows that it also cannot be considered to be either positively prepared or justified. Theoretical supply

6.46 Table 1 of the 2022 Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) confirms that there is a theoretical supply of housing land sufficient to accommodate 39,888 homes. This comprises the following sources of supply: EAST DEVON LOCAL PLAN PUBLICATION DRAFT CONSULTATION 23 TABLE 4: HELAA CONCLUSIONS SOURCE OF SUPPLY NO. OF DWELLINGS (APPROX.) Available, suitable and achievable 27,088 Completions 1st April 2020 to 31st March 2022 1,906 Commitments at 31st March 2022 4,389 Cranbrook DPD 4,170 Windfall allowance 2,335 Total 39,888

6.47 DWH is aware that the above analysis underplays the true potential of the theoretical supply of housing land within East Devon. For instance, they are aware that a greater number of homes are proposed in the Cranbrook Expansion Areas than is set out above and the assessment work dismisses deliverable and developable opportunities across the District, including land to the west of Lilypond Lane, Whimple.

6.48 Notwithstanding the above, even using the Local Planning Authority's own analysis, there would be a sufficient supply of housing land to meet East Devon's objectively assessed need (25,212 homes between 2020 and 2042/1,146 dwellings per annum). Deliverability

6.49 Table 17 of the 2024 Housing Monitoring Update demonstrates that rates of housing delivery greater than 1,000 dwellings per annum have previously been achieved in 2014/15, 2015/16, 2019/20 and 2021/22. Delivery is also forecast to be higher than the local housing need figure for monitoring year 2024/25 (1,192 completions). Sustainability Appraisal

6.50 The Regulation 19 Sustainability Appraisal tested three options for the housing requirement within East Devon, as follows: ? Option A – 950 dwellings per annum (20,909 dwellings over the plan period); ? Option B – 1,045 dwellings per annum (22,990 dwellings over the plan period); and ? Option C – 1,188 dwellings per annum (26,136 dwellings over the plan period).

6.51 Option A is the proposed approach in the consultation version of the Local Plan, whilst Option C reflects the local housing need figure at the time that the Regulation 19 consultation was published.

6.52 The Local Planning Authority's analysis concludes that Option A is the preferred option, as it will deliver a significant amount of new housing at a level that is consistent with the NPPF, with less adverse environmental effects. Conversely, Options B and C were rejected due to the significant adverse environmental impacts of delivering a higher level of housing. EAST DEVON LOCAL PLAN PUBLICATION DRAFT CONSULTATION 24

6.53 However, having reviewed the analysis set out in the document, DWH considers it to be significantly flawed, for the following reasons: ? it is assumed that any additional growth above Option A would be directed to a third new community, ignoring the contribution that sites like land to the west of Lilypond Lane, Whimple, can make towards meeting needs; ? despite Option A failing to provide for just over one in every six homes required, it scores the same for SA Objective 8 (homes) as Options B and C, the latter of which would result in needs being met in full; ? despite the requirement for developments to mitigate and compensate for any impacts and to provide a 10% net gain (or greater if the emerging Local Plan is adopted in its current form), the harm to biodiversity is assessed as being greater for Options B and C, than A; ? no confirmation of where the additional growth above Option A would be located is provided. Despite this, there is an assumption that the additional growth would have a greater harm to the historic and built environment. This analysis particularly ignores the requirements of para. 212 of the 2023 version of the NPPF; ? no assessment of the ability for on-site treatment, including multi-stage treatment and waste water treatment plants, such as that proposed at the new community, is provided to offset any effects on the Exe Estuary SPA or the River Axe SAC; ? the lower score for Options B and C against SA Objective 10 (access to services) is predicated on the additional growth being accommodated in a new town and that new town providing fewer services. It does not consider how the higher levels of development proposed under Options B and C could

have been dispersed to existing settlements with existing services and facilities; and ? the analysis provided for SA Objective 13 (connectivity and transport) ignores the opportunities to accommodate additional levels of growth at sustainable settlements, such as Whimple, where services, facilities and active and sustainable transport opportunities exist.

6.54 It is instructive to note that the analysis contained within the Sustainability Assessment did not conclude that there was an over-riding infrastructure or environmental capacity constraint that would prevent the full objectively assessed need being accommodated. The analysis simply expresses a preferred option, but based on what DWH consider to be a flawed assessment process.

6.55 Analysis provided at Appendix 5 of these representations suggests that a requirement that met local housing needs should have been the preferred option. SY N THESI S

6.56 DWH consider that, given the changes to the standard method in December 2024, which provide for a less volatile output (and therefore less opportunity to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist to justify an alternative approach to the standard method), it should be used for the purpose of calculating the objectively assessed housing need. At present, for East Devon, this is 1,146 homes per annum (25,212 homes over the plan period).

6.57 Even if the transitional arrangements provided by the 2024 version of the NPPF apply, there remains within the 2023 version of the NPPF a requirement for the Plan to be, amongst other things, positively prepared. This necessitates that the emerging strategy should, as a minimum, provide for the area's objectively assessed needs, and potentially unmet needs from neighbouring authorities. In order to justify a lower housing requirement, there would be a need to engage either part of para. 11(b) of the NPPF, but no evidence has been provided to suggest that either would be applicable.

6.58 Consequently, whilst permissible by national planning policy, by failing to plan for one in every six homes over the plan period, it cannot be said that the Plan is positively prepared, justified or consistent with national planning policy. It would also not result in a level of housing that, as required by Objective 5 of the Local Plan, meets needs. It is therefore, as currently drafted, unsound. EAST DEVON LOCAL PLAN PUBLICATION DRAFT CONSULTATION 25

6.59 In addition, the adoption of a stepped trajectory will also compound the problem further, with an even greater resulting disparity between identified local needs and the housing requirement for the first 12 years of the Plan. Indeed, over this period, just 74% of the established objectively assessed need for housing is proposed to be met. This further strengthens the view that the plan cannot be considered as being positively prepared, justified or consistent with national planning policy.

6.60 There is no evidence to suggest that this shortfall in housing is being met in a neighbouring Authority, including within the Greater Exeter HMA. Indeed, the analysis demonstrates that a larger shortfall against emerging requirements is predicted from neighbouring authorities.

6.61 There will be a number of significant social and economic consequences for planning for a lower level of housing than identified needs suggest is required. Such considerations do not form part of the analysis in the Sustainability Appraisal.

6.62 Moreover, and without prejudice to the position set out above, the standard method output produces a local housing need figure that, with the incorporation of the affordability adjustment, does not require under-delivery to be considered in future plans. However, by proposing a housing requirement that does not meet the local housing need figure, past under-delivery should form a consideration. To date, the shortfall against the 2016 Local Plan requirement is approximately 3,500 homes. C H AN GE S R EQUIR E D T O ADD RE SS SO U ND NE SS I SSU ES

6.63 In order to remedy the deficiencies with the proposed housing requirement, there is a need to increase the housing requirement to 1,146 dwellings per annum/25,212 homes between 2020 and 2042 (and potentially by a further 1,146 dwellings, if the plan period is extended).

6.64 There would be a number of benefits with such an approach, including: ? ensuring that the requirement would be consistent with the Government policy objective of boosting the supply of homes; ? by setting a requirement that met the local housing need figure in full (including the affordability adjustment), there would not be the need to consider past under-delivery; ? housing affordability would start to be addressed; and ? East Devon would play its part in addressing the national housing crisis, as set out in the standard method.

6.65 Monitoring information suggests that delivery rates of over 1,000 dwellings have been achieved in the past, with the forecast delivery rate for the current monitoring year anticipated to be greater than the local housing need figure (1,192 homes). To plan for the objectively assessed need for housing in full would therefore be an effective proposition.

6.66 Whilst, in DWH view the Sustainability Appraisal is flawed, it does not identify any constraints that would suggest that a strategy that adopted the local housing need figure as the housing requirement would not be a justified approach.

6.67 If the Local Planning Authority continue to promote a housing requirement that will not provide for one in every six homes required, then, as outlined in the PPG, there will be a need to include the backlog to date from the 2016 Local Plan, which is currently approximately 3,500 homes.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: The following section of this representation sets out DWH response to the emerging Local Plan's housing requirement. It also establishes East Devon District Council's current housing need.

Assessment of alternative levels of housing provision 10.24 As set out in Section 6 above, three options were tested for the most appropriate housing requirement, as follows: ? Option A – 950 dwellings per annum (20,909 dwellings over the plan period); ? Option B – 1,045 dwellings per annum (22,990 dwellings over the plan period); and ? Option C – 1,188 dwellings per annum (26,136 dwellings over the plan period). 10.25 Option A represents the housing requirement contained within the emerging Local Plan, whilst Option C represents the local housing need figure at the time the Regulation 19 Plan was published. 10.26 Having undertaken an assessment of the options against the SA Objectives, the Sustainability Appraisal concludes that Option A is the preferred option. However, DWH note that there are a 35 East Devon District Council, Site Selection Report Whimple (February 2025), para. 1.6. EAST DEVON LOCAL PLAN PUBLICATION DRAFT CONSULTATION 64 number of technical deficiencies with this approach. These concerns are set out in detail in Section 6 of this representation and for brevity, are not repeated here. 10.27 A re-assessment of Options A to C, which is provided at Appendix 5 of these representations, would suggest that Option C is preferrable. 10.28 This revised analysis would suggest that by failing to plan for Option C, which is the preferred outcome, the emerging Local Plan is ineffective. To ensure that the Plan is effective and sound, there is a need for the Local Plan to incorporate a housing requirement that, as a minimum, meets local housing needs.

6.2 Summarily, DWH note that the Local Planning Authority is planning to adopt a housing requirement that is only 82.9% of the identified local housing need. It will fail to provide for one in six homes required and will not result in Objective 5 of the Plan being met. It will neither address the significant shortfall in housing from the 2016 Local Plan or housing affordability. By failing to meet identified local housing needs and planning for the same annualised requirement as established in the 2016 Local Plan, it is not consistent with the national policy objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes. No discussions with neighbouring authorities under the duty to cooperate arrangements have been made to address the shortfall. The application of the stepped trajectory proposed within the Policy would worsen these concerns for the first 12 years of the Plan.

6.3 Consequently, DWH consider that the housing requirement established in Strategic Policy 2 is not positively prepared, justified or consistent with national planning policy. As drafted, it is therefore unsound.

6.4 To address these soundness concerns, and on the basis of a plan period covering 2020 to 2042, the housing requirement should be increased to meet the local housing need figure of 1,146 homes per annum/25,212 homes over the Plan period. There is an adequate theoretical supply of housing land to meet this higher requirement and it is a deliverable proposition. It is therefore effective. None of the Local Planning Authority's evidence suggests that it would be an unjustified strategy. Indeed, analysis provided in Appendix 5 of these representations suggests that a requirement that aligns with the local housing need figure should have been the preferred option.

6.5 Should the Local Planning Authority continue to Plan on the basis of a lower housing requirement, then there will be a need to incorporate the shortfall from the 2016 Local Plan (approximately 3,500 dwellings). EST A BLI SHING T HE LO CAL HOU SI N G NE ED - T HE AP PLI C ATI ON O F T HE ST A ND ARD MET HO D

6.6 As confirmed above and on page 5 of the consultation document, the Local Planning Authority consider that the emerging Local Plan will, due to the transitional arrangements set out in the December 2024 version of the NPPF, be examined against the requirements of the December 2023 version of the NPPF. As set out in Section 5 above, this is disputed by DWH.

6.7 In any event, para. 61 of the 2023 version of the NPPF confirms that in order to determine the minimum number of homes needed in an area, strategic policies should be informed by a local housing needs assessment, conducted using the standard method. The outcome of the standard method is the starting point for establishing a housing requirement for an area.

6.8 The 2023 version of the NPPF acknowledged that there may be exceptional circumstances that justify an alternative approach to calculating housing need. However, since the publication of the 2023 version of the NPPF, a revised standard method has been published, which regardless of the iteration of the NPPF that the Plan is being prepared to accord with, supersedes earlier versions of the standard method. EAST DEVON LOCAL PLAN PUBLICATION DRAFT CONSULTATION 18

6.9 The revised standard method employs differing inputs to earlier versions, including the existing dwelling stock within an area and an adjustment to take account of affordability. The revised approach provides "a stable and predictable baseline that ensures that all areas, as a minimum, are contributing a share of the national total that is proportionate to the size of their current housing market2."

6.10 Given this revised position, the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) confirms that the standard method should be used to assess housing needs and that only in the following limited circumstances should an alternative approach be considered: ? where the strategic policy-making authorities boundaries do not align with the local authorities boundaries; ? the data required for the standard method is not available for the area; or ? the data sample size is too small3.

6.11 None of these circumstances are relevant to East Devon; the emerging Local Plan will cover the whole of East Devon, the data is available and the data sample size for all inputs is sufficiently large. Accordingly, as set out in the Plan, the 2024 version of the standard method should be used for calculating the objectively assessed need.

6.12 Consequently, it would, in the case of the emerging Local Plan, be inappropriate to use any other approach to calculating housing need, other than the latest version of the standard method.

6.13 As rightly confirmed at para. 3.11 of the consultation document, the objectively assessed need for housing within East Devon at the time that the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan was published was 1,188 dwellings per annum. However, since the publication of the Plan, revised affordability ratios have been published. Their application within the standard method suggests that the local housing need is now 1,146 dwellings per annum. Extrapolated over a 22 year plan period, the objectively assessed need would be 25,212 dwellings (net) over the period 2020 to 2042. THE NE ED FO R A HI G HER H OUSI N G R E QUIREME NT

6.14 As set out above, the objectively assessed need for housing within East Devon is presently 1,146 dwellings per annum. Despite this level of local housing need, the Local Planning Authority is proposing to utilise the provisions established within para. 234 of the 2024 version of the NPPF to plan to meet only 82.9% of this identified need. Notwithstanding DWH significant concerns with this approach, the implications of establishing a housing requirement that is lower than the established objectively assessed need for housing is set out below. Not addressing needs

6.15 As set out above, the Local Planning Authority has, over the 22 year plan period, established a housing requirement that seeks to address only 82.9% of local housing need. Consequently, the housing requirement will result in 4,303 homes fewer than the standard method considers is necessary. This equates to a failure to provide just over one in every six homes identified as being needed.

6.16 Whilst this is permissible if the transitional arrangements provided by the 2024 version of the NPPF apply, it is modestly over the minimum level of housing required to enable the Plan to proceed 2 MHCLG, Planning Practice Guidance, Housing and Economic Needs Assessment, Paragraph: 005 Reference ID: 2a-005-20241212. 3 MHCLG, Planning Practice Guidance, Housing and Economic Needs Assessment,

Paragraph: 014 Reference ID: 2a-014-20241212 EAST DEVON LOCAL PLAN PUBLICATION DRAFT CONSULTATION 19 through the plan-making process, without the provisions of para. 237 of the NPPF applying. As set out in Section 5 above, it is DWH view that the transitional arrangements do not apply in this case.

6.17 Moreover, even in the event that the transitional arrangements apply, it will mean that the Plan will be Examined against the 2023 version of the NPPF. There remains in that version of the NPPF, as is described in Section 3 above, a requirement to provide, as a minimum, the objectively assessed needs for housing (paras. 11(b) and 61 refer), unless the provisions of para. 11(b) (i) and (ii) apply. DWH are not aware of any evidence to suggest that the provisions of para. 11(b) (i) and (ii) apply in East Devon.

6.18 Consequently, the Plan, as currently drafted, cannot be considered to be consistent with national planning policy. Indeed, without alteration, given the shortfall between the local housing need and the housing requirement, the emerging Local Plan cannot, also, be considered to be positively prepared or justified.

6.19 In addition, DWH fails to see how such a housing requirement, which will result in such a shortfall in comparison to the objectively assessed need, will help to deliver Objective 5 of the Plan, which seeks to "meet people's needs." The operation of the transitional arrangements with a stepped trajectory

6.20 Alongside setting a housing requirement that seeks to meet only 82.9% of the identified housing need over the Plan period, Strategic Policy SP02 also seeks to employ a stepped trajectory, as follows: ? over the period 2020/21 to 2031/32 – 850 homes per annum; and ? over the period 2032/33 to 2041/42 – 1,070 homes.

6.21 For the first 12 years of the Plan, it is proposed that the housing requirement will be set at a level that is 100.4 homes per annum lower than the proposed annualised housing requirement (950.4 homes). As set out above, the annualised housing requirement itself has been set at a level that seeks to meet only 82.9% of the established housing need.

6.22 Consequently, over the period 2020 to 2032, the requirement is proposed to be just 74% of the objectively assessed need for housing. In comparison to the local housing need figure, over the period 2020 to 2032, the requirement would be just 10,200 homes, against a local housing need of 13,752 homes. It would mean that over the first 12 years of the Plan, the requirement would be 3,552 fewer homes than the objectively assessed need would suggest is required.

6.23 It is also instructive to note that neither element of the stepped trajectory will provide a housing requirement that meets the objectively assessed need for housing.

6.24 Consequently, the use of a stepped trajectory, which will widen the gap further between the local housing need and the housing requirement in the first 12 years of the

Plan, further strengthens the view that the emerging Local Plan cannot be considered to be positively prepared, justified or consistent with national planning policy. Boost significantly the supply of homes

6.25 Para. 60 of the 2023 version of the NPPF confirmed that it was the Government's objective to significantly boost the supply of homes. This objective has been reconfirmed at para. 61 of the 2024 version of the NPPF.

6.26 The current East Devon Local Plan, which was adopted in 2016 and therefore before the 2023 and 2024 versions of the NPPF were published, seeks, as a minimum, to provide 17,100 homes over its 18 year plan period. This is the same housing requirement that is currently being proposed in the emerging Local Plan Review as an annualised average. As stated above, over the first 12 years of the EAST DEVON LOCAL PLAN PUBLICATION DRAFT CONSULTATION 20 Plan, the requirement is proposed to be lower than the requirement contained within the adopted Local Plan.

6.27 Given the above, in DWH view, the proposed housing requirement is not consistent with the national planning policy objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, for, at best, it seeks a continuation of the current requirement.

6.28 Moreover, DWH note that the PPG confirms that the affordability adjustment is applied in order to ensure that the standard method for assessing local housing need is consistent with the national policy objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes4. It follows that a requirement that was set lower than the local housing need figure would not be consistent with the national policy objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes. Shortfall in housing delivery against the adopted Local Plan requirement

6.29 As stated in the PPG, the affordability adjustment is applied in the standard method to take account of past under-delivery5. However, as set out above, the emerging Local Plan is seeking to meet only 82.9% of local housing need. Consequently, by not meeting the affordability uplift in full, it cannot be argued that, in the case of the emerging Local Plan, past under-delivery has been taken into account.

6.30 Table 17 of the Local Planning Authority's latest housing monitoring information confirms that the under-delivery of homes in comparison to the 2016 Local Plan trajectory was, at the end of monitoring year 2023/24, 3,555 dwellings. This is forecast to reduce to 3,477 dwellings at the end of the monitoring period that the Local Plan is envisaged to be adopted (2026/27).

6.31 It is DWH view that by not adopting a housing requirement that seeks to meet the full affordability adjustment, which itself addresses past under-delivery, the shortfall in delivery achieved over the Plan period should, as a minimum, be added to the housing requirement (approximately 3,500 dwellings).

6.32 Assuming that the emerging Local Plan's housing requirement seeks to meet the required increase to the housing stock in full, then it would only be meeting just over 64% of the affordability adjustment (354 homes per annum, out of an affordability adjustment of 550 homes per annum). Housing affordability

6.33 The PPG confirms that the affordability adjustment within the standard method is made to ensure that "the minimum annual housing need starts to address the affordability of homes6" (our emphasis).

6.34 Analysis shows that without the affordability adjustment, the requirement for East Devon would be just 596 homes per annum. However, the application of the affordability adjustment would suggest that in order to start to address the affordability of homes within East Devon, there is a need for a further 550 homes per annum, to provide an overall annual objectively assessed need for housing of 1,146 dwellings per annum.

6.35 The emerging Local Plan, however, only seeks to provide an average annual requirement of 950 homes per annum, which means that over the plan period, each year, there would be a shortfall of 196 homes than the standard method would suggest is necessary in order to start to address the 4 MHCLG, Planning Practice Guidance, Housing and Economic Needs Assessment, Paragraph: 006 Reference ID: 2a-006-20241212 5 MHCLG, Planning Practice Guidance, Housing and Economic Needs Assessment, Paragraph: 011 Reference ID: 2a-011-20241212 6 MHCLG, Planning Practice Guidance, Housing and Economic Needs Assessment, Paragraph: 006 Reference ID: 2a-006-20241212. EAST DEVON LOCAL PLAN PUBLICATION DRAFT CONSULTATION 21 affordability of homes in East Devon. Rather than seeking to address affordability, it is likely that such a shortfall will, instead, exacerbate housing unaffordability.

6.36 Consequently, as drafted, the emerging Local Plan would not provide a housing requirement that would start to address housing affordability. It is therefore inconsistent with national planning policy and cannot, as currently drafted, be considered to be a justified proposition. Implications of increasing the plan period

6.37 If, as is suggested in Section 4 above, there is a need to extend the plan period by a further monitoring year, then there would be the need to increase the housing requirement by: ? Local Planning Authority approach – 950 homes; ? Local housing need approach – 1,146 homes. Unmet need from neighbouring authorities

6.38 As set out above, para. 11(b) of the 2023 version of the NPPF confirms that strategic policies should, as a minimum, provide for objectively assessed needs for housing and other uses, as well as any needs that cannot be met within neighbouring areas, unless the application of parts (b)(i) and (ii) apply. This is reiterated at para. 26. In addition, para. 61 confirms that in addition to the local housing need figure, any needs

that cannot be met in neighbouring areas should also be taken into account in establishing the amount of housing to be planned for.

6.39 The neighbouring authorities to East Devon are: ? Exeter City; ? Teignbridge; ? Mid Devon; ? Dorset; and ? Somerset.

6.40 All the Local Authorities listed above, aside from Dorset and Somerset, are located within the Greater Exeter Housing Market Area.

6.41 Key Supporting Document 002, which relates to the duty to co-operate, confirms that, in East Devon's view, the Local Planning Authority can meet its housing need7. Moreover, it is also confirmed that there are no requests for East Devon to accommodate any unmet housing needs from neighbouring authorities at the present time.

6.42 With regard to the former, Key Document 002 cites the Housing Need, Supply and Requirement Interim Topic Paper (November 2022) (Key Supporting Document 017) as evidence that East Devon can meet their housing need. However, given the age of the document (over two years old), the standard method used within the evidence base is the previous version and does not reflect the more up-to-date approach published in December 2024. Consequently, the evidence base document suggests that the local housing need figure was, at November 2022, 946 dwellings per annum, whereas, as set out above, it is now 1,146 dwellings per annum. Consequently, it is not the case, as is suggested by Key Supporting Document 002, that the emerging Local Plan has met East Devon's local housing need figure. As has been outlined above, the Local Planning Authority is reliant on the transitional arrangements provided in the 2024 version of the NPPF to justify their 7 Para. 4.3. EAST DEVON LOCAL PLAN PUBLICATION DRAFT CONSULTATION 22 housing requirement. It does not appear, given the conclusions of Key Document 002, that any discussion has been held with neighbouring authorities as to how that shortfall could be met.

6.43 In terms of neighbouring authorities, Table 3 below provides an assessment of the current objectively assessed need for each authority against their emerging housing requirement. TABLE 3: OBJECTIVELY ASSESSED NEEDS AGAINST EMERGING HOUSING REQUIREMENTS LOCAL AUTHORITY PLAN-MAKING STAGE HOUSING REQUIREMENT (DPA) OBJECTIVELY ASSESSED NEED FOR HOUSING (DPA) SURPLUS/DEFICIT East Devon Regulation 19 950.4 1,146 -196 Exeter Regulation 19 642 804 -162 Teignbridge Examination 720 1,078 -358 Mid Devon Regulation 18 365 567 -202 Dorset Regulation 18 1,793 3,221 -1,428 Somerset Evidence gathering

- - -

6.44 Whilst it is acknowledged that the plan-making process is ongoing for all the above authorities, which could result in an increase to the housing requirements stated in the

above table and that transitional arrangements in the 2024 version of the NPPF could apply, it shows that at present, the shortfall in planned housing provision for East Devon and its neighbouring authorities, aside from Somerset, against the locally assessed need for housing, is 2,346 homes per annum. Not only does it demonstrate that no local planning authority is planning to provide a greater level of housing than the standard method indicates is necessary, which could be used to meet unmet needs from neighbouring authorities, but that a significant shortfall is currently predicted. It also demonstrates that at the present time, no neighbouring authority is planning to accommodate any of East Devon's unmet need.

6.45 The analysis demonstrates that East Devon District Council has not fulfilled their duty to cooperate, as the basis on which the duty to cooperate discussions were undertaken on, predates existing objectively assessed levels of need. As a result, the Plan is inconsistent with national planning policy (para. 26 of the NPPF). It follows that it also cannot be considered to be either positively prepared or justified. Theoretical supply

6.46 Table 1 of the 2022 Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) confirms that there is a theoretical supply of housing land sufficient to accommodate 39,888 homes. This comprises the following sources of supply: EAST DEVON LOCAL PLAN PUBLICATION DRAFT CONSULTATION 23 TABLE 4: HELAA CONCLUSIONS SOURCE OF SUPPLY NO. OF DWELLINGS (APPROX.) Available, suitable and achievable 27,088 Completions 1st April 2020 to 31st March 2022 1,906 Commitments at 31st March 2022 4,389 Cranbrook DPD 4,170 Windfall allowance 2,335 Total 39,888

6.47 DWH is aware that the above analysis underplays the true potential of the theoretical supply of housing land within East Devon. For instance, they are aware that a greater number of homes are proposed in the Cranbrook Expansion Areas than is set out above and the assessment work dismisses deliverable and developable opportunities across the District, including land to the west of Lilypond Lane, Whimple.

6.48 Notwithstanding the above, even using the Local Planning Authority's own analysis, there would be a sufficient supply of housing land to meet East Devon's objectively assessed need (25,212 homes between 2020 and 2042/1,146 dwellings per annum). Deliverability

6.49 Table 17 of the 2024 Housing Monitoring Update demonstrates that rates of housing delivery greater than 1,000 dwellings per annum have previously been achieved in 2014/15, 2015/16, 2019/20 and 2021/22. Delivery is also forecast to be higher than the local housing need figure for monitoring year 2024/25 (1,192 completions). Sustainability Appraisal

6.50 The Regulation 19 Sustainability Appraisal tested three options for the housing requirement within East Devon, as follows: ? Option A – 950 dwellings per annum

(20,909 dwellings over the plan period); ? Option B – 1,045 dwellings per annum (22,990 dwellings over the plan period); and ? Option C – 1,188 dwellings per annum (26,136 dwellings over the plan period).

6.51 Option A is the proposed approach in the consultation version of the Local Plan, whilst Option C reflects the local housing need figure at the time that the Regulation 19 consultation was published.

6.52 The Local Planning Authority's analysis concludes that Option A is the preferred option, as it will deliver a significant amount of new housing at a level that is consistent with the NPPF, with less adverse environmental effects. Conversely, Options B and C were rejected due to the significant adverse environmental impacts of delivering a higher level of housing. EAST DEVON LOCAL PLAN PUBLICATION DRAFT CONSULTATION 24

6.53 However, having reviewed the analysis set out in the document, DWH considers it to be significantly flawed, for the following reasons: ? it is assumed that any additional growth above Option A would be directed to a third new community, ignoring the contribution that sites like land to the west of Lilypond Lane, Whimple, can make towards meeting needs; ? despite Option A failing to provide for just over one in every six homes required, it scores the same for SA Objective 8 (homes) as Options B and C, the latter of which would result in needs being met in full; ? despite the requirement for developments to mitigate and compensate for any impacts and to provide a 10% net gain (or greater if the emerging Local Plan is adopted in its current form), the harm to biodiversity is assessed as being greater for Options B and C, than A; ? no confirmation of where the additional growth above Option A would be located is provided. Despite this, there is an assumption that the additional growth would have a greater harm to the historic and built environment. This analysis particularly ignores the requirements of para. 212 of the 2023 version of the NPPF; ? no assessment of the ability for on-site treatment, including multi-stage treatment and waste water treatment plants, such as that proposed at the new community, is provided to offset any effects on the Exe Estuary SPA or the River Axe SAC; ? the lower score for Options B and C against SA Objective 10 (access to services) is predicated on the additional growth being accommodated in a new town and that new town providing fewer services. It does not consider how the higher levels of development proposed under Options B and C could have been dispersed to existing settlements with existing services and facilities; and ? the analysis provided for SA Objective 13 (connectivity and transport) ignores the opportunities to accommodate additional levels of growth at sustainable settlements, such as Whimple, where services, facilities and active and sustainable transport opportunities exist.

6.54 It is instructive to note that the analysis contained within the Sustainability Assessment did not conclude that there was an over-riding infrastructure or

environmental capacity constraint that would prevent the full objectively assessed need being accommodated. The analysis simply expresses a preferred option, but based on what DWH consider to be a flawed assessment process.

6.55 Analysis provided at Appendix 5 of these representations suggests that a requirement that met local housing needs should have been the preferred option. SY N THESI S

6.56 DWH consider that, given the changes to the standard method in December 2024, which provide for a less volatile output (and therefore less opportunity to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist to justify an alternative approach to the standard method), it should be used for the purpose of calculating the objectively assessed housing need. At present, for East Devon, this is 1,146 homes per annum (25,212 homes over the plan period).

6.57 Even if the transitional arrangements provided by the 2024 version of the NPPF apply, there remains within the 2023 version of the NPPF a requirement for the Plan to be, amongst other things, positively prepared. This necessitates that the emerging strategy should, as a minimum, provide for the area's objectively assessed needs, and potentially unmet needs from neighbouring authorities. In order to justify a lower housing requirement, there would be a need to engage either part of para. 11(b) of the NPPF, but no evidence has been provided to suggest that either would be applicable.

6.58 Consequently, whilst permissible by national planning policy, by failing to plan for one in every six homes over the plan period, it cannot be said that the Plan is positively prepared, justified or consistent with national planning policy. It would also not result in a level of housing that, as required by Objective 5 of the Local Plan, meets needs. It is therefore, as currently drafted, unsound. EAST DEVON LOCAL PLAN PUBLICATION DRAFT CONSULTATION 25

6.59 In addition, the adoption of a stepped trajectory will also compound the problem further, with an even greater resulting disparity between identified local needs and the housing requirement for the first 12 years of the Plan. Indeed, over this period, just 74% of the established objectively assessed need for housing is proposed to be met. This further strengthens the view that the plan cannot be considered as being positively prepared, justified or consistent with national planning policy.

6.60 There is no evidence to suggest that this shortfall in housing is being met in a neighbouring Authority, including within the Greater Exeter HMA. Indeed, the analysis demonstrates that a larger shortfall against emerging requirements is predicted from neighbouring authorities.

6.61 There will be a number of significant social and economic consequences for planning for a lower level of housing than identified needs suggest is required. Such considerations do not form part of the analysis in the Sustainability Appraisal.

6.62 Moreover, and without prejudice to the position set out above, the standard method output produces a local housing need figure that, with the incorporation of the affordability adjustment, does not require under-delivery to be considered in future plans. However, by proposing a housing requirement that does not meet the local housing need figure, past under-delivery should form a consideration. To date, the shortfall against the 2016 Local Plan requirement is approximately 3,500 homes. C H AN GE S R EQUIR E D T O ADD RE SS SO U ND NE SS I SSU ES

6.63 In order to remedy the deficiencies with the proposed housing requirement, there is a need to increase the housing requirement to 1,146 dwellings per annum/25,212 homes between 2020 and 2042 (and potentially by a further 1,146 dwellings, if the plan period is extended).

6.64 There would be a number of benefits with such an approach, including: ? ensuring that the requirement would be consistent with the Government policy objective of boosting the supply of homes; ? by setting a requirement that met the local housing need figure in full (including the affordability adjustment), there would not be the need to consider past under-delivery; ? housing affordability would start to be addressed; and ? East Devon would play its part in addressing the national housing crisis, as set out in the standard method.

6.65 Monitoring information suggests that delivery rates of over 1,000 dwellings have been achieved in the past, with the forecast delivery rate for the current monitoring year anticipated to be greater than the local housing need figure (1,192 homes). To plan for the objectively assessed need for housing in full would therefore be an effective proposition.

6.66 Whilst, in DWH view the Sustainability Appraisal is flawed, it does not identify any constraints that would suggest that a strategy that adopted the local housing need figure as the housing requirement would not be a justified approach.

6.67 If the Local Planning Authority continue to promote a housing requirement that will not provide for one in every six homes required, then, as outlined in the PPG, there will be a need to include the backlog to date from the 2016 Local Plan, which is currently approximately 3,500 homes.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: No

4(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.:

6.38 As set out above, para. 11(b) of the 2023 version of the NPPF confirms that strategic policies should, as a minimum, provide for objectively assessed needs for housing and other uses, as well as any needs that cannot be met within neighbouring areas, unless the application of parts (b)(i) and (ii) apply. This is reiterated at para. 26. In addition, para. 61 confirms that in addition to the local housing need figure, any needs that cannot be met in neighbouring areas should also be taken into account in establishing the amount of housing to be planned for.

6.39 The neighbouring authorities to East Devon are: ? Exeter City; ? Teignbridge; ? Mid Devon; ? Dorset; and ? Somerset.

6.40 All the Local Authorities listed above, aside from Dorset and Somerset, are located within the Greater Exeter Housing Market Area.

6.41 Key Supporting Document 002, which relates to the duty to co-operate, confirms that, in East Devon's view, the Local Planning Authority can meet its housing need7. Moreover, it is also confirmed that there are no requests for East Devon to accommodate any unmet housing needs from neighbouring authorities at the present time.

6.42 With regard to the former, Key Document 002 cites the Housing Need, Supply and Requirement Interim Topic Paper (November 2022) (Key Supporting Document 017) as evidence that East Devon can meet their housing need. However, given the age of the document (over two years old), the standard method used within the evidence base is the previous version and does not reflect the more up-to-date approach published in December 2024. Consequently, the evidence base document suggests that the local housing need figure was, at November 2022, 946 dwellings per annum, whereas, as set out above, it is now 1,146 dwellings per annum. Consequently, it is not the case, as is suggested by Key Supporting Document 002, that the emerging Local Plan has met East Devon's local housing need figure. As has been outlined above, the Local Planning Authority is reliant on the transitional arrangements provided in the 2024 version of the NPPF to justify their 7 Para. 4.3. EAST DEVON LOCAL PLAN PUBLICATION DRAFT CONSULTATION 22 housing requirement. It does not appear, given the conclusions of Key Document 002, that any discussion has been held with neighbouring authorities as to how that shortfall could be met.

6.43 In terms of neighbouring authorities, Table 3 below provides an assessment of the current objectively assessed need for each authority against their emerging housing requirement. TABLE 3: OBJECTIVELY ASSESSED NEEDS AGAINST EMERGING HOUSING REQUIREMENTS LOCAL AUTHORITY PLAN-MAKING STAGE HOUSING REQUIREMENT

(DPA) OBJECTIVELY ASSESSED NEED FOR HOUSING (DPA) SURPLUS/DEFICIT East Devon Regulation 19 950.4 1,146 -196 Exeter Regulation 19 642 804 -162 Teignbridge Examination 720 1,078 -358 Mid Devon Regulation 18 365 567 -202 Dorset Regulation 18 1,793 3,221 -1,428 Somerset Evidence gathering

- - -

6.44 Whilst it is acknowledged that the plan-making process is ongoing for all the above authorities, which could result in an increase to the housing requirements stated in the above table and that transitional arrangements in the 2024 version of the NPPF could apply, it shows that at present, the shortfall in planned housing provision for East Devon and its neighbouring authorities, aside from Somerset, against the locally assessed need for housing, is 2,346 homes per annum. Not only does it demonstrate that no local planning authority is planning to provide a greater level of housing than the standard method indicates is necessary, which could be used to meet unmet needs from neighbouring authorities, but that a significant shortfall is currently predicted. It also demonstrates that at the present time, no neighbouring authority is planning to accommodate any of East Devon's unmet need.

6.45 The analysis demonstrates that East Devon District Council has not fulfilled their duty to cooperate, as the basis on which the duty to cooperate discussions were undertaken on, predates existing objectively assessed levels of need. As a result, the Plan is inconsistent with national planning policy(para. 26 of the NPPF). It follows that it also cannot be considered to be either positively prepared or justified.

10.31 The Duty to Cooperate Statement sets out that, in East Devon's view, the Local Planning Authority can meet its housing need36. It also confirms that no requirements have been made by neighbouring local planning authorities for East Devon to meet any of their requirements at the present time. 10.32 However, with regard to East Devon's housing need, Document KSD-002 cites Key Document 017 as evidence that East Devon's housing need can be met. However, KSD-002 was published in November 2022. Given the age of the document, the methodology employed for calculating housing need has altered, as has the local housing need figure, which has materially changed from 946 dwellings per annum, to 1,146 homes per annum (an increase of over 20%). 10.33 As is demonstrated in Sections 6 and 8 of this representation, rather than planning to meet their local housing need figure, a significant shortfall will result. No discussion has been undertaken with any neighbouring authority to determine whether this shortfall can be met elsewhere. 10.34 As set out above, Document KSD-002 also confirms that no requests have been made by neighbouring authorities for East Devon to accommodate any of their unmet need. However, we are aware that, as resolved by the Strategic Planning Committee on 4th February 2025, that East Devon District

Council objected to Chapter 7 of the emerging Exeter City Local Plan, on the basis that: ? the emerging Local Plan will not meet the employment needs of the City; ? the lack of provision will undermine the economic growth potential of the city and the wider area; and ? the failure to make sufficient provision will increase the pressure on neighbouring authorities to meet needs. 10.35 Additionally, it was highlighted that: 36 Para. 4.3 EAST DEVON LOCAL PLAN PUBLICATION DRAFT CONSULTATION 65 “The City Council’s approach appears to rely on employment land provision outside of the city boundary but within the wider Functional Economic Market Area in order to meet the economic needs of the area. However, no request has been made under the duty to co-operate for East Devon District Council to assist in meeting the employment land needs identified by the EDNA. The land identified in the emerging East Devon Local Plan 2020 – 2042 is considered to be necessary to meet the needs of East Devon and does not seek to address wider needs.” 10.36 Whilst it could be argued that the concerns are more of an issue associated with the emerging Exeter City Plan, it does demonstrate the failure to meet the requirements of the Duty to Cooperate. If ongoing and meaningful engagement had been undertaken across the Housing Market Area over the course of the preparation of both emerging Plans, matters like those being objected to by East Devon District Council would have been resolved beforehand. Additionally, there would have been a wider and more meaningful discussion about unmet housing needs across neighbouring authorities when compared to more up-to-date assessments of local housing need (see Table 3 above).

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : Due to the significant policy issues concerned.

Full name: Owen Jones

Organisation (where relevant): LRM Planning

Other party name (if relevant): David Wilson Homes

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: Yes

2(a). If yes, and you wish to support the legal compliance of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: As they relate to housing supply. We have indicated that the Plan is not legally compliant in relation to housing need.

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Throughout this representation, DWH has raised a number of concerns with the evidence base underpinning the emerging Local Plan. Their principal concerns relate to: ? the HELAA; ? the process adopted by the Strategic Planning Committee when selecting sites in Autumn 2024; ? the Sustainability Appraisal; ? the Duty to Cooperate paper; and ? the Role and Function of Settlements Background Paper. 10.2 These concerns are outlined below. 10.3 If unresolved, they could result in a Plan that is not positively prepared, is unjustified and inconsistent with national planning policy and is therefore unsound. HELAA – DOCUMENT HOU-003 10.4 Land to the west of Lilypond Lane was assessed in the HELAA at Site Whim_12. 10.5 The assessment identified the following benefits associated with the development of the site: ? it avoids the majority of major biodiversity designations; ? other than the site being located in the 10km buffer zone to the Pebblebed Heaths, no other biodiversity constraints to development were identified; ? no landscape constraints to the development of the site were identified; ? no overhead power lines cross the site and neither do high-pressure gas mains; ? Whimple Primary School is capable of supporting further development; ? it is outside the Airport Vector; and ? it is located in close proximity to a range of local facilities and public transport opportunities, including a railway station. 10.6 DWH agrees with these conclusions. They also draw attention to the other benefits associated with the

development of the site, which are outlined in Section 2 of these representations. 10.7 Notwithstanding the above, they strongly disagree with Devon County Council's Highway comments made in respect of the site, which resulted in the site being incorrectly considered as 'probably unachievable.' 10.8 The County Council raised concerns that access off Grove Road and Lilypond Lane was challenging and it was not readily apparent about how it could be achieved. This incorrect conclusion was taken forward by the Panel, who also raised concerns about the need to improve the road network and bridge over the railway. Consequently, despite being considered as being suitable and available, the overall conclusion for the site was that it was probably unachievable. 10.9 Even without having regard to the evidence presented by the Local Planning Authority and DWH, it would seem to be unjustifiable to rule out the site at such an early stage, when the use of the word 'probably' suggests that there was some doubt as to whether the constraints could be overcome, or not.

EAST DEVON LOCAL PLAN PUBLICATION DRAFT CONSULTATION 62 10.10 Moreover, work undertaken on behalf of DWH has demonstrated that these conclusions are incorrect and are an unjustified conclusion. DWH's technical work (see Appendix 2) confirms that having regard to existing vehicular flows, likely two-way vehicle movements resulting from the proposed development and the site's accessibility to a strategic sustainable transport connection, Lilypond Lane could easily accommodate the traffic generated from the proposals and therefore provides a sensible location for a vehicular access. Moreover, improvements could be made to enhance the route and reinforce pedestrian safety and improve vehicular passing, particularly at the railway bridge. The work also notes that there is a growing shift in transport policy to a vehicle capacity last approach, with a preference given to locations that can maximise sustainable travel and local living. Whilst any increase in movements on Lilypond Lane and other local routes could increase the likelihood of driver inconvenience, there are no contemporary policies that support driver convenience. Indeed, a modest increase in driver inconvenience could create a positive 'nudge' towards shifts to active and sustainable travel modes. 10.11 Consequently, they conclude that: "...there are no technical highways reasons not to support the development, and the residual traffic impacts can largely be offset by wider changes in mobility patterns in the village, which can be accelerated with investment offered by the development." 10.12 Given the above, the conclusion that land to the west of Lilypond Lane is probably unachievable for housing is incorrect. This should be amended in future versions of the HELAA, which in turn should be fed into other evidence base work underpinning the emerging Local Plan (i.e. the Sustainability Appraisal). 10.13 This will be particularly important in the context set out in Sections 6 and 8 of these representations, where the Local Planning Authority will need to find additional housing land. 10.14 The opportunity presented could help focus a greater proportion of development at a settlement, which, having

regard to its services and facilities, could accommodate a greater proportion of the District's needs. Moreover, it would also result in a greater focus of development along the West of England Mainline strategic transport corridor, which provides sustainable transport connections to and from Whimple to a range of services, facilities and employment opportunities to both the east and west. It would help to maximise opportunities to encourage use of the railway line at Whimple. 10.15 These are points which have been made to the Local Planning Authority during both Regulation 18 consultations, as well as separately in writing to Officers and Members of the Strategic Planning Committee in Autumn 2024. Despite this compelling evidence, the Local Planning Authority have chosen not to reconsider the deliverability and developability of the site through their now dated HELAA. 10.16 The treatment of the site through the HELAA process is even more unjustified, when noting that site Whim_04 was considered as being a potential site to accommodate housing, despite it likely requiring pedestrian, cycle and vehicular access onto Lilypond Lane. The treatment site Whim_12 by the Local Planning Authority is therefore clearly unequitable. THE PROCESS ADOPTED BY THE STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE WHEN SELECTING SITES IN AUTUMN 2024 10.17 Based upon the HELAA conclusion that the site was 'probably undeliverable' and therefore the Local Planning Authority considered that it was far from certain that the site was undeliverable, site

EAST DEVON LOCAL PLAN PUBLICATION DRAFT CONSULTATION 63 WHIM_12 was not included within the potential options for accommodating residential development within Whimple35 . 10.18 However, as set out above, in the period between the publication of the HELAA and the publication of the Site Selection Report for Whimple, highways and access technical work, the latest of which is provided at Appendix 2, was prepared on behalf of DWH. This work was provided to the Local Planning Authority as part of DWH response to the last Regulation 18 consultation. 10.19 Despite this work highlighting the obvious technical flaws in the HELAA regarding the treatment of site WHIM_12, the conclusions of the HELAA were not revisited and they were rolled into the 2025 site selection work, which excluded site WHIM_12 from consideration. 10.20 DWH set out their concerns to the approach being adopted and the opportunity provided by WHIM_12 in correspondence to Officers on 17th September 2024, and then in detail to each Member of the Strategic Planning Committee on 20th September 2024. Despite the obvious flaws in the HELAA evidence base which were not revisited, DWH were prevented from presenting the opportunity provided by WHIM_12 at Strategic Planning Committee meetings in September and October 2024. Many other developers of sites that were considered to be developable opportunities were allowed to speak at the series of Strategic Planning Committee meetings held in Autumn 2024, including the two allocations at Whimple. 10.21 DWH considers that the approach taken to site selection by the Local Planning Authority and then again in 2025 via the Strategic

Planning Committee has created inequity between how differing sites have been considered during the formation of the Local Plan. By not revisiting the conclusions of the 2022 HELAA despite clear and up-to-date evidence and then rolling the HELAA conclusions into the Site Selection Report, the approach has been unfairly prejudicial to the promotion of site WHIM_12. SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL – CSD-003A 10.22 DWH have a number of concerns relating to the Sustainability Appraisal. These concerns relate to: ? the approach taken in the Sustainability Appraisal regarding assessing options for the housing requirement to be set closer to the local housing need; and ? the failure to assess land to the west of Lilypond Lane as a reasonable alternative. 10.23 Their concerns are set out in turn below. Assessment of alternative levels of housing provision 10.24 As set out in Section 6 above, three options were tested for the most appropriate housing requirement, as follows: ? Option A – 950 dwellings per annum (20,909 dwellings over the plan period); ? Option B – 1,045 dwellings per annum (22,990 dwellings over the plan period); and ? Option C – 1,188 dwellings per annum (26,136 dwellings over the plan period). 10.25 Option A represents the housing requirement contained within the emerging Local Plan, whilst Option C represents the local housing need figure at the time the Regulation 19 Plan was published. 10.26 Having undertaken an assessment of the options against the SA Objectives, the Sustainability Appraisal concludes that Option A is the preferred option. However, DWH note that there are a 35 East Devon District Council, Site Selection Report Whimple (February 2025), para. 1.6.

EAST DEVON LOCAL PLAN PUBLICATION DRAFT CONSULTATION 64 number of technical deficiencies with this approach. These concerns are set out in detail in Section 6 of this representation and for brevity, are not repeated here. 10.27 A re-assessment of Options A to C, which is provided at Appendix 5 of these representations, would suggest that Option C is preferrable. 10.28 This revised analysis would suggest that by failing to plan for Option C, which is the preferred outcome, the emerging Local Plan is ineffective. To ensure that the Plan is effective and sound, there is a need for the Local Plan to incorporate a housing requirement that, as a minimum, meets local housing needs. Land to the west of Lilypond Lane 10.29 The Sustainability Appraisal does not consider the development potential of land to the west of Lilypond Lane. It is assumed that this is because of the conclusions presented within the HELAA; that the site is probably unachievable. 10.30 For the reasons set out above, this is an incorrect conclusion. The reasonable alternative presented by the site has not therefore been considered, which means that the Plan is unjustified. Accordingly, the site should be subject of assessment in future versions of the Sustainability Appraisal. THE DUTY TO COOPERATE STATEMENT – KSD-002 10.31 The Duty to Cooperate Statement sets out that, in East Devon's view, the Local Planning Authority can meet its housing need36. It also confirms that no requirements have been made by neighbouring local planning authorities for East Devon to meet any of their requirements at the present time. 10.32

However, with regard to East Devon's housing need, Document KSD-002 cites Key Document 017 as evidence that East Devon's housing need can be met. However, KSD-002 was published in November 2022. Given the age of the document, the methodology employed for calculating housing need has altered, as has the local housing need figure, which has materially changed from 946 dwellings per annum, to 1,146 homes per annum (an increase of over 20%). 10.33 As is demonstrated in Sections 6 and 8 of this representation, rather than planning to meet their local housing need figure, a significant shortfall will result. No discussion has been undertaken with any neighbouring authority to determine whether this shortfall can be met elsewhere. 10.34 As set out above, Document KSD-002 also confirms that no requests have been made by neighbouring authorities for East Devon to accommodate any of their unmet need. However, we are aware that, as resolved by the Strategic Planning Committee on 4th February 2025, that East Devon District Council objected to Chapter 7 of the emerging Exeter City Local Plan, on the basis that: ? the emerging Local Plan will not meet the employment needs of the City; ? the lack of provision will undermine the economic growth potential of the city and the wider area; and ?the failure to make sufficient provision will increase the pressure on neighbouring authorities to meet needs. 10.35 Additionally, it was highlighted that: 36 Para. 4.3

EAST DEVON LOCAL PLAN PUBLICATION DRAFT CONSULTATION 65 "The City Council's approach appears to rely on employment land provision outside of the city boundary but within the wider Functional Economic Market Area in order to meet the economic needs of the area. However, no request has been made under the duty to co-operate for East Devon District Council to assist in meeting the employment land needs identified by the EDNA. The land identified in the emerging East Devon Local Plan 2020 – 2042 is considered to be necessary tomeet the needs of East Devon and does not seek to address wider needs." 10.36 Whilst it could be argued that the concerns are more of an issue associated with the emerging Exeter City Plan, it does demonstrate the failure to meet the requirements of the Duty to Cooperate. If ongoing and meaningful engagement had been undertaken across the Housing Market Area over the course of the preparation of both emerging Plans, matters like those being objected to by East Devon District Council would have been resolved beforehand. Additionally, there would have been a wider and more meaningful discussion about unmet housing needs across neighbouring authorities when compared to more up-to-date assessments of local housing need (see Table 3 above). THE ROLE AND FUNCTION OF SETTLEMENTS 10.37 Disappointingly, para. 3.17 of the 'Role and Function of Settlements' background paper describes Whimple as being a dormitory settlement and a "relatively unsustainable" place to live. This conclusion is made after an assessment of the jobs to homes balance, wherein it is identified that the settlement has nearly three times as many residents available to work than the number of jobs available in the settlement. 10.38

This conclusion, as indicated at para. 3.34 of the same document, has influenced the Local Planning Authority's views on the levels of residential development that Whimple could accommodate, as it was considered that "residential development in isolation is likely to perpetuate unsustainable travel to work patterns." 10.39 However, such analysis ignores the significant existing active and sustainable transport opportunities provided at Whimple and the potential for them to be enhanced. Indeed, Whimple is located within a reasonable cycling journey time of Cranbrook and the employment opportunities clustered at that settlement and the surrounding areas. Other than one other road, Cranbrook is linked to Whimple by London Road. The Cranbrook Plan has secured significant funding for environmental enhancements to London Road. Those improvements, which are to be delivered by Devon County Council, will have a design speed of 20mph and are likely to include segregated pedestrian and cycle links. Cycling could therefore become even more of a realistic mode to travel to work for Whimple's residents. 10.40 Moreover, as outlined elsewhere in these representations, Whimple has a railway station, which is described in the Role and Function of Settlements background paper as being a strategic facility. The station is located on the West of England Railway Line and therefore services are provided to a range of destinations including Cranbrook and Exeter to the west and Axminster, Honiton, Crewkerne, Yeovil, Salisbury, Basingstoke and London to the east. Generally, services are provided at a twice hourly frequency. 10.41 The railway station is relatively well-used and proportionally more residents travel to work by the railway than in other areas of the District. Further growth around Whimple has the potential to encourage further patronage. 10.42 As well as reducing congestion on the highways network, the promotion of such sustainable modes of travel would reduce greenhouse gas emissions associated with the private vehicle, whilst health benefits would also result. 10.43 The conclusion presented in the assessment work also ignores more modern methods of working, especially since the Covid-19 pandemic. In this regard we note that superfast broadband is available in Whimple.

10.44 For the above reasons, DWH considers that the evidence base document is deficient. It has resulted in an unjustified strategy that has constrained levels of development at Whimple to an unreasonable level. 10.45 Future versions of the evidence base document and the other documents that the work has influenced, including the emerging Local Plan, should reconsider the role that Whimple could play in accommodating development, particularly given the need, for the reasons set out within these representations, to identify further housing allocations within the District.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the

Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: Having not published a full Regulation 19 Local Plan, DWH do not consider that the transitional arrangements provided at para. 234 of the NPPF are applicable in this case. Consequently, the Plan should be assessed against the 2024 version of the NPPF and provide the full objectively assessed need for housing. ? Even if the transitional arrangements do apply, the 2023 version of the NPPF still requires the full objectively assessed need to be met, unless the tests outlined in para. 11(b) are engaged. No evidence has been presented to suggest that they have. The Local Plan, instead, proposes a housing requirement that meets just 82.9% of local need. This is not positively prepared or justified. ? The operation of a stepped trajectory will widen the gap between the proposed requirement and identified needs in the first 12 years of the Plan, when just 74% of identified need is proposed to be met. This cannot be considered to be positively prepared, justified or consistent with national planning policy. ? The proposed housing requirement will not make its full contribution to boosting the supply of homes nationally. It also proposes a continuation of the housing requirements set within the 2016 Local Plan, which again, cannot be considered to be boosting housing supply. ? The housing requirement is at a level whereby the PPG suggests it would not start to address housing affordability.

? By meeting the full objectively assessed need for housing, the PPG confirms that past under-delivery would have been accounted for. It follows that by not meeting the full objectively assessed need for housing, it will not have. Consequently, if the housing requirement remains at 950 dwellings per annum, the shortfall from the 2016 Local Plan will need to be added to the requirement (approximately 3,500 homes). ? If the plan period is extended, the housing requirement would need to increase. ? The unmet need is not being met in a neighbouring authority. ? There is an adequate supply to meet a higher housing requirement and a revised Sustainability Appraisal assessment suggests that a higher requirement should have been the preferred option. ? Levels of delivery akin to the local housing need figure have been achieved in the past and are forecast to going forward. It is therefore an effective proposition. ? DWH therefore consider that Policy SP02 is not positively prepared, justified or consistent with national planning policy.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

4(a). If yes, and you wish to support this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter's compliance with the duty to co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.: As they relate to housing supply. We have indicated that the Plan is not compliant with the Duty to Cooperate in relation to housing need.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : Due to the significant policy issues concerned.

Full name: Alex Bullock

Organisation (where relevant): LVA

Other party name (if relevant): Clyst Honiton LVA LLP

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Strategic Policy SP02: Levels of future housing development As we have alluded to in our response above the Council is planning for at least 20,909 dwellings and this represents approximately 80% of the Standard Method output. We understand that if the Council is correct in its approach to the splitting of the Regulation 19 consultation then planning for only 80% would be compliant with the requirements of transitional arrangements. However, we consider that planning for the minimum is fundamentally a missed opportunity and that sufficient Sites exist and have been identified which would enable the Council to actually meet its full need now and evidently that would have been the better course of action.

Full name: James McMurdo

Organisation (where relevant): McMurdo Land Planning and Development Ltd

Other party name (if relevant): Stuart Partners Ltd

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: [McMurdo Land Planning & Development Ltd on Behalf of Stuart Partners Ltd relating to Strategic Land at the "West End" of East Devon District made in the context of significant land holdings in this area. Representation to be read in conjunction with representations made by Turley on behalf of our Stuart Partners Ltd and Bloor Homes Exeter on the proposed new and an expanded Hill Barton Business Park, and by Carney Sweeney on behalf of our Stuart Partners Ltd and Down, relating to land being promoted for a village for up to 2,000 houses between Clyst St George and Clyst St Mary]

Object

Reasons: Neither East Devon District Council (EDDC) (2.97 years) nor neighbouring Exeter City Council (ECC) (4.10 years) have a robust 5-years housing land supply (5YHLS), and Exeter is more than 2000 houses behind an "at least" 12,000 houses figure in the current plan period. The under supply of housing in the sub region in the current plan period (s) needs to be correctly addressed and the shortfall should be rectified within the emerging Local Plan. The Council should positively engage with ECC and accommodate the housing land needs of the City which cannot be met there. Instead, against the vision, objectives and sustainability appraisal work, evidenced sub regional housing and employment land needs, and market forces, the Plan proposes C50% of its housing and employment land needs in national landscapes and a significant majority of its "West End" housing and employment land as part of a future second phase of plan making, and does not even attempt to deal with Exeter's unmet need.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: Remove housing land allocations from national landscape areas (which are not market facing in any case) and Allocate more housing land away from national landscapes and to meet EDDC's and ECC's unmet needs, on the area free from development constraints, the "West End" of the district.

Full name: James McMurdo

Organisation (where relevant): McMurdo Land Planning and Development Ltd

Other party name (if relevant): Mr P and Mrs A Broom

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: [McMurdo Land Planning and Development Ltd On Behalf of Mr P and Mrs A Broom]

Housing Delivery and 5 Year Housing Land Supply (5YHLS)

1. Neither EDDC nor neighbouring ECC have a robust 5-years housing land supply

(5YHLS):

- EDDC's housing land supply position is confirmed (by the Council) at only 2.97 years.

- ECC's, housing land supply is confirmed (by the Council) at 4 years and 10 months. 1

2. If these Local Plans are to be found “sound” at examination then the Councils will have to robustly demonstrate a 5 YHLS.

Full name: Stuart Houlet

Organisation (where relevant): PCL Planning Ltd

Other party name (if relevant): Waddeton Park Limited (Honiton)

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: We have significant concerns regarding the approach set out in Strategic Policy SP02 and consider that this could prevent the Plan from being found sound. This is because this approach would fail to meet the local housing needs and therefore has not been positively prepared. The approach is based on a stepped housing delivery approach which has not been sufficiently justified and will instead simply defer the issue of under delivery to the later parts of the Plan at which point unmet needs will be substantial with little prospect of addressing any shortfall. Therefore, rendering the Plan ineffective and failing to deliver sustainable development in order to meet the needs of its community consistent with national policy.

UNJUSTIFIED STEPPED APPROACH TOWARDS HOUSING DELIVERY

Our rationale for this conclusion is as follows. Strategic Policy SP02 proposes a provision of 20,909 dwellings across the District. This is based on the transitional arrangement of 80% of the new standard method of 1,188 dwellings per annum over the 22-year Plan period, equating to 950.4 dwellings per annum. However, rather than suggest this is delivered at a consistent rate, a stepped approach has been applied. This provides for 850 dwellings per annum across the first 12 years of the Plan period (2020/21 to 2031/32) and 1,070 dwellings per annum for the latter 10 years of the Plan period (2032/33 to 2041/42).

This means that for the first 12 years of the plan period housing delivery is proposed at just 71% of the new standard method, significantly below the required 80% set out in the NPPF transitional arrangements. Indeed, on that basis, the Council would only reach 80% of the local housing need figure in 2042, by which time a new Plan is likely to be in place. There is a risk that this approach could be seen to have been contrived to benefit from these arrangements but to plan for a failure for more than half of the Plan period to meet the required (reduced) annual delivery targets and cumulatively to fail until the final year of the Plan period. This must question whether the approach is compliant with the transitional arrangements at all.

Furthermore, the approach would mean a year on year under supply of housing against the (reduced) housing targets for 12 years of 100 dwellings per annum, resulting in a deficit of 1200 homes by 2032/33 to be made up in the remaining 10 years of the Plan. Importantly, for context, if the Plan could not benefit from the NPPF transitional arrangements (and therefore the new standard method setting the local housing needs figure was in place) this would be an under supply of 338 dwellings per annum resulting in a deficit of 4,056 dwellings by 2032/33 to be made up in the second half of the Plan period.

The obvious concern that arises is whether the proposed stepped approach is simply a contrived way of firstly attempting to benefit from the transitional arrangements and secondly, avoiding making the important and difficult decisions required to meet the District's substantial level of housing need.

The Council seek to justify the stepped approach within the 'technical assessment of housing delivery' report dated February 2025 by referring to the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) which does set out circumstances where a stepped approach may be justified. This includes where there is a significant change in the level of housing requirement between emerging and previous policies and/or where strategic sites will have a phased delivery or are likely to be delivered later in the Plan period. However, the PPG also makes it clear that such an approach needs to be evidence-based, should not seek to unnecessarily delay meeting identified development needs.

In the case of the Regulation 19 Plan, the level of housing requirement under the transitional arrangements without a stepped approach would be 950 dwellings per annum which is the same as required under the adopted East Devon Local Plan.

Therefore, there is not a significant change between emerging and adopted policies to justify a stepped approach.

In terms of strategic sites, it is important to recognise that the Regulation 19 Plan relies on many housing allocations of which the majority could not be considered to be 'strategic'. Whilst the housing allocations are dealt with under the strategic policies of the Plan, this in itself does not make them 'strategic' in the sense of the PPG. Indeed, the NPPF at paragraph 22 provides some insight as to the scale which sites should be considered 'strategic', referring to new settlements or significant extensions to settlements and the need in those cases to look forwards through strategic policies over at least 30 years. None of the allocations within the emerging Local Plan meet this definition of 'strategic'.

Notwithstanding the above it would not be unreasonable for the new community to be considered a strategic site given delivery will go beyond the Plan period. However, as discussed below, the lack of details regarding this allocation and the likely long lead-in times will reduce significantly the delivery rate that can be assumed in the Plan period. This would suggest rather than a stepped approach to housing delivery that over relies on the uncertainties of the new community at the back end of the Plan period, the Council should plan to maximise opportunities for the non-strategic sites to come forward in the early parts of the Plan period to provide greater resilience and set its housing requirements accordingly.

We note the other reasons put forward by the Council to justify the stepped approach. This includes the likelihood that allocated sites will not be the subject of speculative consents due to uncertainty. However, a number of applications on such sites have already been made (and some consented) and the Regulation 19 Plan confirming proposed allocations and the current lack of 5 year housing land supply will provide significant incentives for applications to come forward at an early stage.

The realities of what is occurring in East Devon is a more appropriate guide than the Lichfields nationwide study referred to in the evidence base. This also confirms that sites of 100 units or less (which make up a significant proportion of the Plan's proposed allocations) are capable of being delivered in under 4 years. Similarly, the reliance on 'extensive planning complexities', 'environmental constraints', 'infrastructure issues' are matters faced to a large extent by every local planning authority and are not unique to East Devon. These matters in themselves and collectively do not justify a stepped

approach, indeed it perhaps emphasises the need to frontload the Plan by maximising delivery from a range of sites rather than metaphorically 'kicking the can down the road' by delaying delivery and then over relying on the latter part of the Plan period.

NEED TO IMPROVE DELIVERY RATES

Some of the above concerns raised by the Council could be addressed through a re-consideration of the scale of allocations around some of the Principal and Main Centres. These settlements, with a wide range of development opportunities and wide range of services and facilities, can accommodate the delivery of housing in a variety of directions, and are well suited to the delivery of a range of 'smaller' (i.e. 50-200 dwelling) site allocations that can come forward earlier in the Plan period.

As the site selection process undertaken in respect of both Regulation 18 and 19 stages of the emerging Plan demonstrates there are many suitable and available sites within these locations which would have significantly lower infrastructure burdens and reduced lead-in times. However, inconsistencies in the approach of the Strategic Planning Committee in allocating sites for the Regulation 19 Plan (often against officer advice) has meant that some sites considered suitable at Regulation 18 were removed at Regulation 19, whilst other sites, with more challenging constraints, not previously considered were allocated in their place.

There was no consideration of lead-in times or the consequences on Plan delivery at that stage, only the fundamental quantum. This has meant that some of the concerns the Council now raise in respect of early delivery are a direct consequence of the decisions made which saw some larger sites allocated on capacity grounds without due regard to constraints such as securing appropriate access, ecology impacts, heritage impacts and land ownership. We outline these concerns further below in respect of representations made in regards to our client's site at Hulham Road, Exmouth which was not carried forward from the Regulation 18 Plan and the inclusion of the site at St John's, Exmouth.

The point being made is that the Council had in front of them a range of sites in key settlements identified as available and suitable which have not been taken forward, but if they were, they could still provide significant resilience to the Plan strategy by supporting early and increased delivery rates.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: MODIFICATIONS REQUIRED

As we have set out above the Plan's approach in setting a stepped housing target is unjustified, goes against the spirit of the NPPF transitional arrangements and seeks to effectively push the matter of delivering housing to meet local needs into the next local plan cycle. The Government have been clear that in introducing the transitional arrangements they expect the progress of plans to be maintained, whilst maximising proactive planning for the homes communities need. We consider the stepped approach does not support the Government's intentions.

Therefore, currently this approach risks rendering the Plan unsound in our view. To address this the Plan will need to be the subject of fundamental modification. This will include removing all reference to the stepped approach within Policy SP02 and instead including a consistent housing requirement of 950.4 dwellings per annum over the entire Plan period.

In addition, to provide greater resilience against the delivery issues the Council has identified in relation to larger sites, modifications should be made to include a range of sites that can support greater resilience for Plan delivery. This includes reviewing and allocating opportunities already previously considered through the site selection process where sites were previously proposed to be allocated in earlier stages of the Plan and/or where they have not been discounted on deliverability grounds.

These Modifications are essential for addressing the unjustified stepped approach towards housing delivery and ensuring the Plan can be found sound. Otherwise, the Plan as its stands would not be positively prepared in that it fails to deliver the housing required to meet local needs. Its approach is not justified by the evidence base nor is it consistent with national policy. The result will be an ineffective Plan that fails to deliver for the needs of its community.

Full name: Stuart Houlet

Organisation (where relevant): PCL Planning Ltd

Other party name (if relevant): Waddeton Park Limited (Honiton)

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: trategic Policy SP02 – Levels of Future Housing Development

We have significant concerns regarding the approach set out in Strategic Policy SP02 and consider that this is a key matter that could make the Plan unsound. This is because this approach would fail to meet the local housing needs and therefore has not been positively prepared. The approach is based on a stepped housing delivery approach which has not been sufficiently justified and will instead simply defer the issue of under delivery to the later parts of the Plan at which point unmet needs will be substantial with little prospect of addressing. Therefore, rendering the Plan ineffective and failing to deliver sustainable development in order to meet the needs of its community consistent with national policy.

Unjustified Stepped Approach towards Housing Delivery

Our rationale for this conclusion is as follows. Strategic Policy SP02 proposes a provision of 20,909 dwellings across the District. This is based on the transitional arrangement of 80% of the new standard method of 1188 dwellings per annum over the 22-year Plan period, equating to 950.4 dwellings per annum. However, rather than suggest this is delivered at a consistent rate, a stepped approach has been applied. This provides for 850 dwellings per annum across the first 12 years of the Plan period (2020/21 to 2031/32) and 1070 dwellings per annum for the latter 10 years of the Plan period (2032/33 to 2041/42).

This means that for the first 12 years of the plan period housing delivery is proposed at just 71% of the new standard method, significantly below the required 80% set out in the NPPF transitional arrangements. Indeed, on that basis, the Council would only reach 80% of the local housing need figure in 2042, by which time a new Plan is likely to be in place. There is a risk that this approach could be seen to have been contrived to benefit from these arrangements but to plan for a failure for more than half of the Plan period to meet the required (reduced) annual delivery targets and cumulatively to fail until the final year of the Plan period. This must question whether the approach is compliant with the transitional arrangements at all.

Furthermore, the approach would mean a year on year under supply of housing against the (reduced) housing targets for 12 years of 100 dwellings per annum, resulting in a deficit of 1200 homes by 2032/33 to be made up in the remaining 10 years of the Plan. Importantly, for context, if the Plan could not benefit from the NPPF transitional arrangements (and therefore the new standard method setting the local housing needs figure was in place) this would be an under supply of 338 dwellings per annum resulting in a deficit of 4,056 dwellings by 2032/33 to be made up in the second half of the Plan period.

The obvious concern that arises is whether the proposed stepped approach is simply a contrived way of firstly attempting to benefit from the transitional arrangements and secondly, avoiding making the important and difficult decisions required to meet the District's substantial level of housing need.

The Council seek to justify the stepped approach within the 'technical assessment of housing delivery' report dated February 2025 by referring to the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) which does set out circumstances where a stepped approach may be justified. This includes where there is a significant change in in the level of housing requirement between emerging and previous policies and/or where strategic sites will have a phased delivery or a likely to be delivered later in the Plan period. However, the PPG also makes it clear that such an approach needs to be evidence-based, should not seek to unnecessarily delay meeting identified development needs.

In the case of the Regulation 19 Plan, the level of housing requirement under the transitional arrangements without a stepped approach would be 950 dwellings per annum which is the same as required under the adopted East Devon Local Plan.

Therefore, there is not a significant change between emerging and adopted policies to justify a stepped approach.

In terms of strategic sites, it is important to recognise that the Regulation 19 Plan relies on many housing allocations of which the majority could not be considered to be 'strategic'. Whilst the housing allocations are dealt with under the strategic policies of the Plan, this in itself does not make them 'strategic' in the sense of the PPG. Indeed, the NPPF at paragraph 22 provides some insight as to the scale which sites should be considered 'strategic', referring to new settlements or significant extensions to settlements and the need in those cases to look forwards through strategic policies over at least 30 years. None of the allocations within the emerging Local Plan meet this definition of 'strategic'.

Notwithstanding the above it would not be unreasonable for the new community to be considered a strategic site given delivery will go beyond the Plan period. However, as discussed below, the lack of details regarding this allocation and the likely long lead-in times will reduce significantly the delivery rate that can be assumed in the Plan period. This would suggest rather than a stepped approach to housing delivery that over relies on the uncertainties of the new community at the back end of the Plan period, the Council should plan to maximise opportunities for the non-strategic sites to come forward in the early parts of the Plan period to provide greater resilience and set it housing requirements accordingly.

We note the other reasons put forward by the Council to justify the stepped approach. This includes the likelihood that allocated sites will not be the subject of speculative consents due to uncertainty. However, a number of applications on such sites have already been made (and some consented) and the Regulation 19 Plan confirming proposed allocations and the current lack of 5 year housing land supply will provide significant incentives for applications to come forward at an early stage.

The realities of what is occurring in East Devon is a more appropriate guide than the Lichfields national wide study referred to in the evidence base. This also confirms that sites of less than 100 units (which make up a significant proportion of the Plan's proposed allocations) are capable of being delivered in under 4 years. Similarly, the reliance on 'extensive planning complexities', 'environmental constraints', 'infrastructure issues' are matters faced to a large extent by every local planning authority and are not unique to East Devon. These matters in themselves and

collectively do not justify a stepped approach, indeed it perhaps emphasises the need to frontload the Plan by maximising delivery from a range of sites rather than metaphorically 'kicking the can down the road' by delaying delivery and then over relying on the latter part of the Plan period.

Need to Improve Delivery Rates

Some of the above concerns raised by the Council could be addressed through a re-consideration of the scale of allocations around some of the Principal and Main Centres. These settlements, with a wide range of development opportunities and wide range of services and facilities, can accommodate the delivery of housing in a variety of directions, and are well suited to the delivery of a range of 'smaller' (i.e. 50-200 dwelling) site allocations that can come forward earlier in the Plan period.

As the site selection process undertaken in respect of both Regulation 18 and 19 stages of the emerging Plan demonstrates there are many suitable and available sites within these locations which would have significantly lower infrastructure burdens and reduced lead-in times. However, inconsistencies in the approach of the Strategic Planning Committee in allocating sites for the Regulation 19 Plan (often against officer advice) has meant that some sites considered suitable at Regulation 18 were removed at Regulation 19, whilst other sites, with more challenging constraints, not previously considered were allocated in their place. There was no consideration of lead-in times or the consequences on Plan delivery at that stage, only the fundamental quantum. This has meant that some of the concerns the Council now raise in respect of early delivery are a direct consequence of the decisions made which saw some larger sites allocated on capacity grounds without due regard to constraints such as securing appropriate access, ecology impacts, heritage impacts and land ownership and the unjustified removal of other sites which could have contributed to housing delivery in the earlier stages of the Plan. We outline these concerns further below in respect of representations our clients' site at land at Heathfield Manor, Honiton which was not carried forward from the Regulation 18 Plan, contrary to officers recommendations .

The point being made is that the Council had in front of them a range of sites in key settlements identified as available and suitable which have not been taken forward, but if they were, they could still provide significant resilience to the Plan strategy by supporting early and increased delivery rates.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: As we have set out above the Plan's approach in setting a stepped housing target is unjustified, goes against the spirit of the NPPF transitional arrangements and seeks to effectively push the matter of delivering housing to meet local needs into the next local plan cycle. The Government have been clear that in introducing the transitional arrangements they expect the progress of plans to be maintained, whilst maximising proactive planning for the homes communities need. We consider the stepped approach does not support the Government's intentions.

Therefore, currently this approach risks rendering the Plan unsound in our view. To address this the Plan will need to be the subject of fundamental modification. This will include removing all reference to the stepped approach within Policy SP02 and instead including a consistent housing requirement of 950.4 dwellings per annum over the entire Plan period.

In addition, to provide greater resilience against the delivery issues the Council has identified in relation to larger sites, modifications should be made to include a range of sites that can support greater resilience for Plan delivery. This includes reviewing and allocating opportunities already previously considered through the site selection process where sites were previously proposed to be allocated in earlier stages of the Plan and/or where they have not been discounted on deliverability grounds. This should include our client's site at Land at Heathfield Manor, Honiton.

These Modifications are essential for addressing the unjustified stepped approach towards housing delivery and ensuring the Plan can be found sound. Otherwise, the Plan as its stands would not be positively prepared in that it fails to deliver the housing required to meet local needs. Its approach is not justified by the evidence base nor is it consistent with national policy. The result will be an ineffective Plan that fails to deliver for the needs of its community.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : To have the opportunity to elaborate on these and our previous representations

Full name: Stuart Houlet

Organisation (where relevant): PCL Planning Ltd

Other party name (if relevant): Waddeton Park Limited (Honiton)

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: (PCL Planning on behalf of Waddeton Park Limited (Honiton)): We have significant concerns regarding the approach set out in Strategic Policy SP02 and consider that this is a key matter that could make the Plan unsound. This is because this approach would fail to meet the local housing needs and therefore has not been positively prepared. The approach is based on a stepped housing delivery approach which has not been sufficiently justified and will instead simply defer the issue of under delivery to the later parts of the Plan at which point unmet needs will be substantial with little prospect of addressing. Therefore, rendering the Plan ineffective and failing to deliver sustainable development in order to meet the needs of its community consistent with national policy.

Unjustified Stepped Approach towards Housing Delivery Our rationale for this conclusion is as follows. Strategic Policy SP02 proposes a provision of 20,909 dwellings across the District. This is based on the transitional arrangement of 80% of the new standard method of 1188 dwellings per annum over the 22-year Plan period, equating to 950.4 dwellings per annum. However, rather than suggest this is delivered at a consistent rate, a stepped approach has been applied. This provides for 850 dwellings per annum across the first 12 years of the Plan period (2020/21 to 2031/32) and 1070 dwellings per annum for the latter 10 years of the Plan period (2032/33 to 2041/42).

This means that for the first 12 years of the plan period housing delivery is proposed at just 71% of the new standard method, significantly below the required 80% set out in the NPPF transitional arrangements. Indeed, on that basis, the Council would only reach 80% of the local housing need figure in 2042, by which time a new Plan is likely to

be in place. There is a risk that this approach could be seen to have been contrived to benefit from these arrangements but to plan for a failure for more than half of the Plan period to meet the required (reduced) annual delivery targets and cumulatively to fail until the final year of the Plan period. This must question whether the approach is compliant with the transitional arrangements at all. Furthermore, the approach would mean a year on year under supply of housing against the (reduced) housing targets for 12 years of 100 dwellings per annum, resulting in a deficit of 1200 homes by 2032/33 to be made up in the remaining 10 years of the Plan. Importantly, for context, if the Plan could not benefit from the NPPF transitional arrangements (and therefore the new standard method setting the local housing needs figure was in place) this would be an under supply of 338 dwellings per annum resulting in a deficit of 4,056 dwellings by 2032/33 to be made up in the second half of the Plan period.

The obvious concern that arises is whether the proposed stepped approach is simply a contrived way of firstly attempting to benefit from the transitional arrangements and secondly, avoiding making the important and difficult decisions required to meet the District's substantial level of housing need.

The Council seek to justify the stepped approach within the 'technical assessment of housing delivery' report dated February 2025 by referring to the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) which does set out circumstances where a stepped approach may be justified. This includes where there is a significant change in in the level of housing requirement between emerging and previous policies and/or where strategic sites will have a phased delivery or a likely to be delivered later in the Plan period. However, the PPG also makes it clear that such an approach needs to be evidence-based, should not seek to unnecessarily delay meeting identified development needs.

In the case of the Regulation 19 Plan, the level of housing requirement under the transitional arrangements without a stepped approach would be 950 dwellings per annum which is the same as required under the adopted East Devon Local Plan. Therefore, there is not a significant change between emerging and adopted policies to justify a stepped approach.

In terms of strategic sites, it is important to recognise that the Regulation 19 Plan relies on many housing allocations of which the majority could not be considered to be 'strategic'. Whilst the housing allocations are dealt with under the strategic policies of the Plan, this in itself does not make them 'strategic' in the sense of the PPG. Indeed,

the NPPF at paragraph 22 provides some insight as to the scale which sites should be considered 'strategic', referring to new settlements or significant extensions to settlements and the need in those cases to look forwards through strategic policies over at least 30 years. None of the allocations within the emerging Local Plan meet this definition of 'strategic'. Notwithstanding the above it would not be unreasonable for the new community to be considered a strategic site given delivery will go beyond the Plan period. However, as discussed below, the lack of details regarding this allocation and the likely long lead-in times will reduce significantly the delivery rate that can be assumed in the Plan period. This would suggest rather than a stepped approach to housing delivery that over relies on the uncertainties of the new community at the back end of the Plan period, the Council should plan to maximise opportunities for the non-strategic sites to come forward in the early parts of the Plan period to provide greater resilience and set it housing requirements accordingly.

We note the other reasons put forward by the Council to justify the stepped approach. This includes the likelihood that allocated sites will not be the subject of speculative consents due to uncertainty. However, a number of applications on such sites have already been made (and some consented) and the Regulation 19 Plan confirming proposed allocations and the current lack of 5 year housing land supply will provide significant incentives for applications to come forward at an early stage.

The realities of what is occurring in East Devon is a more appropriate guide than the Lichfields national wide study referred to in the evidence base. This also confirms that sites of less than 100 units (which make up a significant proportion of the Plan's proposed allocations) are capable of being delivered in under 4 years. Similarly, the reliance on 'extensive planning complexities', 'environmental constraints', 'infrastructure issues' are matters faced to a large extent by every local planning authority and are not unique to East Devon. These matters in themselves and collectively do not justify a stepped approach, indeed it perhaps emphasises the need to frontload the Plan by maximising delivery from a range of sites rather than metaphorically 'kicking the can down the road' by delaying delivery and then over relying on the latter part of the Plan period.

Need to Improve Delivery Rates Some of the above concerns raised by the Council could be addressed through a re-consideration of the scale of allocations around some of the Principal and Main Centres. These settlements, with a wide range of development opportunities and wide range of services and facilities, can accommodate the delivery of housing in a variety of directions, and are well suited to the delivery of a range of

'smaller' (i.e. 50-200 dwelling) site allocations that can come forward earlier in the Plan period.

As the site selection process undertaken in respect of both Regulation 18 and 19 stages of the emerging Plan demonstrates there are many suitable and available sites within these locations which would have significantly lower infrastructure burdens and reduced lead-in times. However, inconsistencies in the approach of the Strategic Planning Committee in allocating sites for the Regulation 19 Plan (often against officer advice) has meant that some sites considered suitable at Regulation 18 were removed at Regulation 19, whilst other sites, with more challenging constraints, not previously considered were allocated in their place. There was no consideration of lead-in times or the consequences on Plan delivery at that stage, only the fundamental quantum. This has meant that some of the concerns the Council now raise in respect of early delivery are a direct consequence of the decisions made which saw some larger sites allocated on capacity grounds without due regard to constraints such as securing appropriate access, ecology impacts, heritage impacts and land ownership and the unjustified removal of other sites which could have contributed to housing delivery in the earlier stages of the Plan. We outline these concerns further [elsewhere] in respect of representations our clients' site at land at Heathfield Manor, Honiton which was not carried forward from the Regulation 18 Plan, contrary to officers recommendations .

The point being made is that the Council had in front of them a range of sites in key settlements identified as available and suitable which have not been taken forward, but if they were, they could still provide significant resilience to the Plan strategy by supporting early and increased delivery rates.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as

precise as possible.: As we have set out above the Plan's approach in setting a stepped housing target is unjustified, goes against the spirit of the NPPF transitional arrangements and seeks to effectively push the matter of delivering housing to meet local needs into the next local plan cycle. The Government have been clear that in introducing the transitional arrangements they expect the progress of plans to be maintained, whilst maximising proactive planning for the homes communities need. We consider the stepped approach does not support the Government's intentions. Therefore, currently this approach risks rendering the Plan unsound in our view. To address this the Plan will need to be the subject of fundamental modification. This will include removing all reference to the stepped approach within Policy SP02 and instead including a consistent housing requirement of 950.4 dwellings per annum over the entire Plan period. In addition, to provide greater resilience against the delivery issues the Council has identified in relation to larger sites, modifications should be made to include a range of sites that can support greater resilience for Plan delivery. This includes reviewing and allocating opportunities already previously considered through the site selection process where sites were previously proposed to be allocated in earlier stages of the Plan and/or where they have not been discounted on deliverability grounds. This should include our client's site at Land at Heathfield Manor, Honiton. These Modifications are essential for addressing the unjustified stepped approach towards housing delivery and ensuring the Plan can be found sound. Otherwise, the Plan as its stands would not be positively prepared in that it fails to deliver the housing required to meet local needs. Its approach is not justified by the evidence base nor is it consistent with national policy. The result will be an ineffective Plan that fails to deliver for the needs of its community.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : in order to provide greater elaboration of the detail of these representations.

Full name: Stuart Houlet

Organisation (where relevant): PCL Planning Ltd

Other party name (if relevant): Waddeton Park Limited (Honiton)

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Strategic Policy SP02 proposes a provision of 20,909 dwellings across the District. This is based on the transitional arrangement of 80% of the new standard method of 1188 dwellings per annum over the 22-year Plan period, equating to 950.4 dwellings per annum. However, rather than suggest this is delivered at a consistent rate, a stepped approach has been applied. This provides for 850 dwellings per annum across the first 12 years of the Plan period (2020/21 to 2031/32) and 1070 dwellings per annum for the latter 10 years of the Plan period (2032/33 to 2041/42).

This means that for the first 12 years of the plan period housing delivery is proposed at just 71% of the new standard method, significantly below the required 80% set out in the NPPF transitional arrangements. Indeed, on that basis, the Council would only reach 80% of the local housing need figure in 2042, by which time a new Plan is likely to be in place. This must question whether the approach is compliant with the transitional arrangements at all.

Furthermore, the approach would mean a year on year under supply of housing against the (reduced) housing targets for 12 years of 100 dwellings per annum, resulting in a deficit of 1200 homes by 2032/33 to be made up in the remaining 10 years of the Plan. The obvious concern that arises is whether the proposed stepped approach is simply a contrived way of firstly attempting to benefit from the transitional arrangements and secondly, avoiding making the important and difficult decisions required to meet the District's substantial level of housing need.

The approach is not sufficiently justified and relies on there being issues such as 'extensive planning complexities', 'environmental constraints', 'infrastructure issues' but these are are matters faced to a large extent by every local planning authority and are not unique to East Devon. These matters in themselves and collectively do not justify a stepped approach, indeed it perhaps emphasises the need to frontload the Plan by maximising delivery from a range of sites rather than metaphorically 'kicking the can down the road' by delaying delivery and then over relying on the latter part of the Plan period. This includes enabling our clients' site at North Topsham to be released efficiently and effectively at its earliest stage possible.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: As we have set out above the Plan's approach in setting a stepped housing target is unjustified, goes against the spirit of the NPPF transitional arrangements and seeks to effectively push the matter of delivering housing to meet local needs into the next local plan cycle. The Government have been clear that in introducing the transitional arrangements they expect the progress of plans to be maintained, whilst maximising proactive planning for the homes communities need. We consider the stepped approach does not support the Government's intentions.

Therefore, currently this approach risks rendering the Plan unsound in our view. To address this the Plan will need to be the subject of fundamental modification. This will include removing all reference to the stepped approach within Policy SP02 and instead including a consistent housing requirement of 950.4 dwellings per annum over the entire Plan period.

Full name: Will Ridalls

Organisation (where relevant): PCL Planning Ltd

Other party name (if relevant): Simon Stokes

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Strategic Policy SP02 proposes a provision of 20,909 dwellings across the District. This is based on the transitional arrangement of 80% of the new standard method of 1188 dwellings per annum over the 22-year Plan period, equating to 950.4 dwellings per annum. However, rather than suggest this is delivered at a consistent rate, a stepped approach has been applied. This provides for 850 dwellings per annum across the first 12 years of the Plan period (2020/21 to 2031/32) and 1070 dwellings per annum for the latter 10 years of the Plan period (2032/33 to 2041/42). This means that for the first 12 years of the plan period housing delivery is proposed at just 71% of the new standard method, significantly below the required 80% set out in the NPPF transitional arrangements. Indeed, on that basis, the Council would only reach 80% of the local housing need figure in 2042, by which time a new Plan is likely to be in place. This must question whether the approach is compliant with the transitional arrangements at all. Furthermore, the approach would mean a year on year under supply of housing against the (reduced) housing targets for 12 years of 100 dwellings per annum, resulting in a deficit of 1200 homes by 2032/33 to be made up in the remaining 10 years of the Plan. The obvious concern that arises is whether the proposed stepped approach is simply a contrived way of firstly attempting to benefit from the transitional arrangements and secondly, avoiding making the important and difficult decisions required to meet the District's substantial level of housing need. The approach is not sufficiently justified and relies on there being issues such as 'extensive planning complexities', 'environmental constraints', 'infrastructure issues' but these are are matters faced to a large extent by every local planning authority and are not unique to East Devon. These matters in themselves and collectively do not justify a stepped approach, indeed it perhaps emphasises the need to frontload the Plan by maximising delivery from a range of sites rather than metaphorically 'kicking the can down the road' by delaying delivery and then

over relying on the latter part of the Plan period. Some of the above concerns raised by the Council could be addressed through a re-consideration of the scale of allocations around the Principal, Main and Local Centres. These settlements are well suited to the delivery of a range of 'smaller'site allocations. At the earlier stages of the Plan, the Council had in front of them a range of sites in key settlements identified as available and suitable which have not been taken forward, but if they were, they could still provide significant resilience to the Plan strategy by supporting early and increased delivery rates. The site at Castle Lane, Woodbury represents one example of an additional site that could contribute to housing delivery earlier in the Plan period.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: As we have set out above the Plan's approach in setting a stepped housing target is unjustified, goes against the spirit of the NPPF transitional arrangements and seeks to effectively push the matter of delivering housing to meet local needs into the next local plan cycle. The Government have been clear that in introducing the transitional arrangements they expect the progress of plans to be maintained, whilst maximising proactive planning for the homes communities need. We consider the stepped approach does not support the Government's intentions. Therefore, currently this approach risks rendering the Plan unsound in our view. To address this the Plan will need to be the subject of fundamental modification. This will include removing all reference to the stepped approach within Policy SP02 and instead including a consistent housing requirement of 950.4 dwellings per annum over the entire Plan period.

Full name: Jeremy Gardiner

Organisation (where relevant): Pegasus Group

Other party name (if relevant): Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: This policy proposes to deliver 80% of the district's Standard method requirement of 1,188 dwellings per annum. Over the 22 year plan period, the Standard Method provides a local housing need total requirement for a minimum of 26,136 dwellings. The plan proposes to deliver at least 20,909 dwellings, such that it will under-provide against local housing needs by 5,227 dwellings. The Council's published position is that it currently has a 5 year housing land supply shortfall of 2.97 years. The emerging local plan therefore currently does not provide a solution to delivering the minimum local housing need, so that the current severe housing land supply shortfall will persist at least in the short term. Strategic Policy SP02 outlines a stepped trajectory, setting an annual target of 850 homes from 2020/21 to 2031/2032, which then increases to 1,070 homes per annum from 2032/33 to 2041/42. Objection is raised to this approach, because it places a heavy reliance on housing delivery including from a new settlement (which has yet to be the subject of consultation) in the second half of the plan period. The record of housing delivery from the Cranbrook new settlement evidences that this approach is not justified. The delivery of 850 dwellings per annum for the first 11 years of the plan period, against a planned average of 950 dwellings per annum (which itself only represents 80% of the local housing need) will worsen the local housing crisis.

Full name: Sarah Smith

Organisation (where relevant): Rapleys LLP

Other party name (if relevant): The Crown Estate

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: Yes

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: Yes

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: SPATIAL STRATEGY – POLICIES SP01, SP02 AND SP04

4.1 TCE supports the principles of the spatial strategy as set out in SP01, focussing development on the western side of the district (54%) whilst at the same time promoting an appropriate level of development at the 'main centres' (Tier 2 in the hierarchy)throughout the District (30%), including Axminster, and allowing limited development to meet local needs at 'service villages'/local centres and in the countryside (16%). The spatial strategy is not overly reliant on a single source of RAPLEYS LLP | 5 Report Portrait Template – Planning delivery, providing flexibility for the market. This is consistent with the NPPF (2023) and the principles of sustainable development and is supported.

4.2 Local planning authorities are required to have a clear understanding of the housing need in their area, by preparing a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). The EDDC Plan can be prepared under the December 2023 version of the NPPF by reference to paragraphs 234-236 of the NPPF 2024. This is because this Regulation 19 Plan was published prior to 12 March 2025 and its housing requirement meets at least 80% of local need (calculated using the standard method in the NPPF, December 2024).

4.3 The Standard Method requires EDDC to provide circa 1,188 dwellings per annum. The Plan proposes (Policy SP02) at least 20,909 over the 22-year plan period which represents 80% of the requirement – in this context, the Plan is considered to be justified. TCE supports the principles of Policy SP02 in providing at least 20,909 dwellings over the plan period.

4.4 The development of a spatial strategy is a vital component of a Local Plan. Achieving more genuinely sustainable development in delivering growth is a key policy thrust of the East Devon Plan. The evidence base behind the Local Plan, including the Sustainability Appraisal, indicates consideration to varying development strategies prior to selecting the chosen option that appears in the Regulation 19 version.

4.5 In this context, TCE supports the spatial strategy and level of housing proposed within the plan, which is considered to be justified and effective and consistent with national policy.

4.6 TCE supports the general principles of the economic vision set out in paragraphs 3.20 – 3.24. Paragraph 3.29 notes that employment in Tier 1-4 settlements aims to meet local needs and improve self-containment – TCE supports this aim. The Plan goes on to say that new jobs will be required alongside new housing on larger development allocations – in the context of Axminster, the Policy SP04 then allocates 1ha of E(g)(iii) to site GH/ED/80a, where (iii) is industrial use (which can be caried out in any residential area without causing determinant to the amenity of the area). Whilst TCE supports the principle behind the allocation, the reference to E(g)(iii) in Policy SP04 is at odds with the actual wording and requirement within SD02 - GH/ED/80a, which requires a community hub incorporating workspace, café/shop meeting space. TCE would prefer to see the reference in Policy SP04 revised to reflect the requirement within SD02 - GH/ED/80a which reflects the Vision that TCE has for the development of the site – a wider E class definition would be more appropriate than the E(g) restriction.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Nick Matthews

Organisation (where relevant): Savills

Other party name (if relevant): Mac Mic Strategic Land

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: This representation is submitted by Savills on behalf of Mac Mic Strategic Land (from hereon referred to as 'Mac Mic'). Mac Mic is a strategic land promoter with a strong reputation for delivering planning permissions that lead to high-quality development.

2. Mac Mic has instructed Savills on their behalf to submit representations on their behalf to the emerging Local Plan in relation to the Land at Mosshayne. This land was previously promoted for development by another party and representations submitted in support of its allocation at the Regulation 18 stage of the consultation on the emerging Local Plan. It was also assessed through the HELAA process and assessed as a 'reasonable alternative' through the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) under site reference Brcl_31.

[Site map representing a site similar to Brcl_31 which can be seen in the attached PDF]

3. Whilst the site was tested as a reasonable alternative to the proposed strategic scale development in the West End, it is not on that basis that it is proposed for allocation. In other representations to the Regulation 19 Local Plan (the 'Plan') we have raised significant concerns over the compatibility of the housing requirement with the revised Standard Method and the consequent shortfall in the housing land supply. There is a need for the Plan to allocate further land for development in order to address this shortfall. For the reasons explained in this representation, the site is an ideal opportunity to accommodate a significant proportion of that shortfall. In summary it is:

a. Compatible with the EDDC Spatial Strategy, providing strategic scale growth in a sustainable location within the West End of the authority area; b. Suitably and sustainably located in a relatively unconstrained location close to Exeter with good access to a wide range of services, facilities and sustainable movement opportunities; and c. Available for development with the landowner having confirmed its availability and having entered into a promotion agreement with Mac Mic.

4. The site is therefore 'developable' in the first phase of the plan period in accordance with the definition in the Framework Glossary. The remainder of this representation expands upon these reasons. Compatible with the EDDC Spatial Strategy

5. The Plan and the supporting evidence base provide very strong support for strategic scale growth in the West End of East Devon and the site aligns with the East Devon Local Plan spatial strategy for several key reasons: a) Strategic Location within the West End The East Devon Local Plan focuses on directing significant development towards the West End of the district, which includes land near Exeter and along key transport corridors. This area is deemed to be the most sustainable strategic location due to the colocation of housing and jobs. The site falls within this strategically important area, which has been identified for both housing and employment growth due to its connectivity and existing infrastructure. As explained in the following section, the site benefits from close proximity and sustainable transport connectivity to a significant range of employment opportunities. b) Sustainability and Infrastructure Support The West End is considered a highly sustainable development location because of existing and planned infrastructure, including public transport links, green infrastructure, and employment opportunities. The plan aims to cluster development in areas where services can be efficiently provided, reducing the need for car travel and minimising environmental impact. The site is perfectly placed to benefit from this existing and planned infrastructure growth. c) Proximity to the Clyst Valley Regional Park The sustainability appraisal of the Local Plan emphasises the importance of integrating new developments with the Clyst Valley Regional Park to provide green infrastructure, enhance biodiversity, and mitigate recreational pressure on sensitive sites. The site's location offers potential for such integration and enhancement by extending the regional park, thereby contributing to the plan's environmental objectives. d) Economic Growth and Job Creation The spatial strategy supports employment-led growth in the West End, recognising its role as a hub for high-value industries, including those linked to the Science Park and Exeter's economy. Development on the site would contribute to this vision by providing new homes for the future employees of the area.

6. For these reasons the site is compatible with the Local Plan spatial strategy because it supports sustainable development principles, aligns with infrastructure investment priorities, and fits within the overarching goal of focusing growth in the West End. EDDC has identified it as a viable option for development, pending resolution of access

issues, making it a strategic and sustainable choice for future expansionSuitably and Sustainably Located

7. The evidence produced by EDDC clearly demonstrates that the site represents a suitable and sustainable location for development. The two key pieces of evidence which point to this conclusion are the Sustainability Appraisal and the East of Exeter (brcl_31) Site Selection Report.

8. The former compiles high-level evidence regarding the sustainability of the site within the framework of the 13 objectives of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). While the analysis conducted by the East Devon District Council (EDDC) and its consultants, LUC, indicates that the site is a suitable location, the methodology used does not consider potential mitigation options available. These options could address, and in some instances, overcome the adverse impacts of development. Furthermore, it does not account for opportunities for the development to enhance public benefits.

9. The analysis below responds to each of the SA objectives, commenting upon the 'score' that has been attributed to the site and how this would change through suitable design and/or mitigation measures.

[Table of information which can be viewed via the attached PDF]

Suitably and Sustainably Located

7. The evidence produced by EDDC clearly demonstrates that the site represents a suitable and sustainable location for development. The two key pieces of evidence which point to this conclusion are the Sustainability Appraisal and the East of Exeter (brcl_31) Site Selection Report.

8. The former compiles high-level evidence regarding the sustainability of the site within the framework of the 13 objectives of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). While the analysis conducted by the East Devon District Council (EDDC) and its consultants, LUC, indicates that the site is a suitable location, the methodology used does not consider potential mitigation options available. These options could address, and in some instances, overcome the adverse impacts of development. Furthermore, it does not account for opportunities for the development to enhance public benefits.

9. The analysis below responds to each of the SA objectives, commenting upon the 'score' that has been attributed to the site and how this would change through suitable design and/or mitigation measures. "The proposed development would accommodate approximately 1000 dwellings, land for educational use and extensive areas of public open space (including a country park), which would collectively represent a sustainable

community that could benefit future and existing residence within the Western part of East Devon. But because of highway access concerns allocation is not credible." Conclusion 16. Based upon the EDDC evidence it is clear that there are no environmental constraints to development on the site and that the location is considered a sustainable opportunity to deliver strategic scale development. The only outstanding concerned raised by policy officers is highways, a matter addressed in the following section. Available for Development 17. Mac Mic is promoting the land with the express intention of securing planning permission for the site prior to bringing the land forward to the market for development. 18. The only outstanding matter to resolve with regards availability of the land for development is the creation of a suitable vehicle access. To that end, Mac Mic are in extensive negotiations with National Highways and Devon County Highways regarding the creation of an access from the B3181 in the north and from Langaton Lane to the south. There is a good degree of confidence at this will result in a legal agreement that enables the delivery of a vehicle access into the site. Whilst this has not been completed yet, it is anticipated that agreement will be reached in advance of the Local Plan Examination. 19. Once the access arrangements have been resolved, the site will be available and development achievable within the Plan period.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: Overall Conclusion 20. The current Draft Regulation 19 Local Plan is not consistent with national policy and therefore sound as it does not currently propose a housing requirement which would deliver the Standard Method output, nor allocate sufficient land to accommodate the Standard Method output. Inaccordance with our representation to Policy SP02 it is therefore necessary to increase the supply of housing land by a minimum of 5,227 homes during the plan period. 21. Consistent with the Local Plan evidence base and this representation, the Land at Mosshayne is a suitable, sustainable and achievable location to deliver a significant proportion of the housing land supply shortfall. Indeed, it could deliver up to 1,000 homes as part of a new neighbourhood which is compatible with the spatial strategy and exceptionally well located close to existing services, facilities, employment opportunities and sustainable transport infrastructure. Once the highway accessibility of the site has been confirmed, there is no reason why the land could not therefore be allocated in order to remedy the land supply shortfall that currently renders the Plan unsound.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Nick Matthews

Organisation (where relevant): Savills

Other party name (if relevant): Mac Mic Strategic Land

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Introduction

1. This representation is submitted by Savills on behalf of Mac Mic Strategic Land (from hereon referred to as 'Mac Mic'). Mac Mic is a strategic land promoter with a strong reputation for delivering planning permissions that lead to high-quality development.

2. Mac Mic has instructed Savills on their behalf to submit a series of representations to the relevant policies of the Regulation 19 Local Plan, including this policy. Policy SP02

3. Policy SP02 of the Local Plan Regulation 19 Pre-Submission Draft (the 'Plan') sets out the proposed housing requirement for East Devon District Council (EDDC) during the plan period. It states that at least 20,909 dwellings will be delivered between 1 April 2020 and 31 March 2042. This is proposed to be split into two phases with 850 dwellings per annum in the first phase from 2020/21 to 2031/32 and 1,070 dwellings per annum in the second phase from 2032/33 to 2041/42.

4. We have two specific objections to the draft housing requirement proposed in Policy SP02 of the Local Plan. These are as follows: a. The Local Plan cannot proceed under the transitional arrangements and the housing requirement must therefore reflect the revised Standard Method for calculating local housing need; and b. The emerging Exeter Local Plan does not propose the delivery of a level of housing which matches it's local housing need as defined by the Standard Method. There is therefore a shortfall across the HMA which should be addressed by the neighbouring authorities underthe Duty to Cooperate as strengthened by the December 2024 NPPF.

5. The remainder of this representation addresses these matters in turn before concluding on the changes that it is considered are needed to remedy the unsoundness of the Local Plan. Standard Method Starting Point for Establishing Local Housing Need

6. It is evident from both the Forward to the Plan and the Justification for Policy SP02 that EDDC has initiated consultation on the Local Plan prematurely. The reason for this is clear; EDDC is seeking to take advantage of the transitional arrangements of the National Planning Policy Framework (the 'Framework') to advance with a housing requirement that is lower than the Government's revised Standard Method for determining local housing need.

7. This intention is no more obvious than in how the proposed housing requirement has been described in paragraph 3.11 of the Plan. The justification for the policy in this paragraph explains that the requirement has been set at a level that just (by less than one dwelling per annum) exceeds the 80% threshold in paragraph 234(a) of the Framework.

8. This approach flies in the face of the spirit and purpose of the transitional arrangements, and the Government's aim of delivering 1.5m new homes across the country during the course of this Parliament. These provisions are intended to enable Local Plans to progress where an emerging local plan has already reached an advanced stage but not yet made it to Regulation 19 so as not to render existing work wasted, not to set a minimum threshold for Local Plans which are at Regulation 18 stage. However, this is precisely how it has been approached by EDDC.

9. As the intention is clear, we do not consider that the Local Plan consultation is able to proceed on the basis of the transitional arrangements and on that basis this crucial strategic policy of the Local Plan is unsound. 10. Annex One of the Framework details the arrangement for emerging local plans. There are various scenarios which could apply depending upon the stage that the emerging local plan has reached. The extract from Paragraph 234(a) of the Framework which EDDC is seeking to rely upon is copied below: "234. For the purpose of preparing local plans, the policies in this version of the Framework will apply from 12 March 2025 other than where one or more of the following apply: a. the plan has reached Regulation 19 82 (pre-submission stage) on or before 12 March 2025, and its draft housing requirement meets at least 80% of local housing need 83." 11. There are two related footnotes to paragraph 234. The first of these – Footnote 82 – is as follows: "Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 ('the Regulations'). In this context "reached Regulation 19" refers to when Regulation 19 has been complied with (i.e. when the planning authority has made a copy of each of the proposed submission documents and a statement of the representations procedure available, and the statements required in Regulation 19(b) have been sent to consultation bodies)." [emphasis added] 12. The reference to "each of the proposed submission documents" within Regulation 19 of the Regulations is explicit and very important. In order to be considered to have reached Regulation 19, the whole of the Plan, i.e. each component part of the 'submission documents', must have been made available. This is a very deliberate piece of drafting by Government and

we suspect its purpose is to preclude circumstances where a local planning authority could progress under the transitional arrangements contrary to their spirit and purpose. 13. Not all of the proposed submission documents for EDDC have been published. Indeed, the 'About this Consultation' section of the Local Plan states explicitly that: "Consultation starts on Thursday 13 February 2025. This will be the first planned phase of Regulation 19 consultation. A second phases of Regulation 19 consultation is planned to run from Spring 2025 through to the early summer (dates to be confirmed). Thereafter the plan will be submitted for examination in Autumn 2025." 14. Mac Mic contend that the Local Plan cannot therefore proceed under the transitional arrangements and that none of the exceptions contained within paragraph 234 of the Framework apply. 15. In such circumstances the housing requirement must reflect paragraph 62 of the Framework: "To determine the minimum number of homes needed, strategic policies should be informed by a local housing need assessment, conducted using the standard method in national planning practice guidance. In addition to the local housing need figure, any needs that cannot be met within neighbouring areas should also be taken into account in establishing the amount of housing to be planned for". 16. There are two relevant components to this policy. The first explicitly and unambiguously requires local planning authorities to use the Standard Method as prescribed in the PPG, the second, addressing the unmet needs of neighbouring authorities, is addressed later in sub-section (b) of this Representation. There is no room for manoeuvre, with the references in the December 2023 Framework to 'exceptional circumstances' having very deliberately been deleted. 17. The Standard Method output for East Devon from the revised methodology of the PPG is 1,188 dwellings per annum (dpa) as acknowledged in paragraph 3.11 of the Plan. For the reasons set out above, it is this figure which the Plan must put in place proposals to deliver in order to satisfy the 'Positively Prepared' test of soundness in paragraph 36(a) of the Framework. As it stands, the Plan is unsound and significant Main Modifications are required to allocate a minimum of an additional 5,227 dwellings during the plan period to redress this shortcoming. Accommodating the unmet housing needs of Exeter City Council 18. The Exeter Plan (Regulation 19) was published for consultation in December 2024. Policy H2 establishes a housing requirement for the plan period of 642 dpa between 2021 and 2041. This housing requirement is based on the previous version of the Standard Method. The revised version of the Standard Method increases the requirement to 800 dpa. 19. Whilst The Exeter Plan is progressing in accordance with the transitional arrangements, there is nevertheless a shortfall against the latest assessed local housing needs. This shortfall is not addressed in the (undated) Duty to Cooperate Statement which states in relation to 'Housing – meeting neighbouring housing requirements': "There are no requests to meet the housing requirements on other local planning authorities at this stage. Early in the plan making, Torbay Council requested that the Exeter Housing Market Area (which includes the western part of East Devon) help to meetits housing requirement. This issue has been resolved through the

examination of the Teignbridge Local Plan, which borders Torbay". 20. It is not clear when this Statement was produced but it appears that it has since become out of date. Regardless of any request from a neighbouring authority, it is evident from the figures above that a shortfall now exists. 21. In such circumstances the Framework is clear that unmet needs for neighbouring authorities should be accommodated. Indeed, the publication of the revised Framework in December 2024 significantly changed national policy in respect of the approach to housing supply and the accommodation of sufficient land for housing. It is now explicitly clear that the plan-making authority must plan for a scale of growth which accommodates their own local housing need as defined by the Standard Method and, where appropriate, some or all of the local housing need of the neighbouring authorities if those needs cannot be accommodated within their respective authority areas. Of particular relevance are the following paragraphs of the Framework: "24. Effective strategic planning across local planning authority boundaries will play a vital and increasing role in how sustainable growth is delivered, by addressing key spatial issues including meeting housing needs, delivering strategic infrastructure and building economic and climate resilience. Local planning authorities and county councils (in two-tier areas) continue to be under a duty to cooperate with each other, and with other prescribed bodies, on strategic matters that cross administrative boundaries. 27. Once the matters which require collaboration have been identified, strategic policymaking authorities should make sure that their plan policies align as fully as possible with those of other bodies where a strategic relationship exists on these matters, and take into account the relevant investment plans of infrastructure providers, unless there is a clear justification to the contrary. In particular their plans should ensure that: … b) unmet development needs from neighbouring areas are provided for in accordance with paragraph 11b. 36. Local plans and spatial development strategies are examined to assess whether they have been prepared in accordance with legal and procedural requirements, and whether they are sound. Plans are 'sound' if they are: a) Positively prepared – providing a strategy which, as a minimum, seeks to meet the area's objectively assessed needs; and is informed by agreements with other authorities, so that unmet need from neighbouring areas is accommodated where it is practical to do so and is consistent with achieving sustainable development; 62. To determine the minimum number of homes needed, strategic policies should be informed by a local housing need assessment, conducted using the standard method in national planning practice guidance. In addition to the local housing need figure, any needs that cannot be met within neighbouring areas should also be taken into account in establishing the amount of housing to be planned for." [emphasis added] 22. These policies are very clear. If an unmet need from a neighbouring authority exists, then it is a responsibility of the plan making authority to engage through the duty to cooperate to determine where that need is to be accommodated. Not only is this required in order to produce a sound plan, but it is crucial to address the housing affordability challenges within the area which have a

direct impact on the lives of those people living across the Exeter Housing Market Area. 23. The key question is how much growth should the East Devon Local Plan seek to accommodate to address the unmet needs of its neighbours. It would appear that there is no agreement on this at present and that there is therefore a degree of uncertainty. 24. Prior to the December 2024 Framework there was no clear guidance available to plan making authorities or inspectors as to how to respond in such circumstances. However, the revised Framework directly addresses this matter. The new paragraph 28 acknowledges that: "28. In order to demonstrate effective and on-going joint working, strategic policymaking authorities should prepare and maintain one or more statements of common ground, documenting the cross-boundary matters being addressed and progress in cooperating to address these. These should be produced using the approach set out in national planning practice guidance, and be made publicly available throughout the plan-making process to provide transparency. Plans come forward at different times, and there may be a degree of uncertainty about the future direction of relevant development plans or the plans of infrastructure providers. In such circumstances strategic policy-making authorities and Inspectors will need to come to an informed decision on the basis of available information, rather than waiting for a full set of evidence from other authorities." 25. It is therefore incumbent upon the authorities to come to an evidenced judgement and to uplift the housing land supply to reflect those needs and we urge the authorities to come together as soon as possible to come to a view on the appropriate distribution. Conclusion 26. "This Government has inherited an acute and entrenched housing crisis." (Minister of State for Housing and Planning - Matthew Pennycook MP – in his Statement introducing the revisions to the NPPF on 12 December 2024). 27. For decades too few homes have been constructed across the country, housing affordability has spiralled and millions of households are unable to access the housing market. The new Government has moved rapidly and radically to revise national planning policy within six months of the General Election in order to put in place policies designed to increase the number of new homes being planned for and delivered. It's target of 1.5 million new homes during the current parliament is a hugely important ambition for the Government but it will be extremely challenging to achieve unless there is a dramatic change in approach from all parties involved in the planning and delivery of new homes. 28. EDDC needs to play its part in addressing the housing crisis. Rather than trying force an unsound plan through under the transitional arrangements to justify a lower housing requirement the Council should have positively and proactively sought to update the policies and proposals of the Local Plan to reflect the local housing need as defined by the revised Standard Method. This misses thepoint of the new standard method entirely, which is to significantly increase the amount of housing delivery nationally for both social and economic reasons. 29. As it stands, the transitional arrangements do not apply to EDDC as not all of the Local Plan has been published for consultation in accordance with the requirements of Regulation 19 of the Regulations. The housing requirement in Policy SP02 of the draft

Local Plan is therefore unsound. In accordance with the paragraph 36 of the Framework, the housing requirement and related elements of the Local Plan must be updated to reflect the revised Standard Method. 30. In addition to the housing needs of EDDC are the wider unmet needs of the housing market area. If EDDC doesn't seek to accommodate a proportion of the revised Standard Method for Exeter City there is a significant risk of under-delivery across the HMA. This under-delivery won't just affect the communities of Exeter City but it will increase the pressure on housing and affordability in East Devon. 31. The housing requirement for the emerging Local Plan should therefore be uplifted to reflect the updated Standard Method and to accommodate a proportion of the unmet need for housing arising from Exeter City.

Full name: Nick Matthews

Organisation (where relevant): Savills

Other party name (if relevant): Mac Mic Strategic Land

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: Yes

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: See attached.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: See attached.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : See attached.

Full name: Nick Matthews

Organisation (where relevant): Savills

Other party name (if relevant): Mac Mic Strategic Land

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: Yes

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: See attached.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: See attached.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : See attached.

Full name: Nick Matthews

Organisation (where relevant): Savills

Other party name (if relevant): Mac Mic Strategic Land

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: See attached.

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : See attached.

Full name: Dan Yeates

Organisation (where relevant): Savills

Other party name (if relevant): Sidbury LVA LLP

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: No

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Draft Policy SP02 sets out the proposed housing requirement for the plan period. It states that at least 20,909 dwellings will be delivered between 1 April 2020 and 31 March 2042. However, this is proposed to be split into two phases with 850 dwellings per annum in the first phase from 2020/21 to 2031/32 and 1,070 dwellings per annum in the second phase from 2032/33 to 2041/42.

We have concerns over the approach taken in draft Policy SP02 for the following reasons:

• Uncertainty over whether the Local Plan can proceed under the transitional arrangements

• The proposed stepped trajectory

We address each of the two matters in turn below.

UNCERTAINTY OVER WHETHER THE LOCAL PLAN CAN PROCEED UNDER THE TRANSITIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

From our reading of the Forward to the Plan and the Justification for Policy SP02, it is clear that the Council has commenced consultation on the Plan before it is ready, with the intention to try and take advantage of the transitional arrangements contained in Annex 1 of the NPPF, and proceed with a housing requirement that falls below the Government's revised Standard Method output.

This intention is very clear when reading how the proposed housing requirement has been described in paragraph 3.11 of the Plan. This justification for the policy in this paragraph explains that the requirement has been set at a level which just, by less than one dwelling per annum, exceeds the 80% threshold in paragraph 234(a) of the NPPF.

In our view this approach is not in accordance with the purpose of the transitional arrangements. These provisions are intended to enable Local Plans to progress where an emerging local plan has advanced but not yet reached the Regulation 19 stage, not to set a minimum threshold for Local Plans for plans which are at Regulation 18 stage. This is unfortunately how the Regulation 19 plan reads.

However, more fundamentally, we are concerned over whether the Local Plan consultation is even able to proceed on the basis of the transitional arrangements. The relevant extract from Paragraph 234(a) of the Framework is copied below:

"234. For the purpose of preparing local plans, the policies in this version of the Framework will apply from 12 March 2025 other than where one or more of the following apply:

a. the plan has reached Regulation 19 82 (pre-submission stage) on or before 12 March 2025, and its draft housing requirement meets at least 80% of local housing need 83."

This is supported by two related footnotes. The first of these – Footnote 82 – is as follows:

"Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. In this context "reached Regulation 19" refers to when Regulation 19 has been complied with (i.e. when the planning authority has made a copy of each of the proposed submission documents and a statement of the representations procedure available, and the statements required in Regulation 19(b) have been sent to consultation bodies)."

The reference to "each of the proposed submission documents" is very important. In order to be considered to have reached Regulation 19, the whole of the Plan, i.e. each component part of a Regulation 19 local plan, must have been made available. This is a very deliberate piece of drafting by Government intended to preclude circumstances where a local planning authority could progress under the transitional arrangement contrary to their spirit and purpose.

On the basis of the above we consider there is significant risk that the Local Plan may not be able to proceed under the transitional arrangements and that none of the exceptions contained within paragraph 234 of the Framework apply.

In these circumstances, it is our view that the housing requirement must reflect paragraph 62 of the Framework:

"To determine the minimum number of homes needed, strategic policies should be informed by a local housing need assessment, conducted using the standard method in national planning practice guidance. In addition to the local housing need figure, any needs that cannot be met within neighbouring areas should also be taken into account in establishing the amount of housing to be planned for".

STEPPED HOUSING TRAJECTORY

In very simple terms, we consider that there is absolutely no justification for adopting a stepped trajectory in the draft plan for that reduces the housing requirement for the five years (approx.) post-adoption and pushes the resultant backlog that this creates to the later years of the plan period.

The Planning Practice Guidance helpfully attends directly to the question of 'When is a stepped housing requirement appropriate for plan-making?'. In so doing it provide the following guidance:

"A stepped housing requirement may be appropriate where there is to be a significant change in the level of housing requirement between emerging and previous policies and / or where strategic sites will have a phased delivery or are likely to be delivered later in the plan period. Strategic policy-makers will need to identify the stepped requirement in strategic housing policy, and to set out evidence to support this approach, and not seek to unnecessarily delay meeting identified development needs. Stepped requirements will need to ensure that planned housing requirements are met fully within the plan period. In reviewing and revising policies, strategic policy-makers should ensure there is not continued delay in meeting identified development needs."

The guidance also advises that evidence must be provided to support a stepped approach if one is proposed. There is no such evidence in the draft plan or the evidence base.

Overall, the Council needs to play its part in addressing the housing crisis. Rather than trying to do the bare minimum to scrape through under the transitional arrangements, the Council could and should have positively and proactively sought to update the policies and proposals of the Local Plan to reflect the local housing need as defined by the revised Standard Method.

As it stands, the transitional arrangements may not apply to EDDC as not all of the Local Plan has been published for consultation. In accordance with the paragraph 36 of the Framework, the housing requirement and related elements of the Local Plan should therefore be updated to reflect the revised Standard Method.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: UNCERTAINTY OVER WHETHER THE LOCAL PLAN CAN PROCEED UNDER THE TRANSITIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

The Standard Method output for East Devon from the revised methodology of the PPG is 1,188 dwellings per annum (dpa) as acknowledged in paragraph 3.11 of the draft Local Plan. For the reasons set out above, it is this figure which the Plan must put in place in order to satisfy the 'Positively Prepared' test of soundness in paragraph 36(a) of the NPPF. As it stands, our view is the draft Local Plan is unsound and may require significant Main Modifications to allocate a minimum of an additional 5,227 dwellings during the plan period to redress this shortcoming.

STEPPED HOUSING TRAJECTORY

In our view, the housing requirement for the draft Local Plan should therefore be increased in order to reflect the updated Standard Method.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: No

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : It is important that Sidbury LVA LLP is present to participate in the hearing session for Policy SP02 owing to their interest in Land South of Furzehill (Sidm_34). It is important that they are given the opportunity to make their case in relation to this policy.

Full name: Dan Yeates

Organisation (where relevant): Savills

Other party name (if relevant): Summerfield Homes

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: No

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Draft Policy SP02 sets out the proposed housing requirement for the plan period. It states that at least 20,909 dwellings will be delivered between 1 April 2020 and 31 March 2042. However, this is proposed to be split into two phases with 850 dwellings per annum in the first phase from 2020/21 to 2031/32 and 1,070 dwellings per annum in the second phase from 2032/33 to 2041/42.

We have concerns over the approach taken in draft Policy SP02 for the following reasons:

• Uncertainty over whether the Local Plan can proceed under the transitional arrangements

• The proposed stepped trajectory

We address each of the two matters in turn below.

UNCERTAINTY OVER WHETHER THE LOCAL PLAN CAN PROCEED UNDER THE TRANSITIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

From our reading of the Forward to the Plan and the Justification for Policy SP02, it is clear that the Council has commenced consultation on the Plan before it is ready, with the intention to try and take advantage of the transitional arrangements contained in Annex 1 of the NPPF, and proceed with a housing requirement that falls below the Government's revised Standard Method output.

This intention is very clear when reading how the proposed housing requirement has been described in paragraph 3.11 of the Plan. This justification for the policy in this paragraph explains that the requirement has been set at a level which just, by less than one dwelling per annum, exceeds the 80% threshold in paragraph 234(a) of the NPPF.

In our view this approach is not in accordance with the purpose of the transitional arrangements. These provisions are intended to enable Local Plans to progress where an emerging local plan has advanced but not yet reached the Regulation 19 stage, not to set a minimum threshold for Local Plans for plans which are at Regulation 18 stage. This is unfortunately how the Regulation 19 plan reads.

However, more fundamentally, we are concerned over whether the Local Plan consultation is even able to proceed on the basis of the transitional arrangements. The relevant extract from Paragraph 234(a) of the Framework is copied below:

"234. For the purpose of preparing local plans, the policies in this version of the Framework will apply from 12 March 2025 other than where one or more of the following apply:

"a. the plan has reached Regulation 19 82 (pre-submission stage) on or before 12 March 2025, and its draft housing requirement meets at least 80% of local housing need 83."

This is supported by two related footnotes. The first of these – Footnote 82 – is as follows:

"Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. In this context "reached Regulation 19" refers to when Regulation 19 has been complied with (i.e. when the planning authority has made a copy of each of the proposed submission documents and a statement of the representations procedure available, and the statements required in Regulation 19(b) have been sent to consultation bodies)."

The reference to "each of the proposed submission documents" is very important. In order to be considered to have reached Regulation 19, the whole of the Plan, i.e. each component part of a Regulation 19 local plan, must have been made available. This is a very deliberate piece of drafting by Government intended to preclude circumstances where a local planning authority could progress under the transitional arrangement contrary to their spirit and purpose.

On the basis of the above we consider there is significant risk that the Local Plan may not be able to proceed under the transitional arrangements and that none of the exceptions contained within paragraph 234 of the Framework apply.

In these circumstances, it is our view that the housing requirement must reflect paragraph 62 of the Framework:

"To determine the minimum number of homes needed, strategic policies should be informed by a local housing need assessment, conducted using the standard method in national planning practice guidance. In addition to the local housing need figure, any needs that cannot be met within neighbouring areas should also be taken into account in establishing the amount of housing to be planned for".

STEPPED HOUSING TRAJECTORY

In very simple terms, we consider that there is absolutely no justification for adopting a stepped trajectory in the draft plan for that reduces the housing requirement for the five

years (approx.) post-adoption and pushes the resultant backlog that this creates to the later years of the plan period.

The Planning Practice Guidance helpfully attends directly to the question of 'When is a stepped housing requirement appropriate for plan-making?'. In so doing it provide the following guidance:

"A stepped housing requirement may be appropriate where there is to be a significant change in the level of housing requirement between emerging and previous policies and / or where strategic sites will have a phased delivery or are likely to be delivered later in the plan period. Strategic policy-makers will need to identify the stepped requirement in strategic housing policy, and to set out evidence to support this approach, and not seek to unnecessarily delay meeting identified development needs. Stepped requirements will need to ensure that planned housing requirements are met fully within the plan period. In reviewing and revising policies, strategic policy-makers should ensure there is not continued delay in meeting identified development needs."

The guidance also advises that evidence must be provided to support a stepped approach if one is proposed. There is no such evidence in the draft plan or the evidence base.

Overall, the Council needs to play its part in addressing the housing crisis. Rather than trying to do the bare minimum to scrape through under the transitional arrangements, the Council could and should have positively and proactively sought to update the policies and proposals of the Local Plan to reflect the local housing need as defined by the revised Standard Method.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: UNCERTAINTY OVER WHETHER THE LOCAL PLAN CAN PROCEED UNDER THE TRANSITIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

The Standard Method output for East Devon from the revised methodology of the PPG is 1,188 dwellings per annum (dpa) as acknowledged in paragraph 3.11 of the draft Local

Plan. For the reasons set out above, it is this figure which the Plan must put in place in order to satisfy the 'Positively Prepared' test of soundness in paragraph 36(a) of the NPPF. As it stands, our view is the draft Local Plan is unsound and may require significant Main Modifications to allocate a minimum of an additional 5,227 dwellings during the plan period to redress this shortcoming.

STEPPED HOUSING TRAJECTORY

As it stands, the transitional arrangements do not apply to EDDC as not all of the Local Plan has been published for consultation. In accordance with the paragraph 36 of the Framework, the housing requirement and related elements of the Local Plan should therefore be updated to reflect the revised Standard Method. In our view, the housing requirement for the draft Local Plan should therefore be increased in order to reflect the updated Standard Method.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: No

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : It is important that Summerfield Homes Ltd is present to participate in the hearing session for Policy SP02 owing to their interest in the Land adjacent to Markers Park, Payhembury (Payh_03a). It is important that they are given the opportunity to make their case in relation to this policy.

Full name: Dan Yeates

Organisation (where relevant): Savills

Other party name (if relevant): 3West Group

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: No

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Draft Policy SP02 sets out the proposed housing requirement for the plan period. It states that at least 20,909 dwellings will be delivered between 1 April 2020 and 31 March 2042. However, this is proposed to be split into two phases with 850 dwellings per annum in the first phase from 2020/21 to 2031/32 and 1,070 dwellings per annum in the second phase from 2032/33 to 2041/42.

We have concerns over the approach taken in draft Policy SP02 for the following reasons:

• Uncertainty over whether the Local Plan can proceed under the transitional arrangements

• The proposed stepped trajectory

We address each of the two matters in turn below.

UNCERTAINTY OVER WHETHER THE LOCAL PLAN CAN PROCEED UNDER THE TRANSITIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

From our reading of the Forward to the Plan and the Justification for Policy SP02, it is clear that the Council has commenced consultation on the Plan before it is ready, with the intention to try and take advantage of the transitional arrangements contained in Annex 1 of the NPPF, and proceed with a housing requirement that falls below the Government's revised Standard Method output.

This intention is very clear when reading how the proposed housing requirement has been described in paragraph 3.11 of the Plan. This justification for the policy in this paragraph explains that the requirement has been set at a level which just, by less than one dwelling per annum, exceeds the 80% threshold in paragraph 234(a) of the NPPF.

In our view this approach is not in accordance with the purpose of the transitional arrangements. These provisions are intended to enable Local Plans to progress where an emerging local plan has advanced but not yet reached the Regulation 19 stage, not to set a minimum threshold for Local Plans for plans which are at Regulation 18 stage. This is unfortunately how the Regulation 19 plan reads.

However, more fundamentally, we are concerned over whether the Local Plan consultation is even able to proceed on the basis of the transitional arrangements. The relevant extract from Paragraph 234(a) of the Framework is copied below:

"234. For the purpose of preparing local plans, the policies in this version of the Framework will apply from 12 March 2025 other than where one or more of the following apply:

a. the plan has reached Regulation 19 82 (pre-submission stage) on or before 12 March 2025, and its draft housing requirement meets at least 80% of local housing need 83."

This is supported by two related footnotes. The first of these – Footnote 82 – is as follows:

"Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. In this context "reached Regulation 19" refers to when Regulation 19 has been complied with (i.e. when the planning authority has made a copy of each of the proposed submission documents and a statement of the representations procedure available, and the statements required in Regulation 19(b) have been sent to consultation bodies)."

The reference to "each of the proposed submission documents" is very important. In order to be considered to have reached Regulation 19, the whole of the Plan, i.e. each component part of a Regulation 19 local plan, must have been made available. This is a very deliberate piece of drafting by Government intended to preclude circumstances where a local planning authority could progress under the transitional arrangement contrary to their spirit and purpose.

On the basis of the above we consider there is significant risk that the Local Plan may not be able to proceed under the transitional arrangements and that none of the exceptions contained within paragraph 234 of the Framework apply.

In these circumstances, it is our view that the housing requirement must reflect paragraph 62 of the Framework:

"To determine the minimum number of homes needed, strategic policies should be informed by a local housing need assessment, conducted using the standard method in national planning practice guidance. In addition to the local housing need figure, any needs that cannot be met within neighbouring areas should also be taken into account in establishing the amount of housing to be planned for".

STEPPED HOUSING TRAJECTORY

In very simple terms, we consider that there is absolutely no justification for adopting a stepped trajectory in the draft plan for that reduces the housing requirement for the five years (approx.) post-adoption and pushes the resultant backlog that this creates to the later years of the plan period.

The Planning Practice Guidance helpfully attends directly to the question of 'When is a stepped housing requirement appropriate for plan-making?'. In so doing it provide the following guidance:

"A stepped housing requirement may be appropriate where there is to be a significant change in the level of housing requirement between emerging and previous policies and / or where strategic sites will have a phased delivery or are likely to be delivered later in the plan period. Strategic policy-makers will need to identify the stepped requirement in strategic housing policy, and to set out evidence to support this approach, and not seek to unnecessarily delay meeting identified development needs. Stepped requirements will need to ensure that planned housing requirements are met fully within the plan period. In reviewing and revising policies, strategic policy-makers should ensure there is not continued delay in meeting identified development needs."

The guidance also advises that evidence must be provided to support a stepped approach if one is proposed. There is no such evidence in the draft plan or the evidence base.

Overall, the Council needs to play its part in addressing the housing crisis. Rather than trying to do the bare minimum to scrape through under the transitional arrangements, the Council could and should have positively and proactively sought to update the policies and proposals of the Local Plan to reflect the local housing need as defined by the revised Standard Method.

As it stands, the transitional arrangements may not apply to EDDC as not all of the Local Plan has been published for consultation. In accordance with the paragraph 36 of the Framework, the housing requirement and related elements of the Local Plan should therefore be updated to reflect the revised Standard Method.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: UNCERTAINTY OVER WHETHER THE LOCAL PLAN CAN PROCEED UNDER THE TRANSITIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

The Standard Method output for East Devon from the revised methodology of the PPG is 1,188 dwellings per annum (dpa) as acknowledged in paragraph 3.11 of the draft Local Plan. For the reasons set out above, it is this figure which the Plan must put in place in order to satisfy the 'Positively Prepared' test of soundness in paragraph 36(a) of the NPPF. As it stands, our view is the draft Local Plan is unsound and may require significant Main Modifications to allocate a minimum of an additional 5,227 dwellings during the plan period to redress this shortcoming.

STEPPED HOUSING TRAJECTORY

In our view, the housing requirement for the draft Local Plan should therefore be increased in order to reflect the updated Standard Method.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: No

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : It is important that 3West Group is present to participate in the hearing session for Policy SP02 owing to their interest in the Land north and east of Exton Farm (Wood_28). It is important that they are given the opportunity to make their case in relation to this policy.

Full name: Dan Yeates

Organisation (where relevant): Savills

Other party name (if relevant): The Exeter Diocesan Board of Finance Ltd

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: No

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: This Representation is made in response to the consultation on the East Devon Local Plan Regulation 19 Publication Draft, and is submitted by Savills on behalf of The Exeter Diocesan Board of Finance Ltd who have an interest in land south of The Vicarage, Broadhembury. The site was previously assessed by the Council under reference Brhe_07 (Land south of The Vicarage, Broadhembury) but is not currently included within the plan as a draft allocation. Our comments on this consultation and supporting evidence base are set out below and are made in accordance with paragraph 36 of the revised NPPF (e.g. that they are positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy), to assist in ensuring that the Local Plan is found sound when examined in the future. However, in its current form, we do not consider that the Local Plan is sound, and should not therefore progress to submission without amendment. Response to Draft Policies The following section sets out our responses to the draft policies within the Draft Plan. Strategic Policy SP02: Levels of Future Housing Development Draft Policy SP02 sets out the proposed housing requirement for the plan period. It states that at least 20,909 dwellings will be delivered between 1 April 2020 and 31 March 2042. However, this is proposed to be split into two phases with 850 dwellings per annum in the first phase from 2020/21 to 2031/32 and 1,070 dwellings per annum in the second phase from 2032/33 to 2041/42. We have concerns over the approach taken in draft Policy SP02 for the following reasons:

• Uncertainty over whether the Local Plan can proceed under the transitional arrangements

• The proposed stepped trajectory From our reading of the Forward to the Plan and the Justification for Policy SP02, it is clear that the Council has commenced consultation on the Plan before it is ready, with the intention to try and take advantage of the transitional arrangements contained in Annex 1 of the NPPF, and proceed with a housing requirement that falls below the Government's revised Standard Method output. This intention is very clear when reading how the proposed housing requirement has been described in paragraph 3.11 of the Plan. This justification for the policy in this paragraph explains that the requirement has been set at a level which just, by less than one dwelling per annum, exceeds the 80% threshold in paragraph 234(a) of the NPPF. In our view this approach is not in accordance with the purpose of the transitional arrangements. These provisions are intended to enable Local Plans to progress where an emerging local plan has advanced but not yet reached the Regulation 19 stage, not to set a minimum threshold for Local Plans for plans which are at Regulation 18 stage. This is unfortunately how the Regulation 19 plan reads. However, more fundamentally, we are concerned over whether the Local Plan consultation is even able to proceed on the basis of the transitional arrangements. The relevant extract from Paragraph 234(a) of the Framework is copied below: "234. For the purpose of preparing local plans, the policies in this version of the Framework will apply from 12 March 2025 other than where one or more of the following apply: a. the plan has reached Regulation 19 82 (pre-submission stage) on or before 12 March 2025, and its draft housing requirement meets at least 80% of local housing need 83." This is supported by two related footnotes. The first of these – Footnote 82 – is as follows: "Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. In this context "reached Regulation 19" refers to when Regulation 19 has been complied with (i.e. when the planning authority has made a copy of each of the proposed submission documents and a statement of the representations procedure available, and the statements required in Regulation 19(b) have been sent to consultation bodies)." (emphasis added) The reference to "each of the proposed submission documents" is very important. In order to be considered to have reached Regulation 19, the whole of the Plan, i.e. each component part of a Regulation 19 local plan, must have been made available. This is a very deliberate piece of drafting by Government intended to preclude circumstances where a local planning authority could progress under the transitional arrangement contrary to their spirit and purpose. On the basis of the above we consider there is significant risk that the Local Plan may not be able to proceed under the transitional arrangements and that none of the exceptions contained within paragraph 234 of the Framework apply. In these circumstances, it is our view that the housing requirement must reflect paragraph 62 of the Framework. The Standard Method output for East Devon from the revised methodology of the PPG is 1,188 dwellings per annum (dpa) as acknowledged in paragraph 3.11 of the draft Local Plan. For the reasons set out above, it is this figure which the Plan must put in place in order to satisfy the 'Positively Prepared' test of soundness in paragraph 36(a) of the NPPF. As it stands, our view is the draft Local

Plan is unsound and may require significant Main Modifications to allocate a minimum of an additional 5,227 dwellings during the plan period to redress this shortcoming. In terms of the proposed stepped housing trajectory, in very simple terms, we consider that there is absolutely no justification for adopting a stepped trajectory in the draft plan for that reduces the housing requirement for the five years (approx.) post-adoption and pushes the resultant backlog that this creates to the later years of the plan period. Overall, the Council needs to play its part in addressing the housing crisis. Rather than trying to do the bare minimum to scrape through under the transitional arrangements, the Council could and should have positively and proactively sought to update the policies and proposals of the Local Plan to reflect the local housing need as defined by the revised Standard Method. As it stands, the transitional arrangements do not apply to EDDC as not all of the Local Plan has been published for consultation. In accordance with the paragraph 36 of the Framework, the housing requirement and related elements of the Local Plan should therefore be updated to reflect the revised Standard Method. In our view, the housing requirement for the draft Local Plan should therefore be increased in order to reflect the updated Standard Method. We welcome the Council's decision to progress with the Local Plan given the government's objective to significantly boost housing delivery. However, we have objections to draft Policy SP02. As it stands, the transitional arrangements do not apply to EDDC as not all of the Local Plan has been published for consultation. In accordance with the paragraph 36 of the Framework, the housing requirement and related elements of the Local Plan should therefore be updated to reflect the revised Standard Method. In our view, the housing requirement for the draft Local Plan should therefore be increased in order to reflect the updated Standard Method.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: No

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : Given their interest in Bhre_07 board should have opportunity to make case

Full name: Alister Smith

Organisation (where relevant): Stags

Other party name (if relevant): Mosaic (Exeter)

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: Yes

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: Yes

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Cara Chambers

Organisation (where relevant): Stantec

Other party name (if relevant): KCS Development

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Strategic Policy SP02

4.1.1 SP02 sets a housing provision for at least 20,909 dwellings (net) by 2042. The housing requirement will be delivered through a stepped trajectory, with an annual target of 850 homes from 2020/21 to 2031/32, increasing to 1,070 homes per year from 2032/33 to 2041/42.

4.1.2 The above takes into account the recently revised Standard Method figure and transitional arrangements in the NPPF.

4.1.3 The policy supporting text recognises the challenges of delivering against the significant housing need and particularly where a significant portion of the plan is reliant on major sites and a new settlement (see policy WS01 regarding the new settlement). There are inherent complexities in delivering major development sites, particularly the proposed new community, and therefore the plan proposes a stepped trajectory.

4.1.4 Projected delivery from all sources has outlined that there will be a delivery of 22,614 homes, of which 3,514 have been built. This means a net delivery of 19,100 dwelling. It is also worked out, discounting those already built, that there is a net need of 17,395 dwellings (subtracting from the requirement of 20,909 dwellings) across the 22 year plan period to be delivered through windfalls and allocations. This gives a surplus of 1,705 dwellings to act as a headroom surplus of 9.8%, which is below the council's stated aspiration for a minimum 10% headroom within the plan

4.1.5 The report also sets out the rolling five year housing supply calculations, which includes a 20% buffer, in line with Paragraph 78c of the revised NPPF (2024). This outlines that on adoption, the Council will have a 5.18 year supply and that they will have at least a five year supply in the first five years. However, as demonstrated by the

trajectory within the local plan document Appendix 1, delivery in the later years is marginal and some years fall short of the requirement, including years at the end of the plan:

4.1.6 Fundamentally, East Devon must deliver its housing requirement on the allocated sites included within the plan to meet its requirements. Even though there is a 'headroom' of 9.8%, this is across the 22 year plan period and only provides a 77.5 dwelling buffer per year. Further, this headroom does not uplift the housing target, in other words, the additional 1,705 dwellings are unallocated.

4.1.7 This approach is unsound as if a headroom is to be provided the additional homes should be allocated to ensure delivery. However, at present, there is no evidence the headroom will be delivered. Therefore whilst the principle of a headroom is welcomed, the plan should identify sufficient sites to deliver this headroom. Therefore, the council should re-assess the sites submitted in the call for sites so these additional dwellings can be allocated. Failure to do so would mean the housing forecast is not 'sufficiently flexible'. Site (GH/ED/26), or part of it, for example, is a suitable location for a proportion of 'headroom' dwellings. This site will be discussed in more detail in section 6.

4.1.8 Another scenario to consider is that if dwellings are completed early on in the plan period, East Devon could struggle to meet its higher target later in the plan period.

4.1.9 It should also be noted the Council accepts there is currently only a 2.97 year housing land supply and so it is imperative that sites are allocated and brought forward in the Local Plan. The housing delivery technical report sets out the housing trajectory for the plan and the sources of housing supply. Allocations make up for 78% of the net need housing to be delivered, with the planned new settlement being a significant contributor to overall supply over the plan period

4.1.10 Larger sites and new settlements are inherently challenging to deliver. Recent research shows how large schemes have elongated delivery timescales such that on sites of 2,000 dwellings or more it is can take nearly 8 years from the validation of the first planning application to delivery of the first dwelling on site for schemes of 2,000 or more dwellings. However, the emerging plan assumes earlier delivery, which places a significant risk on overall delivery of housing across the plan period.

4.1.11 Therefore, whilst the policy intentions are noted there is an inherent soundness risk with the proposed stepped trajectory related to the acute housing land supply issues in East Devon and the risk that larger sites within the trajectory will be delayed.

4.1.12 There are concerns with deliverability in the timescales given that the planning for the new settlement is in its early stages. Given the stepped approach to housing delivery, there is a greater emphasis on housing delivery between 2031 and 2042 and so

if delivery stalls due to delivery of a large scale scheme, East Devon could fall behind the target by a number of dwellings.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: [attachment page. 7-8]

4.1.7 This approach is unsound as if a headroom is to be provided the additional homes should be allocated to ensure delivery. However, at present, there is no evidence the headroom will be delivered. Therefore whilst the principle of a headroom is welcomed, the plan should identify sufficient sites to deliver this headroom. Therefore, the council should re-assess the sites submitted in the call for sites so these additional dwellings can be allocated. Failure to do so would mean the housing forecast is not 'sufficiently flexible'. Site (GH/ED/26), or part of it, for example, is a suitable location for a proportion of 'headroom' dwellings. This site will be discussed in more detail in section 6.

4.1.13 As such, there is an accepted and very acute short-term housing land supply challenge (with a current supply position of 2.79 year), a further shorter term supply challenge in the early years of the plan (hence the stepped trajectory) and a further longer term supply challenge should larger sites and the new settlement not progress as expected. Therefore, the logical solution is for the council to identify smaller deliverable sites in addition to the current draft allocations to provide greater flexibility.

Full name: Neal Jillings

Organisation (where relevant): Summerfield Homes Ltd

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: No

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: please see previous comment

2(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter legally compliant, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter legally compliant. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: meet the standard method housing requirement as the NPPF(234)(a) does not apply

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: The Council seeks to game the system provided by the transitional arrangements with the average annual requirement over the plan period equating to 80% of the new standard method figure. For reasons expressed elsewhere relating to the scope of the Reg 19 documentation, the exemption in paragraph 234(a) does not apply (in our opinion as regulation 19 has not 'been complied with' (footnote 82) as 'each' of the submission documents are not available prior to the 12th of March 2025). Even if it is determined that it does apply, the exemption does not apply as the stepped approach to delivery plans to reduce the housing requirement from the previous standard method figure of 893 dpa and the adopted Local Plan annual requirement of 950 dpa to 850 dpa up to the end of March 2032. This delivery rate is 71.5% of the the standard method figure of 1,188 dpa. The exemption set out in NPPF(234)(a) does not apply as this is not 'at least 80% of local housing need' (for the first 12 years of the plan period). The stepped approach appears to be more related to reducing the housing requirement below that already required (by

adopted LP Policy) and perhaps hoping that there is a change in the political landscape so that the step up is never required (if one were cynical, which clearly I am not). It must be noted that the 'step up' is required from April 2032 to achieve the bare minimum allowed under the transitional arrangements in the NPPF.

There are two circumstances where the stepped approach is acceptable as set out in the Practice Guidance.

1 - where there is a significant change in the level for the housing requirement; and/or 2 - where strategic sites will be phased for later in the plan period.

Regarding (1), a reduction in the housing requirements from 950 in adopted policy or 893 in the previous standard method requirement to 850 (or the annual average of 950) does not represent a significant change. It is rather worrying that, in the context of higher housing requirements across the board, East Devon District Council has chosen to take a step down before taking a step up in 2032. this contradicts supporting text in paragraph 3.9 of the Plan which states that stepping down delivery by 100 dpa over the first 12 years of the plan somehow equates to supporting the objective to boost significantly the supply of housing. The Plan has not been positively prepared in this regard.

Regarding point (2), this 'jam tomorrow' approach to planning to meet housing requirements cuts across the need to increase housing delivery. For all of the reasons set out above and elsewhere, this approach undershoots requirements significantly (particularly if the exemption in NPPF(234)(a) is found to not apply).

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: Plan to meet the housing requirement set out in the December 2024 Standard Methodology

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: No

4(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as

possible.: Presumably the nationally set standard methodology figures take into account requirements in neighbouring authorities. If one Authority seeks to undershoot requirements because the transitional arrangements allow this, then there must clearly be a knock on effect to other Local Plan areas in the same travel to work area. With Teignbridge District Council close to getting an adopted Plan that plans to deliver against a target of 720 dpa where the standard method is 1,090 dpa, these two Local Plan areas alone are actively planning to underdeliver by 708 dwellings per annum. Accepting the Teignbridge will be required to undertake an immediate review later this year, this figure is for illustration purposes only and highlights that such a shortfall cannot be made up in Exeter/Mid Devon/Torbay. These authorities are facing their own challenges on boosting housing supply. If one Council gets under the wire first by under providing, then the knock on effect for neighbouring authorities could be vast. This process cannot represent any duty to cooperate that has any meaning that might be considered useful in planning or housing delivery terms.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : This matter is fundamental to delivery of a sound plan and a suitable housing requirement

Full name: Neal Jillings

Organisation (where relevant): Summerfield Homes Ltd

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: No

2(a). If yes, and you wish to support the legal compliance of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: See below

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: See below. The Plan does not meet the legal requirement in s39(2) of the PCPA2004 in that significantly underperforming against the housing requirement indicates that the Plan has not been prepared with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development. Instead it has sought to do the bare minimum by planning for a figure of 80% of the need in order to slip under the wire provided by NPPF(234)

2(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter legally compliant, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter legally compliant. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: For the reasons set out below, the Plan needs to plan for a higher housing requirement. The Plan as current drafted fails to meet this housing requirement.

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: We support the inclusion of the words 'at least' prior to the overall housing requirement. We are concerned that the manner in which the Council has chosen to prepare its Plan means that it does not qualify for the exemption provided by NPPF(234)(a). As such we consider that the policies of the December 2024 NPPF apply for the purposes of preparing the Local Plan. The case for this is simply put; Regulation 19 of the relevant regs. requires that the LPA MUST make a copy of EACH of the proposed submission documents available in

accordance with the requirements of Regulation 35 of the same regs. the fact is that there are proposed submission documents yet to be published (at today's date, i.e. post 12th March 2025). As such it is impossible for the LPA to comply with Regulation 19 (and 35) at this stage and the exemption in 234(a) cannot apply. The LPA must plan for the housing requirements set out in the standard methodology, which is 1,188 dwellings per annum (from the point of this standard method figure applying with previous years relating to the standard method figure relevant at the time). This appears to us a simple plain English interpretation of the relevant Regs. It is not an esoteric or academic interpretation, it is merely what the regulations state and the LPA has failed in its attempt to game the system and undershoot the clear housing requirement. If this proposition is accepted, then the Local Plan is not sound as it does not meet the housing requirement which applies (i.e. 1,188 dpa)

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: Policy SP02 needs to plan for a higher housing target taking into account the standard method figure of 1,188 dpa from the relevant date. 22 years at this target equates to 26,136 dwellings over the plan period although we accept that different standard method figures apply to the time period April 2020 to December 2024.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: No

4(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.: The fact that the GESP process stalled indicates that cooperation between Councils in the Exeter strategic area is less than functional. Please bring back strategic planning/structure plans/RPGs

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : This matter is fundamental to the soundness of the Plan and should be aired. We appreciate that others may make the same point in which case it may be that we do not need to participate.

Full name: Nathan Price

Organisation (where relevant): Tetlow King Planning

Other party name (if relevant): South West Housing Association Planning Consortium

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: Paragraph 3.10 of the draft Local Plan sets out that the draft Local Plan will target the delivery of 4,477 affordable dwellings from 2020 to 2042 (uplifting on the 4,070 figure to account to for the years 2040 to 2042). This is guided by the most recent housing needs assessment (2022 LHNA) and the SWHAPC is satisfied that an up-to-date housing needs assessment has been used to inform the policy requirements. Further, paragraph 3.11 of the draft document outlines that the Local Plan housing provision follows transitional arrangements set out under the December 2024 redraft of the NPPF: "The new standard method generates an annual average housing number (at February 2025) of 1,188 dwellings. Providing for 80% of this (para 234 of the December 2024 NPPF) generates the annual average housing level of 950.4 new homes, a 22-year plan requirement of 20,909." The SWHAPC is satisfied that the new Local Plan's housing requirement meets the transitional requirements of the NPPF (2024).

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Draft Strategic Policy SP02: Levels of future housing development Draft Strategic Policy SP02 outlines that housing provision will be made for at least 20,909 dwellings (net) to be delivered in the plan area between 2020-2042. The draft policy adds that the housing requirement will be delivered through a stepped trajectory, with an annual target of 850 homes from 2020/21 to 2031/32, increasing to 1,070 homes per year from 2032/33 to 2041/42. Whilst the SWHAPC acknowledge a stepped trajectory can be useful to account for changes in future housing needs, we encourage the annual housing target to be larger earlier on in the period to deal with the pressing need for new homes that is present right now. As of 31st March 2024, there were 6,1951 households on the housing register in East Devon, following a rise in households on the register over the past three years. It is vital that the Council plans to house these people as soon as possible.

The supporting text to Draft Strategic Policy SP02 specifies a specific target for affordable housing delivery. However, this figure is not contained within the policy text of Draft Strategic Policy SP02 itself. Consequently, it could be argued that this target figure does not form part of the policy requirement.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: The SHWAPC recommends that the affordable housing delivery target figure is set out within the text of the policy itself, rather than the supporting text, to ensure that it is viewed as a policy requirement within the Local Plan. The SWHAPC draw the Council's attention to a typographical error at paragraph 3.12 in which the draft document states that "under a stepped trajectory that will provide an annual average of 850 dwellings per year from 2020/21 to 2031/32 and 1,070 per year from 2032/33 to plan end at 2023/24". It is believed that the latter date in this sentence should read "2041/42" in line with the proposed plan period.

Full name: Frances Lennon

Organisation (where relevant): Turley

Other party name (if relevant): Bloor Homes Exeter

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Strategic Policy SP02: Levels of future housing development [Object]

2.10 Paragraph 3.9 within the plan states that the policy "responds to the Council's priority of addressing housing needs by establishing a clear housing requirement based on the Standard Method using latest ONS statistics". This does not seem to the be the case as the Council is seeking to progress its plan using the transitional arrangements available as part of the NPPF (December 2024), by making provision for only 80% of the housing need which is now identified by the latest version of the Standard Method. The approach being taken by the plan (and specifically Policy SP02) is not consistent with the Council's stated aim and approach as recorded at Paragraph 3.9. This in turn is not consistent with national planning policy that seeks to boost significantly the provision of new housing.

2.11 The level of housing being planned for by the plan is not consistent with latest national policy on need (as reflected in the up-to-date standard method for Local Housing Need), with even the annual provision in the later years of the plan (1,070dpa based on a stepped trajectory) less than the new minimum figure of 1,118dpa which is derived from the lates version of the Standard Method, and which is the basis for the 80% minimum threshold to progress using transitional arrangements.

2.12 Although no specific unmet need has yet been identified to exist, the Council's approach also makes no provision for any unmet needs for housing, that may arise within the City of Exeter, and where East Devon District may be well placed to meet those needs. The preparation and examination of the Exeter Local Pan will be occurring in parallel with that in East Devon and so there will remain a need to retain flexibility and act responsively in the interests of planning for this important part of Devon and wider South West.

Full name: Andrew Ross

Organisation (where relevant): Turley

Other party name (if relevant): Bloor Homes Exeter

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Strategic Policy SP02: Levels of future housing development [Object]

2.6 Paragraph 3.9 within the plan states that the policy "responds to the Council's priority of addressing housing needs by establishing a clear housing requirement based on the Standard Method using latest ONS statistics". This does not seem to the be the case as the Council is seeking to progress its plan using the transitional arrangements available as part of the NPPF (December 2024), by making provision for only 80% of the housing need which is now identified by the latest version of the Standard Method. The approach being taken by the plan (and specifically Policy SP02) is not consistent with the Council's stated aim and approach as recorded at Paragraph 3.9. This in turn is not consistent with national planning policy that seeks to boost significantly the provision of new housing.

2.7 The level of housing being planned for by the plan is not consistent with latest national policy on need (as reflected in the up-to-date standard method for Local Housing Need), with even the annual provision in the later years of the plan (1,070dpa based on a stepped trajectory) less than the new minimum figure of 1,118dpa which is derived from the lates version of the Standard Method, and which is the basis for the 80% minimum threshold to progress using transitional arrangements.

2.8 Although no specific unmet need has yet been identified to exist, the Council's approach also makes no provision for any unmet needs for housing, that may arise within the City of Exeter, and where East Devon District may be well placed to meet those needs. The preparation and examination of the Exeter Local Pan will be occurring in parallel with that in East Devon and so there will remain a need to retain flexibility and act responsively in the interests of planning for this important part of Devon and wider South West.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : To elaborate on issues raised and respond as appropriate during hearings.

Full name: Richard Bailey

Other party name (if relevant): Hobart Land Ltd

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: The levels of future housing development are outlined in Strategic Policy SP02. This states that "Housing provision will be made for at least 20,909 dwellings (net) to be delivered in the plan area between 1 April 2020 to 31 March 2042. The housing requirement will be delivered through a stepped trajectory, with an annual target of 850 homes from 2020/21 to 2031/32, increasing to 1,070 homes per year from 2032/33 to 2041/42."

The level of housing identified is supported in the main, however, it only represents 80% of the housing requirement calculated using the new standard methodology introduced in December 2024 by the updated National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Although this approach is acceptable under the transitional arrangements set out in the NPPF (Annex 1 - Paragraph 234) it is questionable given the recognised housing crisis whether East Devon District Council should be looking to exceed this and plan for the full housing requirement, which would equate to 26,136 dwellings over the plan period, or at least a partially increased figure.

Additionally, given that this is a minimum housing requirement, it is crucial that there are sufficient allocations made to achieve and exceed the target. Whilst there is expected to be some flexibility in the projected supply over the plan period (1705 units / 8.2% over the minimum target), as set out in the Council's Housing delivery technical note (February 2025), there is scope for this to be improved. Increasing the amount of land available for development will provide more choice and competition in the supply, which should have benefits for delivery. It would also provide greater flexibility and resilience to the supply. The amount of allocations put forward as whole could therefore be expanded to help ensure that levels of housing above the minimum target can be achieved. Given the pressing need to boost the supply of housing land, additional

allocations (including land associated with the former showground site at Honiton) could be included to achieve this.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: In this context, and given the earlier comments about bolstering the allocated land for housing delivery, we consider that the land at the former showground site provides a good opportunity to deliver a mixed use residential and sports development on the edge of Honiton. This would assist in addressing both the need for more sports pitches and housing. If the former showground site was included in this then the total supply could be increased to approximately 988, as well as securing the delivery of 4 junior rugby sports pitches. This would be a positive addition to the development strategy for the town.

The site is located in an accessible location approximately 900 metres from the town centre. This is a reasonable walking and cycling distance. Also, the site has an existing access on Langford Road which can be improved as necessary alongside other highway improvements, such as pedestrian crossing, extended footway and cycle route facilities, to provide improved connections.

The former showground site is available, suitable and achievable (as the findings of the HELAA [November 2022] found with regard to the part submitted for assessment - Honi_9) and could be developed with limited adverse impacts, it appears that there is reasonable alternative to the current

strategy that would help further to ensure that the necessary minimum levels of housing are achieved and exceeded, and that some playing pitch provision for the town of Honiton is delivered.

In summary, we support the emerging Spatial Strategy in terms of the direction of growth to the Main Centres, however, we suggest that the Council could pursue a better alternative strategy with regard to the housing target and meeting the full housing need based on the revised NPPF, and bolstering the identified supply of land for housing to ensure that the minimum target is achieved and exceeded.

Full name: Margaret Leppard

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: National and local government's approach to housing The national focus, particularly in recent months has been on numbers of houses to be built. This approach fails to ensure that the right types of houses are built in the right place. Government depends on commercial house builders who in turn, depend on building estates of similar properties on sites that yield economies of scale. Similar calculations limit the number of social housing units that are included in developments. Should economic conditions and supply lines change during the course of development work, social/affordable housing units are first to be reduced or abandoned. Throughout the country, there is housing stock that is abandoned and deteriorating; properties purchased and kept empty until 'market conditions are more favourable'; second homes some of which are constantly in use by 'together-apart' families; second homes used as family holiday homes/ holiday lets and increasing numbers of properties used for short term lets and Air B&B. Current legislation and tax regimens lack power to mobilise these properties for those in genuine need of housing. Central government and councils, including EDDC, need to achieve a more equitable balance between local housing needs and the tourist market. Furthermore, the high proportion of holiday lets in an area with a constant throughput of visitors threatens the development of social capital and health among permanent residents. The numbers of similar 3-4 bedroom properties that developers create also fail to meet the needs of residents. For example, in Seaton there is significant need for social housing. Local working age residents are primarily involved in hospitality, retail and some are carers. These are not high paying forms of employment. 3-4 bedroom new build houses are unlikely to be affordable for this demographic. Also in Seaton (and nationally) there is a need for different types of housing that meets the needs for multigenerational living; for disabled residents requiring easy access and internal adaptations; for small units for single occupancy. Simply building more numbers on 'same old, same old' estates will not work for community members! Innovative use of existing housing stock requires council officers and legal teams. Importantly it is only now that the national government acknowledges the lack of builders for new builds,

repair and renovation. Not all councils have inspectors and officers to monitor and follow up, access, repair and renovate existing housing stock. There is a need for government and councils to both think and act in radically different ways about equitable housing.

Full name: Sylvia Meller

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Yes, we do have to provide more homes. But if this is the case, why are we having empty council houses/flats? Why do we have developments with mainly unaffordable housing? Why do we have a high number of houses that stand empty or are only used for a few weeks a year as 2nd homes?

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: Before building up new areas we should first of all make sure all council flats/houses are used .Buildings/flats which stand empty need to be compulsory purchased and sold/rented out . The purchase of 2nd hoes needs to be limited to a minimum. If new developments need to be build , apartment blocks with affordable 1-2 bedroom flats to buy or rent should be prioritised over developments of individual houses. Developments should not be granted outside settlement boundaries or on areas of National Landscape

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: No

4(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.: See 3B and 3C

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: John Thorne BA DipTP MRTPI(Rtd)

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: No

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: The housing figures fall below those of the NPPF which increased the housing requirement for East Devon 28% from 893 to 1,146 equating to an increase of 5,060 over 20 years (an additional 253 per year).

2(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter legally compliant, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter legally compliant. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: Revise the housing figures to reflect those in the NPPF (22,520 over 20 years) 1146 per annum.

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:

1. There is a shortfall in the housing numbers

2. The 'Stepped trajectory' is unsound and will fail to deliver housing to meet identified need within a satisfactory timescale, rather it is a postponement and abrogation of the LPA's responsibility - potentially and cynically pushing meaningful change through housing delivery beyond the current Government's term of office.

3. The strategy is silent on the subject of delivery of housing on brownfield sites notwithstanding the statutory obligation to keep and update a register of them and to promote their development.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.:

1. Revise the housing figures to reflect those in the NPPF (22,520 over 20 years) 1146 per annum.

2. Remove the 'stepped trajectory' and do not effectively export the problem to another decade.

3. Make a policy commitment pursuant to Regulation 4 of the Town and Country Planning (Brownfield Land Register) Regulations 2017 to annual registration and updating of the brownfield land register. Promote and include the potential delivery of housing on brownfield land as a sustainable alternative to consumption of open land and the natural environment. The register on the EDDC website currently states it was ‘recently’ updated in December 2021. It is therefore more than three years out of date

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: John Thorne BA DipTP MRTPI(Rtd)

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: No

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: "...provision will be made for at least 20,909 dwellings (net) to be delivered in the plan area between 1 April 2020 to 31 March 2042.." represents a shortfall of more than 2000 dwellings over the plan period against the NPPF figure under the Updated NPPF in which the housing requirement for East Devon increased by 28% from 893 to 1,146 equating to an increase of 5,060 over 20 years (an additional 253 per year).

2(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter legally compliant, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter legally compliant. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: provision should be amended to 1,146 per annum over 20 years (22,520)

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:

1. The proposed housing numbers are insufficient.

2. The delivery schedule will not meet need and is potentially pushing delivery further and further away - almost in hope of political chance beyond the term of the current Government. The chapter in paragraph 3.12 states: “In recognition of the complexities inherent in delivering major development sites, particularly the proposed new community provision of new homes will come forward under a stepped trajectory that will provide an annual average of 850 dwellings per year from 2020/21 to 2031/32 and 1,070 per year from 2032/33 to plan end at 2023/24...” Notwithstanding the fact that we are now four years into the plan period, the draft plan proposes site allocations which, for the first ten years of the plan period, fall short annually by 296 dwellings. The

'stepped trajectory' involves effectively 'kicking the can down the road' for another seven years until 2032 before the shortage can be addressed. The approach of the Reg.19 consultation version of the EDDC plan is ineffectual and insufficiently sound to contribute to meeting need and addressing the housing crisis, which is current, rather than seven years or more in the future. This is unconvincing and unrealistic, and lacks a robust evidence base demonstrating that the allocated sites and the numbers suggested can indeed be delivered in time to address need.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.:

1. Correct the annual housing figures to meet the NPPF requirement.

2. Abandon the 'stepped trajectory' and emphasise support for1. delivering housing annually to meet need.

3. Introduce an additional policy making a commitment to meeting the legal obligation to identify and promote the delivery of housing on brownfield land within the district.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: John Thorne BA DipTP MRTPI(Rtd)

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: General Points The draft plan has progressed to consultation under Reg.19 against the backdrop of a change of Government with the incoming administration making a clear declaration of intent to reform the Planning System and prioritise delivery of housing; and the introduction of a statutory requirement to achieve an uplift of 10% in Biodiversity in relation to development proposals.

Housing Delivery Since Consultation under Reg.18, under the Updated NPPF, the housing requirement for East Devon increased by 28% from 893 to 1,146 equating to an increase of 5,060 over 20 years (an additional 253 per year). Faced with a significant level of increase over the same period, nearby Bath and North-East Somerset Council has announced a new call for sites as part of a 'resetting' of the local plan. In the EDDC Regulation 19. Draft, Strategic Policy SP02 states that: "Housing provision will be made for at least 20,909 dwellings (net) to be delivered in the plan area between 1 April 2020 to 31 March 2042. The housing requirement will be delivered through a stepped trajectory, with an annual target of 850 homes from 2020/21 to 2031/32, increasing to 1070 homes per year from 2032/33 to 2041/42." First, this represents a shortfall of more than 2000 dwellings over the plan period against the NPPF figure. Secondly, the subsequent paragraph 3.12 states: "In recognition of the complexities inherent in delivering major development sites, particularly the proposed new community provision of new homes will come forward under a stepped trajectory that will provide an annual average of 850 dwellings per year from 2020/21 to 2031/32 and 1,070 per year from 2032/33 to plan end at 2023/24…" Notwithstanding the fact that we are now four years into the plan period, the draft plan proposes site allocations which, for the first ten years of the plan period, fall short annually by 296 dwellings. The 'stepped trajectory' involves effectively 'kicking the can down the road' for another seven years until 2032 before the shortage can begin to be addressed. The approach of the Reg.19 consultation version of the EDDC plan is ineffectual and insufficiently robust to contribute to meeting need and addressing the housing crisis, which is current, rather

than seven years or more in the future. This is unconvincing and unrealistic, and furthermore lacks a robust evidence base demonstrating that the allocated sites and the numbers suggested can indeed be delivered in time to address need. The new Government's forward-looking approach and methodology has been informed by many years of failure by the Planning system and previous Governments to address the growing housing crisis by achieving and facilitating sufficient housing to meet existing and proposed demand. Habitual allocation of sites where delivery is problematic because of ownership and infrastructure and citing them as evidence of a five-year housing land supply is an out of date and nebulous approach geared more towards developing a strategy for defending appeals against refusals of planning permission for residential development elsewhere, than to the actual delivery of housing. This approach needs to change. In particular a more pragmatic and supportive approach is needed to maximising and realising the potential for smaller sites to contribute to the delivery of housing, including a more rigorous examination of the potential for sustainable delivery on Brownfield land. The now statutory requirement for the achievement of BNG in relation to new residential developments has potential implications for the housing numbers and densities of residential development within planned allocated sites. BNG must be achieved within these sites or by way of purchasable BNG credits elsewhere. Unless each allocation is preceded by an audit in this respect and supported by evidence that the required uplift can be achieved and delivered, the Plan will not enable the LPA to demonstrate adequate provision of land where housing can genuinely be delivered in sufficient numbers. Pursuant to Regulation 4 of the Town and Country Planning (Brownfield Land Register) Regulations 2017, the LPA is under a statutory obligation to identify and publish annually a register of brownfield land and to update it at least once a year. The register on the EDDC website states it was 'recently' updated in December 2021. It is therefore more than three years out of date.

Full name: Rachel Danemann

Organisation (where relevant): Home Builders Federation (HBF)

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: The Importance of the role of the New Settlement within this Plan

47. The NPPF encourages plans to look 30 years into the future when setting a long-term vision for their area. Strategic policies should look ahead over a minimum 15-year period from adoption, to antici-pate and respond to long-term requirements and opportunities, such as those arising from major im-provements in infrastructure. The NPPF also confirms that the supply of large numbers of new homes can often be best achieved through planning for larger scale development, such as new set-tlements. Where larger-scale developments such as new settlements or significant extensions to ex-isting villages and towns form part of the strategy for the area, policies should be set within a vision that looks further ahead (at least 30 years), to take into account the likely timescale for delivery

48. We note the Council intention to develop a new settlement as one of the keys ways it will meet its housing need. HBF has no objections in principle to bring forward a second new community in East Devon, which is supported by the NPPF. However, it is important to recognise the potential for there to be a significant lead in time for first homes to come forward on new developments of this scale and the Council's housing trajectory will need to carefully consider appropriate lead in times and de-livery rates for the new community. It can take many years if not decades for a new settlement to be delivered, and the suggestion that houses would be completed and able to make an early contribution to the housing land supply of this plan is ambitious if the decision on how to progress a new settle-ment was made now.

49. In addition, deferring further policy on the new community the decision until a further Reg 19 limits opportunities for engagement at this stage and creates uncertainty, especially as it is such a key part of the spatial strategy and delivering the housing requirement, two key strategic elements of this Plan. This includes decision on the potential delivery vehicle for the new community which we understand includes the potential to consider the use of a Local or New Town Development Corporation – the complexities of bringing forward development under such a delivery vehicle means that the new community would be highly unlikely to be able to make provision for development in the timescales anticipated by the plan (and required to meet the urgent need for new housing and other development in the plan area). Careful consideration of appropriate lead in times and delivery rates will be needed but it is likely that additional sites in other locations will also need to be allocated to meet the resulting increased housing requirement elsewhere.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: 50. The Plan should more clearly acknowledge that the new community will take time for it to be worked up and developed. Securing outline and detailed planning permission takes time, and the develop-ment still needs to be built out. East Devon has direct experience of the time scales involved and re-sources needed to deliver new communities, gained from its experience of facilitating the delivery of Cranbrook. Although the failure of this 'Publication Version' of the Plan to fully address this issue has been acknowledged and will be addressed by further consultation on this issue. These do suggest the Plan, at this stage is not ready for submission to PINS, as would be expected at a Reg 19 consultation.

Full name: Rachel Danemann

Organisation (where relevant): Home Builders Federation (HBF)

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: 44. HBF, and the consultation document, recognise that Cranbrook new community benefits from its own Cranbrook Plan. Para 1.4 of this consultation document explains that "The adopted Cranbrook Plan remains part of the Development Plan and is the primary plan for determining planning applica-tions at Cranbrook. However, many policies in this new local plan will also apply within the Cranbrook Plan area and should be applied alongside Cranbrook Plan policies which will remain in place as part of the Development Plan".

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: 45. Despite this recognition the Plan, and this policy in particular, remains unclear about how the housing delivery at Cranbrook, which already has permission(s) will contribute to the delivery of the delivery of the housing requirement in East Devon.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: We would request that the housing trajectory specifically identifies Cranbrook development as a par-ticular source of supply. This will be important for monitoring as indicates under-delivery of housing in Cranbrook this would necessitate a different response under the plan, monitor, manage approach, that say for example an under-delivery of housing in the villages, or a particular town.

46. HBF would also note that in relation to employment needs within the Plan it is important to recognise the interrelationship between homes and jobs, both whilst under construction and once occupied as people's homes

Full name: Rachel Danemann

Organisation (where relevant): Home Builders Federation (HBF)

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Small sites

41. HBF note the national policy requirement around the need for Small Sites. The NPPF requires Local Plans to identify land to accommodate at least 10% of the housing requirement on sites no larger than one hectare, unless there are strong reasons why this cannot be achieved. HBF has undertaken extensive consultation with its small developer members. One of the chief obstacles for small devel-opers is that funding is extremely difficult to secure without a full, detailed, and implementable plan-ning permission. Securing an implementable planning permission is extremely difficult if small sites are not allocated. Without implementable consents lenders are uneasy about making finance availa-ble or the repayment fees and interest rates they set will be very high. Small developers, consequent-ly, need to invest a lot of money and time up-front in the risky business of trying to secure an alloca-tion and a planning permission, and this is money that many small developers do not have.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: 42. Therefore, the Council should set out in the Plan's policies and evidence base to set out how the plan will deliver 10% of homes on sites of less than one hectare, as required by paragraph 73 of the 2024 NPPF. Indeed, the HBF would advocate that a higher percentage of small sites are allocated if possi-ble. Such sites

are important for encouraging the growth in SME housebuilders who will tend to develop these sites but rarely see the benefits that arise from the allocation of sites in a local plan. Up until the 1980s, small developers once accounted for the construction of half of all homes built in this country resulting in greater variety of product, more competition, and faster build-out rates. Since then, the number of small companies has fallen by 80%.

43. HBF have been unable to find within the evidence base any analysis of how the small site require-ment will be delivered within this Plan. This information needs to be provided and HBF may wish to comment on it once it has been. HBF also note that support for small and medium builders need not be limited to only small sites of less than 1Ha. SMEs also deliver on other types of non-strategic sites (for example up to 100 units). The inclusion of additional non-strategic allocations would expand the range of choice in the market, and (possibly most importantly), be of a scale that can come forward and making a contribution to housing numbers earlier in the plan period.

Full name: Rachel Danemann

Organisation (where relevant): Home Builders Federation (HBF)

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Concern and Lack of clarity about a "Surplus"

36. As HBF do not agree that the housing requirements is sound, and as such we do not believe there is any 'surplus' housing being planned for in this Plan. Adding to our concerns about the figures, the ex-planation for the numbers given in the wording of para 3.11 is confusing and unclear as to how the headroom/surplus of 9.8% has been calculated. It would be more usual for these figures to be clear-ly explained and set out within the policy wording in a Table, rather than lost in a word salad of the supporting text. This policy needs to include specific reference to the annual monitoring requirement, this is essential for the Plan to be effective, and therefore sound.

37. In para 3.1 the Council says "Providing for 80% of this (para 234 of the December 2024 NPPF) gen-erates the annual average housing level of 950.4 new homes, a 22-year plan requirement of 20,909." We strongly dispute this is the standard method baseline that should be the starting point for setting the housing the requirement, and other factors would justify the housing requirement that should in any respect be higher than the standard method in East Devon. However, even from an 80% of standard method starting point the Council are still then seemingly doing everything they can to min-imise the calculations of the amount of housing that need to be provided for in this Plan, despite the Government's clear injective to increase housing delivery.

Concerns about Windfall

39. HBF are concerns about the level of the windfall allowance being made in the Plan. HBF are of the view that any allowance for windfall should not be included until the fourth year of a housing trajectory, given the likelihood that dwellings being completed within the next three years will already be known about, as they are likely to need to have already received planning permission to be completed within that timeframe. We also would be supportive of windfall sites being additional to the housing requirements, providing further choice and flexibility in the market.

Stepped trajectory

40. HBF are also concerned that the stepped trajectory does not reflect the Government's clear national drive for an immediate uptick in housing delivery. Whilst we appreciate and agree with the challenges of delivering a large-scale new community (see our comments later on) and as such it is reasonable to assume delivery of completed housing units will not occur until later in the plan period, relying on this approach will not deliver the housing East Devon needs in the short and medium term.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: 38. HBF believes that in order to be sound and to comply with the requirement for the Plan to include flexibility a surplus of more that 9.8% is needed.

Full name: Rachel Danemann

Organisation (where relevant): Home Builders Federation (HBF)

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: From the Home Builders Federation (HBF)

The policy is not considered to be sound as it is not positively prepared, effective, justified or consistent with national policy

30. HBF have significant concerns about the way the Council has arrived at its housing requirement. These are set out more fully in our response to the legal compliance section. In HBF's view the housing requirement is too low and such additional development will be needed. This will require the allocation of additional sites across East Devon in order for the Plan to be sound. HBF also have concerns about the windfall allowance, the stepped trajectory, the 'headroom' allowance, the national requirement for small sites, the role of the new settlement, and how this Plan links to the Cranbrook Plan.

The Housing Requirement and the Standard Method Calculation

31. Para 3.11 of this East Devon new Local Plan Reg 19 consultation says:

"The Local Plan housing provision follows transitional arrangements set out under the December 2024 redraft of the NPPF. The new standard method generates an annual average housing number (at February 2025) of 1,188 dwellings. Providing for 80% of this

(para 234 of the December 2024 NPPF) generates the annual average housing level of 950.4 new homes, a 22-year plan requirement of 20,909."

32. In HBF's view, this is simply not correct. The introduction of the new standard method in the Dec 2024 NPPF requires the new standard method figure to be the starting point for setting the housing requirement in a Plan. HBF acknowledge that Plans that have reached the Reg 19 consultation stage before 12 March are able to proceed under the transitional arrangements, however as mentioned earlier, HBF would question if this Plan should be able to benefit from these provisions, and in-deed even if it can, whether only planning for 80% of the housing requirement is in fact the intention of the transitional arrangements.

33. The Council acknowledges the requirement for further consultation on the key spatial elements of meeting the housing needs in East Devon, the new settlement, HBF would therefore have expected an Issues and Options type Reg 18 consultation to be followed by a Preferred Options Reg 18, and then a Reg 19 consultation on the final version of the Plan, as it is intended to be submitted for Exam-ination. The fact this is not the intention behind this version of the Plan could be seen as a failure to follow the correct processes and/or an attempt to manipulate the transitional arrangements to get an adopted Plan that does not have to plan for the full housing requirements. HBF strongly suggest that the need for an additional Reg 19 consultation on this Plan, means it has to be considered under the Dec 2024 NPPF in full, not the transitional arrangements, and as such the Plan must plan for the full housing requirement calculated using the new standard method.

34. Indeed, the standard method housing requirement has always been the minimum starting point for setting the housing requirement, and HBF support more housing than the standard method housing requirement in order to support economic growth, deliver more affordable housing, provide a range and type of sites and to support small and medium house builders. HBF would therefore argue that the standard method should be the minimum starting point for establishing the housing requirement for East Devon, and the Council should be considering each of these factors in turn to establish whether or not they justify a higher housing requirement.

35. In para 3.11 the Council acknowledges it has an affordable housing need of 4,477 over the Plan peri-od, which the plan says is "justified by the latest evidence of affordable housing" when set against the housing requirement of 20,909 dwellings (a

figure HBF questions), this suggests a need for affordable housing that could justify a higher housing requirement. No mention is made of the need to provide for a range and choice of sites, the need to support economic growth, or the need to support diversification of housebuilding through the allocation of small and medium size sites to support SME builders. Each of these reasons, on their own or in combination, could support the need for a higher housing requirement.

Full name: Rob Martin

Organisation (where relevant): Clyst Honiton Parish Council

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: With the potential for more than 20,000 homes to be delivered over the plan period, it is essential that the proposals are not over-optimistic. The experience of Cranbrook has shown that new settlements do not deliver dwellings as a constant flow because builders will always build in accordance with what can be sold, which often means shutting down building work at times when the economy slows. For this reason, Inspectors have been reluctant to accept stepped trajectories for housing supply loaded as this one is towards the back end of the plan period. The danger is that, if the initial years fall behind the trajectory, the later years end up having to provide totally undeliverable numbers, even without the new settlement taking longer than anticipated to get going which will also create problems later on. The net effect of this is for the plan to be disregarded when a 5-year housing supply cannot be demonstrated which ends up with the Cranbrook effect of dwellings being built without infrastructure just to get numbers on the ground. The problem is having no ‘Plan B’ in the early years.

Full name: Harriet Fuller

Organisation (where relevant): Environment Agency

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: The housing numbers, while we appreciate have been updated are not specific e.g. 'at least' and 'around' are used. Where possible, we would suggest using the specific numbers for clarity.

Full name: Steve Havers

Organisation (where relevant): National Highways

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP02

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: Strategic Policy SP02 sets out levels of future housing development, with the target to provide at least 20,909 dwellings (net) between April 2020 and March 2042, at a rate of 850 dwellings per annum to March 2032 and 1,070 dwellings per annum thereafter. Projected build-out from April 2024 is for 22,614 homes, providing headroom to account for possible non-delivery.

SP03

Full name: Robert Jones

Organisation (where relevant): River Otter Fisheries Association

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP03

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: SP02 / SP03 -We note that the plan proposes @1,600 additional houses in the Otter valley added to which during the plan period will be windfall gains from houses built within BUAB's.

Full name: Daniel Rogers

Organisation (where relevant): Bell Cornwell LLP

Other party name (if relevant): Mr J Persey

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP03

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: MR J PERSEY REPRESENTATIONS ON THE EAST DEVON LOCAL PLAN (2020 – 2042) REGULATION 19 CONSULTATION DRAFT (MARCH 2025) BY BELL CORNWELL LLP 1 INTRODUCTION Mr Persey and his family are long standing owners of large areas of agricultural land in East Devon. Our client's interests include much of the land around the village of Plymtree and the surrounding area. The family continue to farm the land today, and also have commercial operations including Fordmore Farm Shop and other commercial space on the East Devon / Mid Devon border. Our client therefore has a wide range of land and building interests in the district and they are actively promoting a site for housing in the village of Plymtree (Plym_03). Against this background, Bell Cornwell LLP has reviewed the policies and information set out in the East Devon Local Plan (2020 -2042) Regulation 19 Consultation Draft and makes the following representations. CHAPTER 3. THE SPATIAL STRATEGY Strategic Policy SP03: Housing Requirement by Designated Neighbourhood Area Mr Persey supports the overall approach of Strategic Policy SP03. This policy sets out the housing requirement figure for each designated neighbourhood area. It outlines the requirement for the period from April 2020 to April 2042. For Plymtree, this equates to 42 homes which will come from completions and allocations. The Designated Neighbourhood Area Housing Requirements Figures which are contained within the LPA evidence base (reference HOU-014) includes our client's land, Plym_03, which allocates 30 dwellings. This forms part of the overall housing requirement figure for the designated Plymtree Neighbourhood Area and confirms the importance of our client's site to meeting this target figure. It is therefore important for this site to be allocated to achieve this target. It should be noted that an outline planning application is currently submitted for this site. This application has the support of officers, and realistically, a reserved matters submission for the site could be expected later this year or early in 2026. Delivery of the site will therefore likely take place much faster than the timeline/schedule suggested in the EDDC evidence base

and the landowner is committed to delivery. We also note that the policy states that the figures expressed represent the minimum housing development in each of the Designated Neighbourhood Areas over the plan period. Proposals for MR J PERSEY REPRESENTATIONS ON THE EAST DEVON LOCAL PLAN (2020 – 2042) REGULATION 19 CONSULTATION DRAFT (MARCH 2025) BY BELL CORNWELL LLP 2 additional housing, including through allocations in neighbourhood plans to meet a specific local need will be supported where they are in accordance with other strategic policies in the Local Plan and supported by appropriate evidence. The fact that these figures are expressed as minimum targets is a positive approach to housing delivery which accords with guidance contained in the NPPF.

Full name: Daniel Rogers

Organisation (where relevant): Bell Cornwell LLP

Other party name (if relevant): Mr J Persey

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP03

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: Yes

2(a). If yes, and you wish to support the legal compliance of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: See attachment

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: Yes

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: See attachment

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

4(a). If yes, and you wish to support this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter's compliance with the duty to co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.: See attachment

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Bethan Haigh

Organisation (where relevant): Boyer Planning

Other party name (if relevant): Vistry Group

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP03

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Policy SP03 does not align with National Policy and the Government's overarching objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes under paragraph 60 of the NPPF (2023) and is therefore not sound.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: Greater emphasis must be placed on the fact that housing requirements for Neighbourhood Development Plan areas are considered as a minimum target and should therefore not prevent additional growth from coming forward.

Whilst Vistry therefore support the principle of Policy SP03, we are concerned and object to the current policy wording and consider that minor changes to the text are needed to ensure that the policy is consistent with National Policy.

Full name: Bethan Haigh

Organisation (where relevant): Boyer Planning

Other party name (if relevant): Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd. C/O Boyer

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP03

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:

2.33 We do not object in principle to Policy SP03, however, minor text revisions are required to ensure the policy is justified and accords with National Policy.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.:

2.34 Greater emphasis should be placed on conveying that the figures represent a minimum housing requirement. Although wording to this effect is mentioned in the second part of the policy, reiterating it within the table would enhance clarity for readers and decision-makers.

2.35 Additionally, we have observed discrepancies between the figures in this policy and those in other policies within the Draft LP. Notably, the Honiton DNA housing requirement in Strategic Policy SP03 specifies 839 homes, while the Honiton allocations identified within Strategic Policy SD03 (Honiton and its development allocations) amount to 838 homes.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : Our attendance is necessary to effectively discuss the points raised in these representations.

Full name: Alex Munday

Organisation (where relevant): Kitchener Land and Planning

Other party name (if relevant): Mr Lillie and Ms Blundell

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP03

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: We support reference within draft Policy SP03 to the inclusion of the Land West of Oaklands (WOOD-01) within the housing requirement figures breakdown.

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: We do however have some significant concerns with the overall housing requirement within which the designated neighbourhood area figures are derived, as set out in our response to draft Policy SP02.

Full name: Zoe Mason

Organisation (where relevant): Lichfields

Other party name (if relevant): Church Commissioners

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP03

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: The Commissioners own land in Clyst Honiton, East Devon, known as the Clyst Honiton Bypass Site ('the Site'). The Site has previously been submitted to the East Devon District Council (EDDC) Call for Sites consultation and Preferred Options Regulation 18 Consultation, as well as the to the Clyst Honiton Neighbourhood Plan and Greater Exeter Strategic Plan Call for Sites in April 2017. The Site is proposed to be brought forward for development under a Neighbourhood Development order, and was considered as an allocation in the Regulation 14 Clyst Honiton Neighbourhood Plan consultation. This was subsequently disregarded as it was understood that the Neighbourhood Development Order would not be brought forward on the same timeline as the now made Clyst Honiton Neighbourhood Plan. A plan showing the location of the site is included at Annex 1 [see uploaded document]. The Commissioners continue to engage with the Clyst Honiton Steering Group in relation to the emerging Neighbourhood Development Order.

The Commissioners support Strategic Policy SP03, which outlines the minimum development to take place in each Designated Neighbourhood Area during the plan period. We note the inclusion of a "minimum" figure, which provides a degree of flexibility that allows for additional development within the plan period. With respect to the Requirement Figures that support the policy in Appendix 2 of the Draft Plan, it is noted that the Commissioners' promoted Site, which is being pursued for development by the Clyst Honiton Parish Council through a Neighbourhood Development Order, is not accounted for within the figures. The Site has been excluded from the made Clyst Honiton Neighbourhood Plan (13 March 2025) due to a NDO not being able to be completed prior to the making of the plan. Whilst this is the case, the Site is likely to come forward within the plan period, and could be accounted for within Policy SP03 as a 'commitment.' This can assist to support in providing the shortfall in housing provision

as outlined above. The Site has been assessed to have a maximum capacity of 50 dwellings, employment space and a new community facility as promoted within the Regulation 14 and 16 Neighbourhood Plan consultations. As such, the Site could support the development of 50 dwellings.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: [As above] Site [at Clyst Honiton] could be accounted for within Policy SP03 as a 'commitment.'

Full name: Owen Jones

Organisation (where relevant): LRM Planning

Other party name (if relevant): David Wilson Homes

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP03

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: Yes

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:

9.3 DWH supports the principle of Strategic Policy SP03. They also understand the rationale for the minimum housing requirement for each designated area as set out within the Policy. However, because the approach taken uses designated neighbourhood plan areas, it has the potential to suggest that greater levels of housing are being provided at a settlement level than is the case. Whimple for instance, has a total minimum housing requirement of 611 dwellings. However, as shown in Appendix 2 of the emerging Local Plan, 500 dwellings of this requirement are associated with the Cobdens Expansion Area, which is physically divorced from the urban extent of Whimple.

9.4 In operation with Strategic Policy SP01, it has the potential for confusion, as whilst Strategic Policy SP01 recognises the West End, Strategic Policy SP03 does not. So, under Strategic Policy SP01, the 500 homes associated with the Cobdens development would be focused at the West End (under limb A of the Policy), whilst in Strategic Policy SP03 it would be attributable to the Whimple designated neighbourhood plan area. This has the potential to, in the terms of para. 16 of the NPPF, create ambiguity, which would conflict with national planning policy.

9.5 It would be more effective for the table contained within Strategic Policy SP03 to exclude housing commitments associated with the Cranbrook development from any designated neighbourhood plan area and either provide an explanation in the Policy, or its supporting text. Suggested changes TABLE 8 – SUGGESTED CHANGES TO POLICY SP03 DESIGNATED NEIGHBOURHOOD AREA (AS OF DECEMBER 2024, IN

ALPHABETICAL ORDER) TOTAL (MINIMUM) HOUSING REQUIREMENT (01/04/20 TO 01/04/42 31/03/42) - ALL SUPPLY SOURCES (COMPLETIONS, COMMITMENTS, DPD ALLOCATIONS (CRANBROOK, LOCAL PLAN (EXCLUDING SECOND NEW COMMUNITY), AND NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANS) MINIMUM CONTRIBUTION FROM EMERGING/FUTURE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANS (NOT MADE OR RECOMMENDED TO REFERENDUM AT DECEMBER 2024) Whimple 111* 0 *An additional 500 homes are allocated in the Cranbrook Plan within the Whimple Neighbourhood Area, but it is development that is more associated with Cranbrook/the West End

9.6 Please note that the minimum housing requirement established in the table above is made without prejudice to the considerations made elsewhere in this representation, that a greater minimum housing requirement should be provided at Whimple.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.:

9.3 DWH supports the principle of Strategic Policy SP03. They also understand the rationale for the minimum housing requirement for each designated area as set out within the Policy. However, because the approach taken uses designated neighbourhood plan areas, it has the potential to suggest that greater levels of housing are being provided at a settlement level than is the case. Whimple for instance, has a total minimum housing requirement of 611 dwellings. However, as shown in Appendix 2 of the emerging Local Plan, 500 dwellings of this requirement are associated with the Cobdens Expansion Area, which is physically divorced from the urban extent of Whimple.

9.4 In operation with Strategic Policy SP01, it has the potential for confusion, as whilst Strategic Policy SP01 recognises the West End, Strategic Policy SP03 does not. So, under Strategic Policy SP01, the 500 homes associated with the Cobdens development would be focused at the West End (under limb A of the Policy), whilst in Strategic Policy SP03 it would be attributable to the Whimple designated neighbourhood plan area. This has the potential to, in the terms of para. 16 of the NPPF, create ambiguity, which would conflict with national planning policy.

9.5 It would be more effective for the table contained within Strategic Policy SP03 to exclude housing commitments associated with the Cranbrook development from any designated neighbourhood plan area and either provide an explanation in the Policy, or its supporting text. Suggested changes TABLE 8 – SUGGESTED CHANGES TO POLICY SP03 DESIGNATED NEIGHBOURHOOD AREA (AS OF DECEMBER 2024, IN

ALPHABETICAL ORDER) TOTAL (MINIMUM) HOUSING REQUIREMENT (01/04/20 TO 01/04/42 31/03/42) - ALL SUPPLY SOURCES (COMPLETIONS, COMMITMENTS, DPD ALLOCATIONS (CRANBROOK, LOCAL PLAN (EXCLUDING SECOND NEW COMMUNITY), AND NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANS) MINIMUM CONTRIBUTION FROM EMERGING/FUTURE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANS (NOT MADE OR RECOMMENDED TO REFERENDUM AT DECEMBER 2024) Whimple 111* 0 *An additional 500 homes are allocated in the Cranbrook Plan within the Whimple Neighbourhood Area, but it is development that is more associated with Cranbrook/the West End

9.6 Please note that the minimum housing requirement established in the table above is made without prejudice to the considerations made elsewhere in this representation, that a greater minimum housing requirement should be provided at Whimple.

[Change suggested in table in attached PDF]

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : Due to the significant policy issues concerned.

Full name: Oliver Keates

Organisation (where relevant): OBK Land and Planning Ltd

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP03

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: Yes

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: Yes

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: A "Minimum Contribution from Emerging/ future Neighbourhood Plans" of 72 dwellings is identified for Bishops Clyst (Clyst St Mary and Sowton). It is important to stress that this is a "Minimum" figure for Clyst St Mary and, on this basis, I support this policy.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Jeremy Gardiner

Organisation (where relevant): Pegasus Group

Other party name (if relevant): Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP03

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: This policy proposes a minimum housing requirement for each Neighbourhood Designated Area in the district. Given that the plan has been prepared under the transitional arrangements set out in paragraphs 234 – 235 of the NPPF, the proposed Neighbourhood Area housing requirements only plan to meet 80% of local housing need, consistent with draft Strategic Policy SP02. Again, this does not provide a solution to delivering the minimum local housing need. At 100% of its local housing need, the minimum requirement for Feniton would be 159 dwellings.

Full name: Elliot Jones

Organisation (where relevant): Planning Potential

Other party name (if relevant): Bloor Homes

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP03

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: Yes

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.:

4.18. This policy sets out the housing requirement figure for each designated neighbourhood area. It outlines the requirement for the period from April 2020 to April 2042. For Exmouth, this amounts to 2,311 homes, which will come from completions and allocations. A review of the Designated Neighbourhood Area Housing Requirements Figures (HOU-014) indicates that the Land to the South of Littleham forms part of the overall housing requirement figure for designated Exmouth Neighbourhood Area.

4.19. On this point, the site at Littleham will be the subject of a hybrid planning application, which is due to be submitted in Autumn 2025. The anticipation is that it would be determined during the course of 2026 and that, if approved, work on the site could commence in early 2027 with the first homes being completed later in that year. This is significantly in advance of the schedule set out in the appendix to the Designated Neighbourhood Area Housing Requirements Figures (HOU-014), which suggested that site will not start delivering homes until 2032/33.

4.20. In addition, the policy notes that these figures represent the minimum housing development in each of the Designated Neighbourhood Areas over the plan period. Proposals for additional housing, including through allocations in neighbourhood plans to meet a specific local need will be supported where they are in accordance with other strategic policies in this Plan and supported by appropriate evidence.

4.21. This policy aligns with the guidance in the NPPF at Paragraph 69, which states that:

'Within this overall requirement, strategic policies should also set out a housing requirement for designated neighbourhood areas which reflects the overall strategy for the pattern and scale of development and any relevant allocations. Once the strategic policies have been adopted, these figures should not need re-testing at the neighbourhood plan examination, unless there has been a significant change in circumstances that affects the requirement.'

4.22. In principle, Bloor Homes are supportive of this policy, the fact that Land to the South of Littleham forms part of the overall housing requirement for Exmouth and the drafting of the policy that says the figures should be considered as a minimum.

4.23. However, the Council should be mindful - that at the point of submission for examination - the housing requirement specified in Strategic Policy S03 is up to date and based on the latest available inputs to the Standard Method. Failure to do so would undermine the plan's ability to be 'positively prepared' and 'consistent with national policy'– two key tests of 'soundness.'

4.24. Moreover, it is important that the final housing figure continues to be expressed as a 'minimum' figure. As recognised by government and the Council, there is a serious shortage of new homes being delivered where there are pressing affordability issues. This is further compounded by a shortage of new homes coming forward. Accordingly, Bloor Homes supports Strategic Policy S03 in determining that the housing requirement should not be a cap for development and the figure represents the minimum number of new homes that should be planned for in the authority area.

4.25. Indeed, in these terms, it is noted that the Local Plan does not account for unmet need from neighbouring authorities. This position might change given the uplift in housing targets in neighbouring authorities as well as the wider uncertainty regarding proposed local government changes in Devon. As such, Bloor Homes suggest that this matter should be kept under review.

4.26. Furthermore, it is recommended that Statements of Common Ground on this matter should be agreed prior to the plan being submitted for Local Plan Examination. The Council will be aware that it is under a Duty to Cooperate and will need to demonstrate effective and on-going joint working with neighbouring authorities. This is particularly relevant given the recent experience of BCP Council, whose Local Plan Examination has not progressed following a failure, perceived by the Planning

Inspectorate, to cooperate with Dorset and New Forest Council in relation to housing matters.

4.27. Strategic Policy S03 is supported by Bloor Homes. The inclusion of Land to the South of Littleham as part of the overall housing requirement for Exmouth is welcomed. Likewise, the fact that the policy suggests that the figures set out should be considered to be a minimum is also considered to respect 'best practice' and will allow for much needed flexibility in terms of housing provision. That said, the Council, in the lead into the Examination, should ensure that the housing requirement figure is up-to-date and that they have adequately addressed the Duty to Cooperate in terms of unmet housing need from neighbouring authorities.

4.28. Bloor Homes support this policy.

Full name: Elliot Jones

Organisation (where relevant): Planning Potential

Other party name (if relevant): Bloor Homes

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP03

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: No

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: A Supporting Statement has been submitted on behalf of Bloor Homes in respect of the Land to the South of Littleham. It has been submitted in respect of Policy SP01 but considers Policy SP03 and others.

2(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter legally compliant, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter legally compliant. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: Please see Supporting Statement

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Please see Supporting Statement

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: Please see Supporting Statement

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: No

4(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.: Please see supporting Statement

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : The matters raised in our representations affect matters of strategic importance that run to the heart of the East Devon Local Plan 2020 to 2042. In our capacity as a major housebuilder, we would welcome the opportunity to partake in the hearing session(s).

Full name: Dan Yeates

Organisation (where relevant): Savills

Other party name (if relevant): Sidbury LVA LLP

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP03

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: No

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: We support reference within draft Policy SP03 to the inclusion of the Land South of Furzehill, Sidbury within the housing requirement figures breakdown. It is clear from the Regulation 19 plan that the site forms part of the proposed local plan allocations figure of 215 dwellings.

We do however have some significant concerns with the overall housing requirement within which the designated neighbourhood area figures are derived, as set out in our response to draft Policy SP02 above.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: We also consider that given neighbourhood planning is an entirely voluntary activity, outside of the control of the Council, housing delivered through Neighbourhood Plans is not a reliable enough source of supply to contribute to the

housing land supply position, and they should be viewed as providing additional capacity.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: No

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : It is important that Sidbury LVA LLP is present to participate in the hearing session for Policy SP03 owing to their interest in Land South of Furzehill (Sidm_34). It is important that they are given the opportunity to make their case in relation to this policy.

Full name: Dan Yeates

Organisation (where relevant): Savills

Other party name (if relevant): 3West Group

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP03

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: No

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: We support reference within draft Policy SP03 to the inclusion of the Land north and east of Exton Farm within the housing requirement figures breakdown. It is clear from the Regulation 19 plan that the site forms part of the proposed local plan allocations figure of 311 dwellings.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: We do however have some significant concerns with the overall housing requirement within which the designated neighbourhood area figures are derived, as set out in our response to draft Policy SP02.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: No

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : It is important that 3West Group is present to participate in the hearing session for Policy SP03 owing to their interest in the Land north and east of Exton Farm (Wood_28). It is important that they are given the opportunity to make their case in relation to this policy.

Full name: Cara Chambers

Organisation (where relevant): Stantec

Other party name (if relevant): KCS Development

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP03

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: Yes

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: Strategic Policy SP03

4.2.3 This policy relates to housing requirement by designated neighbourhood area. The total minimum housing requirement for Ottery St Mary is 483 dwellings over the plan period. It should be noted that Axminster, a settlement on the same level of the settlement hierarchy as Ottery St Mary, has a minimum requirement of 1,409 dwellings.

4.2.4 Whilst the identification of Ottery as a Main Centre is supported and sound, the overall level of development identified for Ottery is unsound for reasons set out below as Ottery can accommodate additional development.

Full name: Helen Dimond

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP03

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: Yes

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Lympstone was the first village in East Devon to have a Neighbourhood Plan made which allocated sites for 40 dwellings in accordance with the current Local Plan . The village has some 900 households and this was a reasonable level of new development for the village to accommodate . it now seems that the neighbourhood area needs 323 , a massive increase of over a third . This compares with Budleigh Salterton a much larger settlement with appears to need only 132 . There are similar extreme variations in the level of housing need identified for other places . A more equable distribution of housing is needed.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: There needs to be a fairer distribution of housing better related to the nature of places . This relates back to my comments on SP01

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : I want to ensure that I have done as much as I can to ensureLympstone has an appropriate level of development.

Full name: Mr John Hamill

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP03

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: No

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: No

4(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.: Budleigh Salterton Town Council (BSTC)has not been consistently engaged in the processes of EDDC which is in direct conflict with EDDC's Statement of Community Involvement published on their website. P16 states:The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2012 require the Council to consult the following 'specific' and 'general' consultation bodies if proposals in planning policy documents affect them. A number of these bodies are also considered to be Duty to Co-operate bodies. It is important to note that the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (schedule 1) also requires qualifying bodies to consult the same consultation bodies in the preparation of Neighbourhood Development Plans. In instances where any of the organisations (bodies) detailed below cease to exist, successor bodies will be consulted. In the bodies annotated to this statement are:-Town / Parish Councils - ? All Town and Parish Councils within and adjoining East Devon District. By completely ignoring BSTC, EDDC have failed their own policy and thus the Duty to Co-operate requirements of the Regulation 19 Consultation. Not only does EDDC have the Duty to Co-operate with Organisations but also an obligation to ensure development is viable, for example infrastructure such as effective sewage removal and processing and the capacity and safety of Highways. It is not clear that Devon County Council, the Authority responsible for Highways, has been properly consulted. It would appear to be obvious that infrastructure should be capable of handling any future development whic can only be achieved by proper consultation with the relevant Authority. EDDC has failed to do this.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : Having tried to be heard by EDDC for many months I would like the opportunity to speak before the Inspector

Full name: Graham Long

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP03

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: No

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: The Spatial Strategy relies on a simplistic Sustainability Assessment conducted by EDDC to determine which settlements are sustainable and will be allowed housing development and which settlements are not sustainable and will not be allowed housing development 2020 to 2042. This assessment and the simplistic scoring of each settlement such that a score of 7 and over means a settlement is sustainable and a score of 6 or less means a settlement is unsustainable, was done without any consultation with local residents or parish councils. EDDC refuse to adjust their scoring following input from local residents. EDDC have not weighted the importance of each of the facilities and services scored in the assessment saying they did not have the time to apply weightings.

2(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter legally compliant, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter legally compliant. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: Although the number of facilities and services EDDC consider could make a settlement sustainable was increased early in the process by EDDC from 10 to 11, the 6/7 cut of for sustainability was not adjusted by EDDC. I suggest that any settlement which has missed the sustainability score by 1 mark (i.e. scored 6 rather than 7) should be allowed to have their score increased by 1 such that they are considered sustainable (and allowed a small amount of limited housing development) if the local population, represented by the parish council consider that appropriate.

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: A simplistic black and white

tick box approach to the sustainability assessment and an arbitrary cut off at 6 and below =unstainable, 7 and above =sustainable, without consultation with parish councils and local residents casts any settlement scoring 6 or less in aspic and condemns that settlement to stagnation and decline for the next 18 years and has means that young people are forced to move away when they start their own families and no new homes will be available where they grew up. It has serious consequences for the viability of existing primary schools in such "unsustainable" settlements. It has serious consequences for local businesses, such as village pubs and local community hubs like village halls

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: The EDDC Local Plan 2020 to 2042 should reflect the growth needs of local communities and not be a masterplan forced on local communities from above. Each settlement that has a sustainability score of 6 should be allowed to have their score increased by one point to 7 if they consider that their parish/village/settlement is sustainable and they want small organic growth of their settlement as recommended by the CLA who call for a return to a policy which promotes organic incremental growth in settlements of fewer than 3,000 inhabitants..... A smaller number of houses in a larger number of villages would support the sustainability of rural areas reversing decades of settlements being held in aspic unable to incrementally grow to meet the changing needs of the community" - Para 5.1, CLA Recommendations in CLA report: Sustainable Communities; The Role of Housing in Strengthening the Rural Economy, 2022

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: No

4(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.: As previously stated, EDDC conducted sustainability assessments of settlements as a desk exercise, without consulting local residents and parish councils. In the case of my parish Upottery this resulted in a sustainability score of 6 and results on no new housing being allowed in the settlement before 2042. As EDDC have told me, "Upottery village will be consdidered to be open fields where development is not allowed". This condemns Upottery to stagnation and decline despite the fact that it is a thriving village. NB: Misleadingly, the table on page 34 of Spatial Strategic Policy SP03 shows Upottery to have a total housing requirement of 3 between 2020 and 2042. These 3 properties are barn conversions that have already been approved by EDDC before

now, 2025. No development will be allowed between now and 2042 because EDDC gave Upottery a sustainability score of 6.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : Please see attached pdf; "FAO Planning Inspector". Understanding the growth and housing development needs of a community is difficult to do as a "paper exercise" and the deficiencies of EDDC's sustainability assessments demonstrate that. For that reason it is important to present those requirements "face to face" and that is why I consider it necessary to participate in the hearing session(s)

Full name: Andrew Minter

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP03

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: No

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: SP03 - This table is disingenuous and has been massaged to show the reader what EDDC wants them to believe rather than what is the case. The table purports to set out that the vast majority of new or emerging Neighbourhood Plans do not propose any housing developments in their regions. Speaking SPECIFICALLY for Lympstone Parish Council (LPC), which is in the process of updating its Neighbourhood Plan (which expires in 2026), LPC was SPECIFICALLY told by EDDC NOT to include any house building targets in its emerging plan UNTIL the new EDDC Local Plan had been agreed. So Of Course there are zero new houses in the emerging plan! How to make EDDC look so good and to unfairly and incorrectly label the village and towns councils as conservative NIMBYs when all that town and village councils want to do is manage sustainable housing growth so SPIRIT OF PLACE is not completely destroyed.

2(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter legally compliant, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter legally compliant. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: 2b contents should be inserted into the plan, or at least the statement that village and town councils were instructed to WAIT for the EDDC LP to be finalised before putting new housing numbers in

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: No

4(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.: see comments above

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : I want my voice to be heard

Full name: Rachel Danemann

Organisation (where relevant): Home Builders Federation (HBF)

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP03

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: The policy is not considered to be sound as it is not positively prepared, effective, justified or con-sistent with national policy

56. As neighbourhood planning is an entirely voluntary activity and as such is outside of the control of the Council, HBF do not believe housing delivered through Neighbourhood Plans is a reliable enough source of supply to contribute to the Housing Land Supply Position, and they should be viewed as providing additional capacity.

Full name: Alice Gater-Wildgust

Organisation (where relevant): Budleigh Salterton Town Council

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP03

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: No

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: We are unable to determine if this policy is legally compliant

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: SP03 is not sound, particularly in addressing the local housing needs of Budleigh Salterton. Specifically, the plan does not adequately address the demand for affordable housing within the town. There is a notable deficiency in the provision of affordable housing in accordance with the housing needs of Budleigh Salterton, which prevents the plan from ensuring that the needs of the entire demographic are met, especially for low- to middle-income households. The current proposals do not demonstrate a sufficient commitment to achieving a balanced and sustainable housing market in the area. Additionally, Budleigh Salterton Town Council (BSTC) advocates for the inclusion of conditions in the granting of planning permission for any new developments, ensuring that appropriate infrastructure is in place to support the growing population. This includes, but is not limited to, sufficient school capacity, as outlined in the evidence presented elsewhere in the document (Ref: SD27). Without these critical infrastructure provisions, the plan will not adequately support the needs of the community in the long term.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: Increased and ringfenced affordable housing provision: The plan should be revised to allocate a greater proportion of housing units for affordable

housing for local people, ensuring that the needs of low- to middle-income households are met. Clear commitment to meeting demographic demands: The plan should provide clear, measurable objectives to meet the needs of the entire demographic spectrum in Budleigh Salterton. This involves not only increasing the quantity of affordable housing but also ensuring that a variety of housing types and sizes are available to accommodate diverse community needs. By incorporating these modifications, SP03 would better meet the needs of the local population, ensuring it is both sound and responsive to the housing challenges in Budleigh Salterton.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: No

4(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.: Budleigh Salterton Town Council, and by extension its residents, have not been consistently engaged with in the ongoing discussions, which constitutes a failure in the duty to cooperate. Not only is there a requirement to co-operate with organisations, EDDC has an obligation to ensure that development is viable, given infrastructure problems such as handling of sewage by SWW and the capacity and safety of Highways. Ongoing current local issues should be fully resolved before developments are given any go ahead.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : BSTC wish to be present to hear, in full any discussions

Full name: Bethan Haigh

Organisation (where relevant): Boyer Planning

Other party name (if relevant): Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd. C/O Boyer

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP03

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:

2.36 Whilst we agree with the principle of this policy, we object to the current policy wording, which appears to restrict and discourage Neighbourhood Plans from allocating sites beyond settlement boundaries.

2.38 Should updated evidence be prepared in support of a future Neighbourhood Plan that suggests that there is a local unmet need for additional housing (beyond that identified within the adopted LP), the Council should not prevent additional sites from being allocated within the Neighbourhood Plan.

2.39 As currently worded, therefore, it is considered that this Strategic Policy is not sound as it does not align with National Policy and the Government's overarching objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes (NPPF; Paragraph 61).

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.:

2.37 The housing numbers within the Council's strategic policies and housing distribution should not represent a ceiling for growth. Neighbourhood Plans must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan in force (in order to meet the basic conditions).

SP04

Full name: Nicola Wilson

Organisation (where relevant): Devon County Council

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP04

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: The county council notes that the Economic Development Needs Assessment (EDNA) from 2020 has been used as part of the suite of evidence base documents. DCC requests that references to the EDNA in the plan include additional wording to clarify how pre-covid trend estimates and changes in demand for the usage class split have been addressed, which may have been affected by more recent economic trends. DCC also recommends that Evidence Base document ECN-007 is updated. DCC considers that all references to the EDNA should include additional wording to clarify how the use of pre-covid trend estimates and the usage class split in the assessment has been addressed, as they may have changed in light of more recent economic trends. In particular, whether the volume of demand and the type of units may have changed since then. This could include, for instance, looking at impacts of remote working on office space and the potential change in demand for warehousing and light industrial.

Full name: Amy Roberts

Organisation (where relevant): Bell Cornwell LLP

Other party name (if relevant): GB House and Son

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP04

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Please refer to the attached sheet.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: Please refer to the attached sheet.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : To highlight the suitability and availability of our client's land in Woodbury to facilitate the growth and expansion of Woodbury Business Park - a well-established, popular and successful local employment site - to help provide a resilient local rural economy and prevent out-commuting to Exeter.

Full name: Amy Roberts

Organisation (where relevant): Bell Cornwell LLP

Other party name (if relevant): Mr and Mrs Feast

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP04

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: Yes

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: Please refer to the attached sheet.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Daniel Rogers

Organisation (where relevant): Bell Cornwell LLP

Other party name (if relevant): Combe Estates

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP04

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Strategic Policy SP04: Employment Provision and Distribution Strategy Combe Estate supports the overall approach of Strategic Policy SP04, which sees their land at Gitt_03 and Gitt_04 allocated for employment use. The Estate support the technical evidence base which has determined the quantum of new employment land proposed for Honiton. It is noted that this site is currently allocated in the adopted Local Plan, and the land within our client's control is entirely available for development. There is strong support for the allocation and our client is committed to seeing this allocation delivered. However, we note that within policy SP04 the uses allocated on designated sites are for B2, B8 and E(g) use. Whilst Combe Estate clearly support this allocation in principle, it is disappointing that the allocations or policy text within SP04 does not clearly allow for a wider disposition of land uses. For example, paragraph 3.21 of plan states that, "Particular attention is given to emerging technologies, green industries, and adapting to changes like increased homeworking and artificial intelligence." However, there appears to be very little, if any, content within the policy that makes provision for a wider range of employment opportunities beyond traditional office and industrial uses. COMBE ESTATE REPRESENTATIONS ON THE EAST DEVON LOCAL PLAN (2020 – 2042) REGULATION 19 CONSULTATION DRAFT (MARCH 2025) BY BELL CORNWELL LLP 2 As such, Combe Estate would suggest that a wider range of employment generating uses should be defined within Policy SP04 to allow for a changing employment market and to ensure that East Devon District as a whole is able to respond and provide employment accommodation that reflects a modern economy. In summary, while Combe Estate support the allocation of their land, there needs to be greater acknowledgement of the changing nature of employment activity, with amendments to policy to include:

• Giving equal/greater weight to other Class E uses (not just E(g) within in the policy.

• Include a policy clause that would allow flexibility to deliver more than ‘traditional’ employment uses where there is evidence to suggest this is appropriate (e.g. a need for other leisure, tourism, community uses)

Full name: Daniel Rogers

Organisation (where relevant): Bell Cornwell LLP

Other party name (if relevant): Combe Estate

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP04

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: Yes

2(a). If yes, and you wish to support the legal compliance of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: See attached

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: there is insufficient flexibility on the definition of employment uses - they should be broader than traditional B2, B8 and E(g) use classes - see attached document.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Simon Coles

Organisation (where relevant): CarneySweeney

Other party name (if relevant): C G Fry & Son Ltd

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP04

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: EMPLOYMENT

As set out above, Strategic Policy SP04 identifies provision of 178.16ha of employment land against an identified need of 80ha. While reference is made to providing range and choice this significant over supply – some 98ha – is totally unjustified. The wording supporting Policy SP04 makes no explanation as to why it is appropriate to overprovide 98ha of employment floorspace, an oversupply of some 123%, when the same approach is not being applied (for example) to housing numbers, where the Council are only just meeting a target that falls short of the latest NPPF numbers.

In addition, the SP04 justification wording also fails to explain why a seemingly generic approach has been applied of allocating small pockets of employment floorspace as part of housing allocations. The Council's Site Selection Report (SAL-005), which supports the allocation of the Land East of Musbury Road, assesses Axmi_02, Axmi_08 and Axmi_09 for housing only and provides a yield accordingly (Axmi_02 – 100 dwellings, Axmi_08 – 68 dwellings, Axmi_09 – 270 dwellings). No mention is made of any potential capacity, or suitability for employment use. The site is also not assessed at all under the East Devon Employment Land Review (ECN-004) and so it remains unclear in which evidence document the Council has justified its position that this site is suitable for employment uses.

The site is not considered suitable for traditional employment 'sheds' due to its heritage and landscape sensitivities and small pockets of commercial use spread through residential development are very hard to make successful. Given the significant need for housing as compared to the much smaller need for employment land, it is not clear

why the Council are not choosing to maximise housing delivery on suitable sites such as this.

Further it is noted that one of the proposed allocations at Axminster is on an existing employment site – Land at Axminster Carpets (Axmi_07). This site is currently a 4.99ha site, part of which is in active employment use. While being proposed as mixed use for 50 dwellings and the retention of the existing 0.5 ha of employment it would make more sense to increase/redevelop the employment use on this site rather than decant employment uses to our client's site.

Axmi_07 is more centrally located within the town, immediately adjacent to Axminster Train Station, so must be considered a better location for increased employment opportunities. The loss of part of the site to residential also conflicts with Strategic Policy SE04: Resisting the loss of employment sites. If the Council are accepting the loss of 4.49ha of employment floorspace (total site area less the allocation requirement to retain 0.5ha) in a better location for such uses, it must undermine the justification for any employment being provided on Land East of Musbury Road.

Full name: Simon Collier

Organisation (where relevant): Collier Planning

Other party name (if relevant): Eagle One MMIII Ltd

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP04

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: We write on behalf of Eagle Investments (SW) Ltd to make representations on the Local Plan Regulation 19 Publication Draft consultation with reference to land which it owns at St Johns, Exmouth, which is included as part of the draft allocation Exmo_20. It is unclear at this stage what has formed the basis of the employment provision and distribution strategy set out within Strategic Policy SP04. There appears to be a lack of evidence underpinning this policy and how it has been conceived. We note that an element of the proposed strategy is for Use Class E(g)(iii) light industrial use needs to be met alongside larger housing developments as allocations. We question the rationale for this and what assessment has been made in respect of how suitable such allocations are for accommodating light industrial employment needs of the area. At this stage, we do not consider that it has been demonstrated that this strategy is Justified or likely to be Effective for delivering employment land and premises in the right places over the plan period.

Full name: Claire Alers-Hankey

Organisation (where relevant): Greenslade Taylor Hunt

Other party name (if relevant): Waddeton Park Ltd

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP04

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: Yes

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Response to The Spatial Strategy Chapter 3 within the consultation document refers to quantity, type and distribution of development within East Devon. Strategic Policy SP04: Employment provision and distribution strategy This policy seeks to allocate a total of 178.16 hectares of land for employment use. The employment land total includes sites that have planning permission which have not yet been constructed and also 17.5 hectares of employment land at a second new community, to be delivered by 2042. Given the very premature stage that the second new settlement is at, as set out within Policy WS01 of the consultation document, it is considered unrealistic that over 17 hectares of employment land could be delivered within this timescale. There is currently no agreed masterplan for the new settlement, and to expect extensive employment land to have been delivered within the next 17 years (by 2042) is an unachievable timeline. Furthermore, there has been an historic under delivery of employment land within East Devon, as evidenced within the Greater Exeter Economic Development Needs Assessment (EDNA). Therefore, EDDC should be seeking to allocate land well in excess of the 80 hectares mid-point clean growth scenario set out within the EDNA. Paragraph 6.2.2 of the EDNA states, 'The West End of East Devon is the most popular location within Greater Exeter for industrial occupiers. This is due to accessibility to the regional road network and the availability of both serviced land and good quality second-hand options. It is evidence that there is a large quantity of unsatisfied demand.' The new National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out in paragraph 85, an ambitious strategy with significant weight attributed to the need to support economic growth and productivity, taking into account both local business needs and wider opportunities for development. The approach taken to economic development should allow each area to

build on its strengths, counter any weaknesses and address the challenges of the future. The West End is identified as a strategically important location for economic growth to serve the needs of both EDDC but also Exeter City, given the proximity to Exeter. The policy as currently drafted is relying on insufficient and unsuitable sites to come forward within an unrealistic time frame.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: SP04 - Additional land that is deliverable should be allocated. Land north of Sowton has undergone a robust pre-planning analysis, to inform Waddeton Park Ltd of the constraints and feasibility of development in this location. The site is in a sustainable location, with close proximity to the regional transport corridor of the M5 and A30 and it is achievable to deliver the site for economic development within the Plan period. Constraints identified with the site are capable of being mitigated through the design process. Therefore, this site should be included as an allocated site for employment within the Local Plan, as previously proposed in the draft Local Plan.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : To present the case for the inclusion of land north of Sowton as an employment allocation.

Full name: Zoe Mason

Organisation (where relevant): Lichfields

Other party name (if relevant): Church Commissioners

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP04

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: Yes

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: [Representation on behalf of Church Commissioners who own land at Clyst Honiton] The Commissioners endorse EDDC's objective of supporting business investment and job creation opportunities within East Devon. The Commissioners have a record of delivering facilities in East Devon, including the Exeter Gateway Distribution facility to the north of the Site, at which Lidl and Amazon distribution centres are already operating. It is noted that Strategic Policy SP04 does not quantify a proportion of employment land contribution for windfall developments. The flexibility of this approach is supported by the Commissioners, as it allows site specific circumstances, such as location and viability, to be taken into account when determining appropriate land uses.

Full name: Zoe Mason

Organisation (where relevant): Lichfields

Other party name (if relevant): Mr M.J. Nancekivell and Mr R.P. Nancekivell

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP04

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: No

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: Whilst the Landowner is supportive in principle of delivering employment land within allocation Otry_01b, there must be flexibility in the draft policy to account for any changes to the market or changes in employment demand in the future.

2(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter legally compliant, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter legally compliant. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: The following text should be added to Policy Sp04: "If market testing for 12 months at an appropriate market rate demonstrates a lack of demand for the employment land then a revised scheme mix can be considered including the delivery of additional homes." This is to ensure that sufficient flexibility is included within the draft policy.

Full name: James McMurdo

Organisation (where relevant): McMurdo Land Planning and Development Ltd

Other party name (if relevant): Stuart Partners Ltd

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP04

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: [McMurdo Land Planning & Development Ltd on Behalf of Stuart Partners Ltd relating to Strategic Land at the "West End" of East Devon District made in the context of significant land holdings in this area. Representation to be read in conjunction with representations made by Turley on behalf of Stuart Partners Ltd and Bloor Homes Exeter on the proposed new and an expanded Hill Barton Business Park, and by Carney Sweeney on behalf of Stuart Partners Ltd and Down, relating to land being promoted for a village for up to 2,000 houses between Clyst St George and Clyst St Mary]

Object

Reasons: Allocating C 50% of employment land in national landscapes is at odds with the NPPF and the vision, objectives, and sustainability appraisal work, evidenced sub regional housing and employment land needs, and market forces, especially when other far better, more sustainable and market facing, alternatives (Like Hill Bartton and Greendale Barton) exist in the "West End" of the district.

Concerning employment land supply in East Devon (and the subregion) Appeal Reference APP/U1105/W/23/3323252 on land at Hill Barton Business Park in East Devon is relevant. From Paragraph 29 the Inspector states: "29. It is common ground between the parties that there is a lack of supply of available employment land at present. The draft Framework indicates support for key industries, including freight and logistics.... 30. Consequently, I need to consider the weight to be attached to that lack

of supply of available employment land, weight to be attached to policies of the emerging Local Plan and draft Framework, and the need for this development. Supply of employment land 31. The East Devon Local Economic Review published by the Council in October 2023 summarises the most up to date position in relation to the need for employment land. This indicates current demand (2022) for over 50ha of employment space, of which around 80% relates to the logistics sector, that would include the businesses occupying the appeal site. However, currently available space comprises only 1.7ha, of which over 70% is office space, i.e. unlikely to be suitable for the logistics sector. 32. Over the period 2019-2040 demand for employment space in East Devon is expected to be nearly 130ha, of which over 123ha would be for industrial and logistics space. Current and future supply over that period is anticipated to be approximately 87ha. That indicates a remaining shortfall at the end of that period of approximately 43ha. 33. Logistics businesses, such as those using the appeal site, need locations with good access to the road network. In this part of Devon, this means demand is focussed on Exeter and around the M5. Hill Barton Business Park is well located within that area, with good access to the M5. However, only the west part of East Devon is located within that market area, with potential sites for development to meet the needs of logistics operators being both within and outside East Devon. The Council accept that more land needs to be found for these operators. 34. In conclusion, there is a demonstrable and significant shortfall in the provision of employment land in the area around Hill Barton Business Park, particularly for logistics operators. This must carry significant weight in the planning balance."

ECC, in this this context, in its Regulation 19 Publication Plan, proposes 85% of its housing delivery on brownfield land, a substantial proportion of which is existing high value employment land (when ECC accepts it needs to provide 80ha of employment land in the Plan period).

The under supply of employment land in the current plan period in EDDC and ECC (i.e. in the subregion) needs to be correctly addressed by the Council and the shortfall rectified within the emerging Local Plan by positively engaging with ECC, accommodating the development needs of the City which cannot be met there, in the "West End" of East Devon.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as

precise as possible.: Remove non-strategic (i.e. small sites) from employment land allocations (many of which are not proven to be deliverable in any case and Remove employment land allocations from national landscapes (which are not market facing in any case) and Allocate more employment land away from national landscapes and to meet EDDC's, and ECC's unmet, needs, on the area free from development constraints, the "West End" of the district, including expanding Hill Barton early in the plan period to meet clearly evidenced pent up demand in the logistics, waste, and energy sectors. We will present detailed expert evidence on these matters as the plan progresses to EiP

Full name: Elliot Jones

Organisation (where relevant): Planning Potential

Other party name (if relevant): Bloor Homes

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP04

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:

4.29. Bloor Homes note that the Council have sought to prepare a robust technical evidence base to determine the quantum of new employment land required within East Devon during the Local Plan period. This is welcomed.

4.30. However, and despite acknowledgment in the preceding paragraphs that employment uses now encompass a wider range of use classes beyond traditional office, industrial, and retail functions, the current drafting of the policy does not appear to reflect this. Equally, the supporting text notes that there will be an increasing role for emerging technology, homeworking, and artificial intelligence (AI) in shaping employment patterns in future but, again, the allocation of employment sites does not seem to take this into account.

4.31. Accordingly, Bloor Homes object to the policy in its current form on the grounds that employment-generating uses outside of Class E are not given the same weight as those within this category. It is noted that underneath the categorisation of the employment uses, there is a provision which states that: 'Other employment generating development, such as sustainable green rural tourism and leisure development will be permitted in accordance with other Plan Policies.'

4.32. This is welcomed because the economy (type of jobs) is evolving rapidly, and many viable employment uses do not neatly fit within traditional employment uses such as manufacturing, logistics, and offices. Other sectors can and will contribute significantly to employment and economic growth. The current lack of weight or prominence given to these non-traditional employment uses risks creating an imbalance in how employment sites are allocated and developed, which could undermine the ability to provide a diverse and adaptable employment landscape in East Devon.

4.33. Furthermore, if technical evidence demonstrates that there is demand for a non-traditional employment use and that supply of employment land for offices, industrial and logistics is sufficient then alternative employment uses should be permitted on sites. This approach will allow for a responsive and evidence-based allocation/development of employment land, ensuring that East Devon can attract and retain a diverse range of businesses.

4.34. Accordingly, the policy should also provide greater flexibility in the quantum of land required for employment uses, as it might be the case that emerging industries require less space (than that allocated in the Local Plan) to meet the same level of employment creation. It also considered that the policy should include mechanisms to reassess employment land allocations in response to evolving market conditions and business needs.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.:

4.35. In summary, while Bloor Homes support the Local Plan's acknowledgment of the changing nature of employment uses, we urge the Council to:

- Give equal weight to non-E-class employment uses in the policy.

- Include a policy caveat allowing flexibility where technical evidence shows a need for alternative employment uses or different size requirement; and

- Ensure the policy framework remains adaptable to economic changes, including technological advancements and evolving work patterns.

4.36. Bloor Homes do not object to the overall direction of the policy but consider that there is a need for more recognition that employment and job creation come from a variety of different sources and uses. This means that traditional allocation of land as part of mixed-use development will require some flexibility to be applied if it is brought forward. This flexibility should be in form of the weight to be given to non-traditional forms of employment in the policy, the quantum of land required and the introduction of a review mechanism to ensure the employment land provided is 'fit for purpose' and is developed positively.

4.37. Bloor Homes objects to current wording of this policy.

Full name: Elliot Jones

Organisation (where relevant): Planning Potential

Other party name (if relevant): Bloor Homes

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP04

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: No

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: A supporting Statement has been submitted on behalf of Bloor Homes in respect of the Land to the South of Littleham, Exmouth. It has been submitted in respect of Policy SP01 but considers Policy SP04 and others.

2(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter legally compliant, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter legally compliant. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: Please see Supporting Statement

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Please see Supporting Statement

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: Please see Supporting Statement

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: No

4(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.: Please see Supporting Statement

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : The matters raised in our representations affect matters of strategic importance that run to the heart of the East Devon Local Plan 2020 to 2042. In our capacity as a major housebuilder, we would welcome the opportunity to partake in the hearing session(s).

Full name: Sarah Smith

Organisation (where relevant): Rapleys LLP

Other party name (if relevant): The Crown Estate

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP04

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: No

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: There is inconsistency in the description of uses for the 1ha at Axminster site GH/ED/80a when compared to the GH/ED/80a Policy allocation at SD02 – please see main representations for fuller explanation.

SPATIAL STRATEGY – POLICIES SP01, SP02 AND SP04

4.1 TCE supports the principles of the spatial strategy as set out in SP01, focussing development on the western side of the district (54%) whilst at the same time promoting an appropriate level of development at the 'main centres' (Tier 2 in the hierarchy)throughout the District (30%), including Axminster, and allowing limited development to meet local needs at 'service villages'/local centres and in the countryside (16%). The spatial strategy is not overly reliant on a single source of RAPLEYS LLP | 5 Report Portrait Template – Planning delivery, providing flexibility for the market. This is consistent with the NPPF (2023) and the principles of sustainable development and is supported.

4.2 Local planning authorities are required to have a clear understanding of the housing need in their area, by preparing a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). The EDDC Plan can be prepared under the December 2023 version of the NPPF by reference to paragraphs 234-236 of the NPPF 2024. This is because this Regulation 19 Plan was published prior to 12 March 2025 and its housing requirement meets at least 80% of local need (calculated using the standard method in the NPPF, December 2024).

4.3 The Standard Method requires EDDC to provide circa 1,188 dwellings per annum. The Plan proposes (Policy SP02) at least 20,909 over the 22-year plan period which represents 80% of the requirement – in this context, the Plan is considered to be justified. TCE supports the principles of Policy SP02 in providing at least 20,909 dwellings over the plan period.

4.4 The development of a spatial strategy is a vital component of a Local Plan. Achieving more genuinely sustainable development in delivering growth is a key policy thrust of the East Devon Plan. The evidence base behind the Local Plan, including the Sustainability Appraisal, indicates consideration to varying development strategies prior to selecting the chosen option that appears in the Regulation 19 version.

4.5 In this context, TCE supports the spatial strategy and level of housing proposed within the plan, which is considered to be justified and effective and consistent with national policy.

4.6 TCE supports the general principles of the economic vision set out in paragraphs 3.20 – 3.24. Paragraph 3.29 notes that employment in Tier 1-4 settlements aims to meet local needs and improve self-containment – TCE supports this aim. The Plan goes on to say that new jobs will be required alongside new housing on larger development allocations – in the context of Axminster, the Policy SP04 then allocates 1ha of E(g)(iii) to site GH/ED/80a, where (iii) is industrial use (which can be caried out in any residential area without causing determinant to the amenity of the area). Whilst TCE supports the principle behind the allocation, the reference to E(g)(iii) in Policy SP04 is at odds with the actual wording and requirement within SD02 - GH/ED/80a, which requires a community hub incorporating workspace, café/shop meeting space. TCE would prefer to see the reference in Policy SP04 revised to reflect the requirement within SD02 - GH/ED/80a which reflects the Vision that TCE has for the development of the site – a wider E class definition would be more appropriate than the E(g) restriction.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: Policy SP04 in so far as it relates to the GH/ED/80a allocation site should reflect the description of uses in Policy SD02.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : To emphasise our point in this context, that Policy

SP04 in so far as it relates to the GH/ED/80a allocation site should reflect the description of uses in Policy SD02.

Full name: Nick Matthews

Organisation (where relevant): Savills

Other party name (if relevant): FWS Carter and Sons

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP04

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Introduction

1. This representation is submitted by Savills on behalf of FWS Carter & Sons (from hereon referred to as 'FWS') owners of Greendale Business Park in response to the Regulation 19 Consultation on the Draft East Devon Local Plan. FWS has instructed Savills on their behalf to submit a series of representations to the relevant policies of the Regulation 19 Local Plan, including this policy. Strategic Policy SP04

2. Securing economic growth is about delivery. It requires a planning system which enables and facilitate growth in the locations which fit with a diverse range of business strategies and growth plans. A location which suits one business will not necessarily suit others and a wide range of employment land opportunities and flexibility in the land market is therefore required in order to maximise economic growth.

3. There has been a large amount of land allocated for employment purposes within East Devon since the adoption of the previous Local Plan. The Council's Employment Land Review (Spring 2024) indicates that the combination of sites under construction, with planning permission, and allocated totals 181.52 ha. Paragraph 6.3 of the Statement expands upon this stating that: "Most of the allocated land is in the West End of the District and this is a focal point for future development and job creation. Key sites include: a) Skypark Business Park with 29.60 hectares remaining. b) Science Park provision of 13.34 hectares of land remaining. c) Exeter logistics park with 11.88 hectares of vacant land. d) Exeter Airport Business Park Phase 2 with 7.54 hectares. e) Policy provision at Cranbrook for 10.04 hectares of employment land. f) Exeter Logistics Park, although not mentioned in policy in the local plan can be expected to be developed for B8 use and has 11.88 hectares of remaining vacant land". East Devon Local Plan: Regulation 19 (Phase 1) Strategic Policy SP04: Employment Provision and Distribution Strategy Savills on behalf of FWS Carter & Sons March 2025 2

4. Whilst there is a large quantity of land allocated for economic growth, the location and type of that land will not suit all businesses. It is for this reason that, despite the availability of land elsewhere in East Devon, the owners of the Greendale Business Park receive regular enquiries from local businesses for space. Since there are no vacancies within the Business Park (as evidenced by the Employment Land Review – ECN004 – Pages 68-73), these enquiries have to be rejected.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: At a time of stagnant economic growth and national Government concerns over productivity, the Local Plan policies and proposals must support a wide range of employment opportunities. This needs to include not only the high profile business parks such as Skypark and the Science Park, but the more affordable employment locations across the authority area.

6. In other representations we make the case that this necessitates two changes to the Local Plan:

• The allocation of employment land at the Greendale Business Park. This location is: o capable of expansion within environmental limits as demonstrated by our Omission Site representation; o a popular location for businesses as demonstrated by the Employment Land Review which shows that there are no vacancies; and o can deliver new affordable employment floorspace which is powered by onsite renewable energy generation which supports the Council's sustainability objectives and provides below market rate running costs for businesses.

• Increased flexibility in Policy SE02 to allow for the expansion of existing businesses and business parks where there is a demonstrable demand.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Nick Matthews

Organisation (where relevant): Savills

Other party name (if relevant): FWS Carter and Sons

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP04

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: Yes

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Please refer to the supporting representations attached to this response.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: Please refer to the supporting representations attached to this response.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : FWS Carter and Sons, as the owner of Greendale Business Park, is a significant landowner and employer within East Devon and is capable of delivering significant development to address the needs and aims identified within the draft Local Plan.

Full name: Kim Miller

Organisation (where relevant): Historic England

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP04

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: We note that the Plan proposes a large amount of employment land over and above the stated need. Where individual site allocations that include proposed employment land have potential to result in significant harm to heritage assets, this suggests that the allocation is unlikely to meet the soundness test of being 'justified'. In situations where there is no demonstrable need for employment land, and where development would result in harm to heritage assets, we recommend that the proposed site allocation (or the portion of it that contributes to employment provision), is removed from the Plan. Please refer to our comments on individual site allocations.

Full name: Steve Havers

Organisation (where relevant): National Highways

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP04

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Strategic Policy SP04 sets out proposed employment provision and a distribution strategy. Around 17.5 hectares (ha) of land for employment is proposed for allocation (up to 2042) at the Second New Community. We anticipate that further details of likely employment uses and build-out will be set out as part of the forthcoming consultation on the Second New Community. This is in addition to 19.2 ha at the Cranbrook New Community, and a further 90.66 ha proposed for wider allocation. 26. Of the 108 ha proposed for allocation in the Publication Draft plan, allocations in the West End total some 68 ha. West End sites and new communities are indicated to support high-value jobs and strategic inward investment, especially in emerging technology sectors. The West End is also identified to be the focus for General Industrial and Warehousing and Distribution uses, presumably in part due to its proximity to the M5 motorway and Exeter. 27. Overall, the scale and type of employment targeted for the West End has the potential to generate both additional commuter travel demands and longer distance freight journeys via the SRN. Whilst the spatial strategy seeks to capitalise on existing sustainable travel opportunities in Exeter and the West End, we are concerned that the residual car-borne travel demands of such a concentration of development could still be significant. Given current limitations in the evidence for required infrastructure to support this spatial distribution, we beieve that the Plan is not satisfactorily justified at this stage.

SP05

Full name: Bethan Haigh

Organisation (where relevant): Boyer Planning

Other party name (if relevant): Vistry Group

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP05

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: While we support the policy in principle, we are concerned that the proposed wording restricts and discourages Neighbourhood Plans from allocating sites outside of settlement boundaries.

Housing numbers within the Council's strategic policies and housing distribution should not represent a ceiling to growth. Should local unmet need for additional housing be identified (beyond that identified within the Draft LP), the Council should encourage growth within Neighbourhood Development Plan areas to support the delivery of homes within East Devon. Neighbourhood Plans are required to be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan in force (in order to meet the basic conditions) [Neighbourhood Planning PPG Paragraph: 009 Reference ID: 41-009-20190509].

Should updated evidence be prepared in support of a future Neighbourhood Plan that suggests that there is a local unmet need for additional housing (beyond that identified within the adopted LP), the Council should not prevent additional sites from being allocated within the Neighbourhood Plan if the additional growth accords with the overarching spatial strategy for EDDC.

As currently worded, therefore, it is considered that this Strategic Policy is not sound as it is not consistent with National Policy and the Government's overarching objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes under paragraph 60 of the NPPF (2023).

Full name: David Morgan

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP05

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Strategic Policy SP05: Development inside Settlement Boundaries (pages 41-42). Quote: "3.31. Settlement boundaries direct growth to areas that align with our plan objectives, providing clarity on where development is likely to be acceptable. This offers certainty to decision makers, local communities, landowners, and developers." Comment: The definition of "settlement boundary" is not explicit or robust enough in its definition and therefore is potentially open to arbitrary interpretation/misinterpretation. Does 'settlement boundary' refer to the recognised parish boundary or to the built-up area boundary; the latter of which usually falls within the parish boundary? This lack of a rigid and robust definition could potentially create confusion for decision makers, local communities, landowners and developers in relation to identifying where future new development might/might not be permitted inside the "settlement boundary". Therefore, the East Devon Local Plan must provide a robust definition in relation to what a "settlement boundary" is and how it relates to the context of the existing 'parish boundary' definition and 'built up area boundary' definitions.

Full name: Gerald Murton Strouts

Other party name (if relevant): For himself, and Mary Strouts

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP05

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: No

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: he proposed plan excludes the Property of Hillcroft, Burgmann's Hill from the settlement boundary. This Property is at the heart of the village, within metres of the village's shopping high street and the Lympstone train station. To propose to exclude this Property from the settlement boundary whilst accepting development on the periphery of the village goes against the key sustainability aims of the local planning policy (building with easy access to public transport and shops).

2(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter legally compliant, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter legally compliant. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: The Property should be reincluded within the settlement boundary and stop along the Avenue, to the north of the Property.

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: The Property is at the heart of the village, within metres of the village's shopping high street and the Lympstone train station. To propose excluding this Property from the settlement boundary whilst accepting development on the periphery of the village goes against the key aims of planning policy (building with easy access to public transport and shops). Sustainability is a key theme to the new local plan. Excluding the Property from the settlement

boundary which is located at the heart of the village, metres away from public transport, and all the village shops is completely contrary to sustainability and environmental values that the local plan is attempting to uphold. Furthermore, the planning officer's expert opinion was not heeded.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: The Property should be reincluded in the settlement boundary, and stop along the Avenue, to the north of the Property.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : The reasons for the proposed green wedge and settlement boundaries have not been clearly explained, even after having exchanged with senior planning officers. I have understood that the proposed changes to the local plan go against the recommendations of the planning officer. I therefore would like to be present to ensure that the proposals are in line with planning policy, especially concerning sustainability considerations, and furthermore, our interests are protected.

Full name: Peter Strouts

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP05

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: No

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: Hillcroft, Burgmann's Hill has been allocated green wedge. It is in the centre of the village, bordering the rail station and the shop and pub. It is a sustainable location if development were to happen.

2(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter legally compliant, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter legally compliant. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: This should not be a green wedge, it is a garden with garages and sheds, however, the national trust fields nearby should be as correctly annotated.

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: It should not be in the green wedge.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: It should not be in the green wedge.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: No

4(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.: It means the planners are choosing to develop the village in unsustainable locations.

Full name: Lucy Tyrrell

Organisation (where relevant): Lympstone Parish Council

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP05

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: The settlement boundaries defined by the Policies Map have been changed both to the north and south of Lympstone's historic boundary. Lympstone's historic boundary is clearly marked by boundary stones and a long-held village tradition of 'Beating the Bounds' can be traced back to at least the nineteenth century. This change has been made without consultation or discussion. These changes significantly impact the housing allocations of the plan and in determining the spatial strategy, the impact on neighbouring communities has not been considered. Example A Lymp_07 (Courtlands) is within Lympstone parish, on the Lympstone side of the green wedge, yet has been allocated to Exmouth. Lymp_07 should be allocated to Lympstone, for residential, commercial and recreational purposes. This is of particular importance because its inclusion within the settlement boundaries of Exmouth totally overrides a previous Inspectorate decision at Public Enquiry that found, to prevent coalescence, a distance of 450m should separate the two communities. Even EDDC's early documentation referred to in our response at the first Strategic Planning Site selection was changed to facilitate site selection (Appendix D: Response for SPC meeting Lymp07.docx). How can this be sound practice? Example B During the Reg 18 consultation phase and subsequent site selection process, site GH/ED/72a was within Woodbury parish. This site was discounted for Woodbury because it did not meet the spatial policy requirements, being totally separate and distanced from Woodbury centre. Then the site was allocated for consideration. Lympstone Parish Council requested to be allowed to comment on this during the site selection process as the full impact of the development would be felt in Lympstone. The Strategic Planning Committee refused to allow this request. Now at Reg 19, the site has been allocated to Lympstone, without any prior notice or discussion. Can this be regarded as sound when consultation on GH/ED/72a has been highly questionable to say the least and the subject of formal complaint (Stage 1 ref 657909870, Stage 2 complaint Iken ref 003227). There is also a question whether the

site selection complies with Nolan Principles and Rules: the land owner Mr S Parkes is a Woodbury Parish Councillor, which could indicate a conflict of interests. The site was discussed as part of Woodbury, put forward by Woodbury and allocated to Woodbury, but at this last Regulation 19 stage, is now in…Lympstone!

SP06

Full name: Bethan Haigh

Organisation (where relevant): Boyer Planning

Other party name (if relevant): Vistry Group

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP06

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Strategic Policy SP06 states: "In locations outside of the defined settlement boundaries development will not be permitted unless it is in accordance with a specific Local or Neighbourhood Plan policy that explicitly permits such development".

Vistry consider that minor amends are required for this policy to be sound. There is an element of inconsistency with Strategic Policy SP05, which appears to discourage Neighbourhood Plans from allocating sites outside of the Draft LP settlement boundaries.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: It should be acknowledged that Neighbourhood Plans can make alterations to the settlement boundaries to allow for additional housing growth where this is justified and accords with the Council's overarching spatial strategy, therefore meeting the NDP Basic Conditions Tests.

Full name: Bethan Haigh

Organisation (where relevant): Boyer Planning

Other party name (if relevant): Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd. C/O Boyer

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP06

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:

2.40 Strategic Policy SP06 states that in locations outside of the defined settlement boundaries, development will not be permitted unless it is in accordance with a specific Local or Neighbourhood Plan policy that explicitly permits such development.

2.41 While we support this policy, we consider that there is an inconsistency with Strategic Policy SP05, which appears to discourage Neighbourhood Plans from allocating sites outside of the Draft LP settlement boundaries.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: It should be acknowledged that Neighbourhood Plans can make alterations to the settlement boundaries to allow for additional housing growth where this is justified and accords with the Council's overarching spatial strategy, therefore meeting the NDP Basic Conditions Tests.

Full name: Nick Guildford

Organisation (where relevant): C G Fry & Son

Other party name (if relevant): Mr & Mrs Cowling

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP06

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Elsewhere in the Draft Local Plan, notably in Strategic Policy HN02 (Affordable Housing), it is referenced that 35% affordable housing would be a target for windfall development outside settlement boundaries. This appears at odds with Policy SP06 which restricts development outside settlement boundaries, presenting concerns about the level of contribution that windfall sites will provide to meeting housing need. Paragraph 75 of the Framework is clear that there should be "compelling evidence" that windfall sites will provide a reliable source of supply. The current wording of Policy SP06 does not provide confidence that development on windfall sites will be a reliable source of supply.

In combination, the restrictive nature of Policy SP06, and the reliance of larger sites to deliver the required housing need later in the plan-period cemented by Policy SP02, presents the prospect of a deteriorating housing supply position from the point of adoption within the first half of the plan period. The Framework is clear that planning policies "should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services". The restrictive nature of Policies SP02 and SP06 is at odds with the clear intention of what the Framework is aspiring to achieve. Furthermore, the Framework is clear that strategic policies should provide for objectively assessed needs "as a minimum".

Full name: Simon Coles

Organisation (where relevant): CarneySweeney

Other party name (if relevant): C G Fry & Son Ltd

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP06

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Elsewhere in the Draft Local Plan, notably in Strategic Policy HN02 (Affordable Housing), it is referenced that 35% affordable housing would be a target for windfall development outside settlement boundaries. This appears at odds with Policy SP06 which restricts development outside settlement boundaries, presenting concerns about the level of contribution that windfall sites will provide to meeting housing need. Paragraph 75 of the Framework is clear that there should be "compelling evidence" that windfall sites will provide a reliable source of supply. The current wording of Policy SP06 does not provide confidence that development on windfall sites will be a reliable source of supply.

In combination, the restrictive nature of Policy SP06, and the reliance of larger sites to deliver the required housing need later in the plan-period cemented by Policy SP02, presents the prospect of a deteriorating housing supply position from the point of adoption within the first half of the plan period. The Framework is clear that planning policies "should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services". The restrictive nature of Policies SP02 and SP06 is at odds with the clear intention of what the Framework is aspiring to achieve. Furthermore, the Framework is clear that strategic policies should provide for objectively assessed needs "as a minimum".

Full name: Jess Perminter

Organisation (where relevant): CarneySweeney

Other party name (if relevant): DAAB Partnership

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP06

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: The current wording of Policy SP06 does not provide confidence that development on windfall sites will be a reliable source of supply.

Full name: Ollie Thorogood

Organisation (where relevant): CarneySweeney

Other party name (if relevant): Jackson-Stops

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP06

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Policy SP06 should provide sufficient flexibility to enable development to come forward on sustainably located land outside settlement limits needed to deliver a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites or to maintain delivery in accordance with the housing trajectory in Policy SP02. At present, the policy does not accord with the Framework and should be revised to include the identification of specific uses that may be acceptable outside settlement limits, while providing for sufficient flexibility to provide for the development of new homes to achieve targets and maintain supply. In combination, the restrictive nature of Policy SP06, and the reliance of larger sites to deliver the required housing need later in the plan-period cemented by Policy SP02, presents the prospect of a deteriorating housing supply position from the point of adoption within the first half of the plan period. The Framework is clear that planning policies “should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services”. The restrictive nature of Policies SP02 and SP06 is at odds with the clear intention of what the Framework is aspiring to achieve. Furthermore, the Framework is clear that strategic policies should provide for objectively assessed needs “as a minimum”. In such instances, an achievable and deliverable development site such as the subject site should be considered to bolster the early trajectory of housing delivery to ensure the District can meet its recognised housing needs. The site can act as a continuation of Wood_06, in a settlement with high sustainability credentials to accommodate appropriate growth and presents no insurmountable constraints that would render development of the site unachievable.

Summary These representations fully support the Council’s identification of Woodbury as a ‘Local Centre’ suitable for appropriate levels of growth to meet its needs as well as

the requirements of the wider network of rural settlements. We have identified concerns with the housing trajectory and the overreliance on windfall sites and larger allocations coming forward towards the end of the planperiod. The site subject to these representations provides a suitable and deliverable opportunity to provide additional housing in a location that is highly sustainable in order to bolster early delivery of housing within the plan period to consistently meet the housing needs of the District. Subject to further refinement through the planning application process, a design could be proposed that is sensitive to the edge of settlement location to deliver on other objectives of the Draft Local Plan to promote development that meets the needs of Woodbury and the wider community. We ask to be kept informed of next stages of consultation and also that we have an opportunity to participate in any public examination of this document. In the meantime, should you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact us.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: In combination, the restrictive nature of Policy SP06, and the reliance of larger sites to deliver the required housing need later in the plan-period cemented by Policy SP02, presents the prospect of a deteriorating housing supply position from the point of adoption within the first half of the plan period. An extension to Wood_06 should be considered.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Ollie Thorogood

Organisation (where relevant): CarneySweeney

Other party name (if relevant): Jackson-Stops

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP06

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Furthermore, Policy SP06 (Development beyond Settlement Boundaries) does not accord with the National Planning Policy Framework because it imposes a carte blanche prohibition on development outside settlement limits unless sites are allocated in neighbourhood plans. The approach in the Framework is quite different, with a key provision being Paragraphs 82-84 which identifies a range of circumstances where the development of new homes in rural areas will be acceptable, outside of settlement boundaries. The lack of complete coverage of Neighbourhood Plans in East Devon means www.carneysweeney.co.uk that Policy SP06 will lead to an automatic prohibition on any development from coming forward outside settlement limits that may be needed to meet the housing delivery targets set out in the Draft Local Plan and enable the Council to maintain a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites. This is contrary to the Framework.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: Alter Policy SP06 (Development beyond Settlement Boundaries) as it does not accord with the National Planning Policy Framework because it imposes a carte blanche prohibition on development outside settlement limits unless sites are allocated in neighbourhood plans

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Claire Alers-Hankey

Organisation (where relevant): Greenslade Taylor Hunt

Other party name (if relevant): Waddeton Park Ltd

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP06

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: Yes

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Strategic Policy SP06: Development beyond Settlement Boundaries This policy is aimed at restricting development outside of defined settlement boundaries, due to being located in open countryside. While the aim of this policy is supported at a general level, in circumstances where there are insufficient employment sites allocated for the Plan period, the policy does not offer sufficient flexibility for alternative employment sites to come forward, even in circumstances where a site is sustainably located and where there is a demand for such development. Where a potential employment site is located close to other allocated employment sites, the unallocated site should not be perceived as unsustainable due to being on the wrong side of an arbitrary line. If a site is in a sustainable location, it should be considered suitable for development. Land north of Sowton is one such example. It is located in a sustainable location with excellent transport links to the local and wider strategic road network and is also sited adjacent to other allocated sites within the West End area.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : To present the case for the inclusion of land north of Sowton as an employment allocation.

Full name: Zoe Mason

Organisation (where relevant): Lichfields

Other party name (if relevant): Church Commissioners

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP06

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: Yes

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: [Representation on behalf of Church Commissioners who own land at Clyst Honiton] The Commissioners welcome the flexibility of Strategic Policy [SP06] to permit development outside of settlement boundaries where it is in accordance with specific Local or Neighbourhood Plan policies which explicitly permits such development, where it would not harm the distinctive landscape, amenity and environmental qualities of the area within which it is located. This approach will assist in bringing forward appropriate development on sites within rural Neighbourhood Plan areas that otherwise would be opposed within the Local Plan.

Full name: Zoe Mason

Organisation (where relevant): Lichfields

Other party name (if relevant): Mr M.J. Nancekivell and Mr R.P. Nancekivell

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP06

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:

2.27 Strategic Policy SP06: Development Beyond Settlement Boundaries states: "In locations outside of the defined settlement boundaries development will not be permitted unless it is in accordance with a specific Local or Neighbourhood Plan policy that explicitly permits such development".

2.28 This policy is unsound and unjustified. It in effect stops any development from taking place outside of the settlement boundaries. This could include house extensions, agricultural development, additions/enhancement to business or industrial parks, highways works etc. This is fundamentally flawed and would have hugely negative impacts on East Devon's economy and wider social and environmental sustainability. We assume this refers to new dwellings outside of the settlement boundaries, with the exception of allocations, but this must be clarified and the policy updated. Further, as well as reference to Local or Neighbourhood Plan policy, reference should be made to the NPPF as there are exceptions

Pg 8

through e.g. para. 84 (isolated homes in countryside) or para. 82 (rural exception sites); the Local Plan must not preclude this.

Full name: James McMurdo

Organisation (where relevant): McMurdo Land Planning and Development Ltd

Other party name (if relevant): Stuart Partners Ltd

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP06

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: [McMurdo Land Planning & Development Ltd on Behalf of Stuart Partners Ltd relating to Strategic Land at the "West End" of East Devon District made in the context of significant land holdings in this area. Representation to be read in conjunction with representations made by Turley on behalf of Stuart Partners Ltd and Bloor Homes Exeter on the proposed new and an expanded Hill Barton Business Park, and by Carney Sweeney on behalf of Stuart Partners Ltd and Down, relating to land being promoted for a village for up to 2,000 houses between Clyst St George and Clyst St Mary]

Object

Reasons: This policy seems to suggest that if lower tier "made" neighbourhood plans forbid development then that is the end of the matter, at odds with the NPPF (and other Strategic Policies as proposed in this Local Plan and in ECC's Plan). But land not currently earmarked for development in neighbourhood plans may well be required in the plan to meet the district's housing and employment land needs in addition to the unmet needs of Exeter.

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Amend the policy to be flexible to ensure adequate housing and employment land is delivered and to comply with the NPPF

Full name: Nick Matthews

Organisation (where relevant): Savills

Other party name (if relevant): Mac Mic Strategic Land

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP06

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Introduction

1. This representation is submitted by Savills on behalf of Mac Mic Strategic Land (from hereon referred to as 'Mac Mic'). Mac Mic is a strategic land promoter with a strong reputation for delivering planning permissions that lead to high-quality development.

2. Mac Mic has instructed Savills on their behalf to submit a series of representations to the relevant policies of the Regulation 19 Local Plan, including this policy. Policy SP06

3. Strategic Policy SP06 states definitively that development proposals outside of the existing defined settlement boundaries will not be permitted unless in accordance with specific local or neighbourhood plan policies. In so doing, it effectively assumes that the Local Plan will deliver as hoped by EDDC and that there will be no shortfall in delivery.

4. We can appreciate why EDDC would present the position in these definitive terms, however, there is inevitably some degree of uncertainty in the delivery of allocated and windfall development which it would be prudent to acknowledge and reflect in this policy. To that end, we would recommend that the following additional paragraph is incorporated into the policy: "If the scale of housing and employment development does not deliver new homes and employment floorspace at the rate anticipated within the Local Plan and the land supply short for engages the presumption in favour of sustainable development, then the local planning authority will work positively and proactively to support development proposals in appropriate and sustainable locations beyond the existing defined settlement boundaries."

Full name: Nick Matthews

Organisation (where relevant): Savills

Other party name (if relevant): Mac Mic Strategic Land

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP06

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: Yes

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: See attached.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: See attached.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : See attached.

Full name: Cara Chambers

Organisation (where relevant): Stantec

Other party name (if relevant): KCS Development

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP06

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Strategic Policy SP06

4.2.6 This relates to development beyond settlement boundaries. It is stated that development outside of settlement boundaries will not be permitted unless it is in accordance with a specific Local or Neighbourhood Plan policy.

4.2.7 This policy is unsound as it does not apply a flexible approach to housing delivery, for example the policy must follow the NPPF approach and enable development when or where there is a specific need (such as to meet housing land supply requirements)

4.2.11 Regarding the policy relating to development outside of settlement boundaries, this is unsound due to its lack of flexibility. It does not consider the scenario if a five year housing land supply cannot be demonstrated. The plan does not consider windfall market housing schemes adjacent to settlement boundaries. Another policy deems that rural exception affordable schemes coming forward on the edge of settlements are acceptable. However, these are only small scale and generally consist of just affordable housing and would not be able to meet general housing requirements if a five year housing land supply cannot be demonstrated.

Full name: David Morgan

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP06

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Strategic Policy SP06: Development outside Settlement Boundaries (page 42). Quote: "In locations outside of the defined settlement boundaries development will not be permitted unless it is in accordance with a specific Local or Neighbourhood Plan policy that explicitly permits such development. This policy applies across the whole local plan area other than in the Cranbrook Plan area where it applies only to locations that fall outside of the Built-up Area Boundaries set out in the Cranbrook Plan." Comment: As with Policy SP05, there is a lack of robust definition of what the term "settlement boundary" refers to. In the follow-on paragraph for Cranbrook, there is reference to the 'built-up area boundary'. Therefore, does 'settlement boundary' refer to the recognised parish boundary or to the built-up area boundary; the latter of which usually falls within the parish boundary? This lack of a rigid and robust definition could potentially create confusion for decision makers, local communities, landowners and developers in relation to identifying where future new development might/might not be permitted outside of the "settlement boundary". Therefore, the East Devon Local Plan must provide a robust definition in relation to what a "settlement boundary" is, to aid users' understanding and how it relates to the context of the existing 'parish boundary' definition and 'built up area boundary' definitions.

SP07

Full name: Dee Woods

Organisation (where relevant): Otter Valley Association

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP07

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: The OVA's concerns are lack of sufficient infrastructure to accommodate growth, and the fact that the provision of nearly all required infrastructure is the responsibility of other providers and authorities, eg roads, railways, schools, medical, sewage and water supplies etc. (Ref Objective 10 and paras 2.7 and 2.8 Strategic policy SP07) Most facilities are at capacity or there is an under provision, and much of the existing infrastructure is known to be at or near the end of its useful life. Who is going to fund future sports and recreation facilities? (Policy OS04)

Policy SP07 is not strongly worded to ensure delivery of infrastructure. Reference to 'Applications will be required to' should be changed to 'Developers'. Also 'consider' should be changed to 'Make sure of ' at point E in this policy.

Full name: Robert Jones

Organisation (where relevant): River Otter Fisheries Association

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP07

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: SP07/SP08 – 3.41 states that developers and landowners will need to consult the EDLP – IDP Version 01-Jan 2024 in order to identify and assess Infrastructure requirement associated with their proposals. In our view the IDP is seriously lacking due to the inadequate responses from SWW in particular when consulted by EDDC. https://eastdevon.gov.uk/media/g54jh2qx/ksd-001-infrastructure-delivery-plan.pdf There are no infrastructure proposals in relation to improvement and enhancement of clean water supply or more importantly plans to upgrade / improve / replace existing foul water treatment plants in the valley. This has to be reviewed in order to ensure that both landowners and developers fully understand the costs associated with their proposals and accordingly a new response should be required from SWW and the plan should be reviewed in the light of the Water Cycle Study when produced. It is our view that the results of investigations by citizen science groups active in the valley now as to the level of pollution evidenced from treatment plants and water monitor 'spill' EDM records should all be taken into account by EDDC when evaluating the realities of water quality issues in the river rather than relying solely upon SWW whose views and responses are clearly compromised.

-3.39-3.34 Justification for Policy. This makes no mention whatsoever of the natural environment and seems to us to be a fundamental blindspot in the philosophy of this plan. Beautiful East Devon / 'Our outstanding landscape' will not stay beautiful or outstanding if it is not made clear in the plan that all and any development has to above all else improve not damage the natural environment.

Full name: Nicola Wilson

Organisation (where relevant): Devon County Council

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP07

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Education The local education authority supports the proposals set out in the East Devon Local Plan providing that the necessary mitigations are put in place relating to the provision of education, as detailed within the plan policies and IDP. Detailed education comments are provided in Appendix 1. Devon County Council's response to the plan aligns to the local education authority's statutory duty to ensure there is sufficient and suitable education provision for early years and childcare, primary and secondary education, post 16/further education provision and provision for students with education health and care plans up to age 25. The response to the Publication Draft Local Plan is underpinned by the policies in the county council's Education Infrastructure Plan1, in particular the provision of local schools for local children as well as recognising schools as a key community asset in support of cohesive communities. The Devon County Council approach to securing contributions2 informs the infrastructure requests as set out in the IDP which aligns to the DfE National Guidance3. Provision for children and young people is considered critical for the delivery of the plan. Devon County Council and East Devon District Council have successfully delivered education infrastructure early in Cranbrook which has supported the new town to grow, including a new primary and an education campus and timing of delivery in the second new community will be a key consideration for successful delivery. DCC considers it essential that the Local Plan provides clarity on the funding of education infrastructure through the provision of Section 106 so that DCC, as local education authority, has greater certainty that developers will be required to fully mitigate the education impact of development. DCC therefore requests amended and additional wording in relation to paragraph 3.44 as shown below. This wording is consistent with Policy SP07 and with supporting statement wording contained in other Local Plans coming forward within Devon. "3.44. Additional homes create the need for additional education provision including for early years and childcare, primary and secondary education, post 16 and further education, and provision for students with special education needs and disabilities. There are also implications for home to school transport. This education impact of development must

be fully mitigated by development and the required education infrastructure is delivered in a timely manner. Education provision is important for the young people of East Devon. Not only does education provide children and young people with the knowledge and skills they require to live fulfilled and productive lives, it helps to reduce inequalities, helps to create supportive communities and has an important role in place-making. Reflecting the impacts which development has on education provision and the associated requirements for expansion or new schools, the provision of early years, primary and secondary education infrastructure, provision for children with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) and home to school transport through Section 106 agreement contributions is supported as may be required. The District Council will work with Devon County Council on planning and delivering appropriate education provision making reference to the Devon County Council's Education Infrastructure Plan and Education Approach for Developer Contributions." Paragraph 3.45 understates the essential nature of education provision as a legal requirement and DCC requests that paragraph 3.45 includes additional wording below: "Infrastructure Provision 3.45 Delivering infrastructure alongside housing and economic development is crucial for sustainable communities. This includes essential services like transport, flood risk measures, utilities, and habitat mitigation, as well as daily access to education, health, open spaces, and play areas. Access to education is a legal requirement and statutory duty of the county council meaning the delivery of appropriate education infrastructure to support development is critical. This includes provision for early years and childcare, primary, secondary, post 16 and pupils with special educational needs and disabilities." Devon County Council has a strong preference that county-related infrastructure is funded through Section 106 agreements as this provides greater certainty that sufficient funding is available for delivery of the necessary infrastructure at the appropriate time. The county council does not have control of CIL receipts and has experience that where CIL is intended to support infrastructure delivery, it has not been made available to support this. This is particularly important for the provision of education and transport infrastructure. DCC requests additional wording explaining the need for provision of Section 106 contributions for County related infrastructure is included in paragraph 3.44 as shown above.

Full name: Nicola Wilson

Organisation (where relevant): Devon County Council

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP07

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Infrastructure Provision Devon County Council considers it essential that the infrastructure necessary to support the development proposed in the Local Plan is provided in an appropriately phased and timely manner. To achieve this, appropriate funding mechanisms, which do not rely upon forward funding by the county council will be required, because it cannot be guaranteed that the council will be able to forward fund infrastructure. This is particularly important in relation to education and transport and the second new community where significant new infrastructure is required. The county council looks forward to continuing the work with East Devon District Council on the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The county council has a strong preference that county-related infrastructure is funded through Section 106 agreements as this provides greater certainty that sufficient funding is available for delivery of the necessary infrastructure at the appropriate time. DCC does not have control of CIL receipts and has experience that where CIL is intended to support infrastructure delivery, it has not been made available to support this. This is particularly important for the provision of education and transport infrastructure. To ensure the availability of funding from development, DCC requests that additional wording is added to paragraph 3.44 of the supporting statement to indicate that funding of education infrastructure to support delivery of the plan will be provided through Section 106 contributions. DCC supports Policy SP07. However, the county council wishes to make some detailed comments on the February 2025 version of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). These comments which include requested changes to the wording of the IDP are shown below in the table in Appendix 2 of this letter. Some of the comments in Appendix 2 provide an initial indication of the infrastructure requirements for the second new community that DCC considers would need to be included within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (or within a dedicated Infrastructure Delivery Plan for the second new community). Please note that these requirements may need to be revised following further discussion with the district council about the second new community this spring.

Full name: George Marshall

Organisation (where relevant): Exeter City Council

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP07

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: Yes

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: Habitat mitigation There is long and well-established history of productive partnership working across Exeter, East Devon and Teignbridge via the Joint Habitats Sites Mitigation Strategy and associated joint committee. This work, which has involved Natural England, has been revisited in recent years via a review of the Joint Strategy. Now this has been finalised, the City Council looks forward to the anticipated adoption of the new Strategy in the near future to support the ongoing work on the local plans.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

Full name: George Marshall

Organisation (where relevant): Exeter City Council

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP07

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: Yes

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: Infrastructure
Beyond transport, there are various other infrastructure themes which are being addressed comprehensively through the collaborative planning of the East Devon Local Plan and the Exeter Plan. Such strategic infrastructure includes utilities, healthcare and education. There have been particular discussions regarding the adjacent proposed development areas on the edge of Topsham which include allocations in both Exeter and East Devon for which the two local plans have elements of jointly prepared policy text. The City Council supports the potential for collaborative infrastructure planning and provision in this area, particularly in relation to transport, education, healthcare and green infrastructure, including the Clyst Valley Regional Park.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

Full name: Bethan Haigh

Organisation (where relevant): Boyer Planning

Other party name (if relevant): Vistry Group

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP07

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: Vistry support the principle of Strategic Policy SP07 which relates to the delivery of supporting infrastructure with new development. We understand and acknowledge the need for infrastructure on both a strategic and local level to support growth within East Devon, and that new development is a key aspect of the delivery of infrastructure.

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: We, however, disagree with the policy text that references the need for appropriate development to support the 'wider community'. We object to the inclusion of this text within the draft policy. Infrastructure to support proposed development must meet the tests set out within Regulation 122 (as amended by the 2011 and 2019 Regulations) (necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; directly related to the development; and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development). At present, the draft LP policy indicates that the proposed development should offer infrastructure that would improve the infrastructure needs of the wider community.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: As set out above, infrastructure must be suitable for the development to be acceptable in planning terms, there is no requirement for development to support the needs of the wider community. This element of the draft LP policy should be removed accordingly.

Full name: Bethan Haigh

Organisation (where relevant): Boyer Planning

Other party name (if relevant): Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd. C/O Boyer

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP07

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:

2.42 We support the need for new development to be accompanied by appropriate infrastructure, delivered in a timely manner to support the needs of the community.

2.43 However, the draft policy requires new development proposals to be delivered alongside infrastructure that supports the needs of the "wider community." We object to this inclusion, as it contradicts with CIL Regulation 122, which requires planning obligations to be necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; directly related to the development; and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

2.45 It should be noted that land off Northcote Hill is capable of meeting the requirements of policy SP07 through the delivery of a number of public benefits, including extensive areas of public open space; highway improvements to support the vehicular trips likely to arise from

the proposed development; community park; neighbourhood hub; and enhancement of walking and cycling routes.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your

suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.:

2.44 Policy SP07 needs greater clarity to reflect the tests at Regulation 122 to ensure the policy is effective and can be found sound.

Full name: Chris Dadds

Organisation (where relevant): JLL

Other party name (if relevant): Charles Kislingbury on behalf of L Askew

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP07

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Draft policy SP07 outlines the requirement for infrastructure provision in new development proposals.

The policy outlines a series of policy requirements that planning applications will be required to demonstrate, in ensuring that proper infrastructure provision is delivered to support the creation of sustainable communities and that meets the needs of resident and businesses. The objective and thrusts of this policy are noted and supported.

Greater flexibility should however be introduced into policy SP07 in order to ensure that infrastructure delivery and obligations do not render new development unviable. NPPF paragraph 35 states that policies in local plans should not undermine the deliverability of the plan.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: An additional reference should be introduced into the policy wording which reads:

"Where developers consider that scheme viability may be affected by the above policy's requirements, they will be expected to demonstrate whether particular circumstances justify the need for a viability assessment and provide full development appraisals to demonstrate an alternative provision".

The suggested additional policy wording noted above would ensure that the policy is effective and consistent with national policy, as required by the NPPF under paragraph 35.

Full name: Chris Dadds

Organisation (where relevant): JLL

Other party name (if relevant): Charles Kislingbury on behalf of L Askew

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP07

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Draft policy SP07 outlines the requirement for infrastructure provision in new development proposals.

The policy outlines a series of policy requirements planning applications will be required to demonstrate in ensuring that proper infrastructure provision is delivered to support the creation of sustainable communities and that meets the needs of residents and businesses. The objective and thrusts of this policy are noted and supported.

Greater flexibility should, however, be introduced into policy SP07 in order to ensure that infrastructure delivery and obligations do not render new development unviable. NPPF paragraph 35 states that policies in local plans should not undermine the deliverability of the plan.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: An additional reference should be introduced into the policy wording which reads “Where developers consider that scheme viability may be affected by the above policy’s requirements, they will be expected to demonstrate whether particular circumstances justify the need for a viability assessment and provide full development appraisals to demonstrate an alternative provision.”

The suggested additional policy wording noted above would ensure that the policy is effective and consistent with national policy, as required by the NPPF under paragraph 35.

Full name: Kate Bergin

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP07

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: 4) No infrastructure : There is absolutely no infrastructure in place to cope with such a vast new population. No roads, no railway, no bus routes, no sewage. There are no medical facilities here and thousands of additional people will totally flood an already overwhelmed medical system.

Full name: Karen Crawford

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP07

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: No

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: EDDC are fully aware that the sewage network infrastructure is already beyond capacity to cope yet have not given adequate focus to this in the Local Plan. A previous Water Cycle Study (circa 2010) commissioned by East Devon District Council (EDDC) was predicated on the building of a new waste water treatment works (WWTW) to serve the new Cranbrook community. This plan was subsequently dropped by South West Water and the sewage diverted to Countess Wear. This study specifically assessed the projected capacity for waste water treatment over the coming years and (with the inclusion of the new works) concluded that several locations would be over capacity by 2025 including Maer Lane STW. Since the time of the study the new WWTW was not built, the population in East Devon has increased by more than twice the national average (Census data 2011 -21) and the published performance data in Exmouth shows a large increase in the use of storm overflows discharging untreated sewage into the sensitive estuary and designated bathing waters. This clear evidence, of an already inadequate sewerage infrastructure, is entirely missing from the draft Local Plan. The council wrote to Government last year citing the situation as an 'civil emergency' yet this is not reflected in the Local Plan. It would also appear that EEDC has failed to comply with section 33A of the PCPA which requires the LPA to engage constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis with neighbouring authorities and certain other bodies over strategic matters during the preparation of the plan. We know that a follow up Water Cycle Report has been Commissioned by EDDC and was due to be completed last year but this does not appear in the draft Plan and has not been shared with the community. This new Water Cycle Study is a key part of the evidence required for the Local Plan going forward to reflect how this will ensure adequate capacity for waste water treatment in East Devon. We urge the Planning Inspector to consider these omissions and request urgent action by EDDC in conjunction with South West Water to address and assess sewage infrastructure future capacity. We can submit further evidence to support this if required.

2(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter legally compliant, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter legally compliant. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: A full and detailed review of the Exmouth sewage infrastructure is urgently needed before any more development can take place. We cannot rely on promises from South West Water of future improvements. EDDC need to learn from recent history. We all know that South West Water promised to build a sewage treatment works at Cranbrook which they failed to delivery. Current suggestions of expanding the Exmouth treatment works cannot be relied upon. EDDC know the existing infrastructure is already insufficient for current needs without another 3000 homes adding to the problem.

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: As above. Exmouth Sewage Infrastructure needs a full investigation

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: No

4(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.: As above. Exmouth Sewage Infrastructure needs a full investigation

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Karime Hassan MBE

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP07

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: [Representation on behalf of Exeter Rugby Group based in Exeter close to Junction 30 of the M5 at Sandy Park. See also upload of full representation]

Strategic Policy SP07: Delivery of Infrastructure; and Strategic Policy SP08: Phased Delivery of Infrastructure and Services are essential, and supported, and to be read along with Strategic Policy WS01: Development of a second new community east of Exeter.

Full name: Geoff Crawford

Organisation (where relevant): ESCAPE

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP07

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: No

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: It appears that EEDC has failed to comply with section 33A of the PCPA which requires the LPA to engage constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis with neighbouring authorities and certain other bodies including South West Water over strategic matters during the preparation of the plan.

2(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter legally compliant, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter legally compliant. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: We know that a follow up Water Cycle Report has been Commissioned by EDDC and was due to be completed early 2024 but this does not appear in the draft Plan and has not been shared with the community.

This new Water Cycle Study is a key part of the evidence required for the Local Plan going forward to reflect how this will ensure adequate capacity for waste water treatment in East Devon.

The previous report dated 2010 clear highlighted that Exmouth sewage treatment capacity was already significantly exceeded. We know that considerable additional housing, population growth and water usage means that things can only have gotten

worse. Indeed the continuing increasing frequency and duration of untreated sewage overflows at Exmouth demonstrates that.

We also know that there has been no expansion of sewage treatment capacity.

Without the new report being available we must relay in the old report to inform us and that report and likely the new report both state that the proposed expansion of development within the Local Plan exceeds both the current and projected treatment capacity.

By presenting this Local Plan whilst knowing that infrastructure cannot and will not cope with the proposed expansion EDDC are being negligent at best and wilfully irresponsible in not completing their statutory duties.

I would strongly urge the Planning Inspector to consider these omissions and request urgent action by EDDC in conjunction with South West Water to address and assess sewage infrastructure future capacity.

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: In conjunction with a large group of East Devon residents I am concerned the consultation may not be based on sound evidence in relation to the waste water infrastructure in the area.

A previous Water Cycle Study (circa 2010) commissioned by East Devon District Council (EDDC) was predicated on the building of a new waste water treatment works (WWTW) to serve the new Cranbrook community. This plan was subsequently dropped by South West Water and the sewage diverted to Countess Wear. This study specifically assessed the projected capacity for waste water treatment over the coming years and (with the inclusion of the new works) concluded that several locations would be over capacity by 2025 including Maer Lane STW. Since the time of the study the new WWTW was not built, the population in East Devon has increased by more than twice the national average (Census data 2011 -21) and the published performance data in Exmouth shows a large increase in the use of storm overflows discharging untreated sewage into the sensitive estuary and designated bathing waters. This clear evidence, of an already inadequate sewerage infrastructure, is entirely missing from the draft

Local Plan. The leader of the council wrote to Government last year citing the situation as an 'emergency' yet this is not reflected in the Local Plan.

We know that a follow up Water Cycle Report has been Commissioned by EDDC and was due to be completed last year but this does not appear in the draft Plan and has not been shared with the community. This new Water Cycle Study is a key part of the evidence required for the Local Plan going forward to reflect how this will ensure adequate capacity for waste water treatment in East Devon.

I would strongly urge the Planning Inspector to consider these omissions and request urgent action by EDDC in conjunction with South West Water to address and assess sewage infrastructure future capacity.

If required I would be happy to submit further evidence to support this.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: The Local Plan MUST acknowledge the failures of the sewage network infrastructure. It must also address them. It must complete an publish the water report to prove its proposal sound or remove those proposals specifically in the Exmouth STW catchment from the plan.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: No

4(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.: EDDC and SWW are in open disagreement about sewage treatment capacity, failed and aging infrastructure. A Water report stating the true situation is not available and so cannot be referenced as evidence.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : EDDC have made a clear, conscious decision to ignore what they know to be true. EDDC issued notice of a civil emergency due to sewage pollution August 2024. EDDC gave a vote of no confidence in SWW due to sewage overflows, pipe bursts, tanker traffic etc in February 2024. EDDC are fully aware that the SWW sewage network and infrastructure cannot cope with the proposed expansion plans. If the public and campaign groups who have gathered and presented the data are not allowed to participate in highlighting the shortfalls and failings then who will highlight what EDDC have chosen to ignore?

Full name: Margaret Leppard

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP07

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Infrastructure first
Continuing to place the development cart before the infrastructure horse at every level only leads to a downward spiral in overall human and environmental wellbeing. I join with other contributors to this consultation to highlight the paucity of health services; primary and secondary education; transport and highways; surface water and sewage systems to support new development. With experience of internal residential flooding I highlight that tertiary technical education for essential building trades and technicians to ensure resilient housing design; ongoing monitoring and maintenance of common areas and sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDS) has received little attention. Therefore development of SEAT_02, 03, 05 and _13a threatens existing adjacent properties and environment. Legislative infrastructure also needs change. In the context of climate crisis; nature based solutions to address flooding; and top down imposition of housing targets, national legislation needs updating in relationship to land registry, riparian rights and responsibilities and use of water courses.

Full name: Digby Morrison

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP07

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: No

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: I don't know if it's legal. The commonplace platform doesn't describe what constitutes legal compliance. It simply names the acts and regulations that describe this. Hardly accessible for anyone other than a chartered planner to be able to comment on legality of the plan when the parameters of legality have not bee described!

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Policies SP07 & 08 are not Effective. They are too weak and general to ensure that sufficient and adequate waste water treatment infrastructure is in place before homes are occupied. Policies SP07 & 08 are also not Justified. To date development has continued without the commensurate upgrading of waste water treatment infrastructure, when combined with more regular significant rainfall events, this has resulted in increased overflows of sewage into the Exe Estuary and the sea. Evidence of housing being built ahead of waste water infrastructure, or more regular significant rainfall events has not been included in the development of the plan and no work has been conducted to establish policies and plans which would mitigate this issue. The only waste water project mentioned in the East Devon Local Plan Infrastructure Delivery Plan is UI-5 Investment at Countess Wear Sewage Treatment Works to increase capacity for growth. There is no mention of the waste water pollution issued in Exmouth (or any other coastal towns and villages) and investment required to resolve these before further housing is developed.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: Further work needs to be conducted on this issue, included in the

evidence, and policies redrafted to make them more specific and robust on this topic of waste water infrastructure and pollution.

4(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.: I don't know, I haven't read any description of the collaboration entered into with other councils.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : To more specifically represent the lack of evidence and weakness of policy wording.

Full name: Rob Wallbank

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP07

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: The “Strategic Policy SP07 is an important section, and without this being a “cast in stone”, the damage to any area proposed in this proposal will cause irreparable damage to all areas. The infrastructure is at breaking point, and fails already under certain conditions, causing flooding and sewage discharge into the sea.

Full name: Rachel Danemann

Organisation (where relevant): Home Builders Federation (HBF)

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP07

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: The policy is not considered to be sound as it is not positively prepared, effective, justified or conistent with national policy

57. It must also be noted that Section 106 contributions can only be sought to ensure a development mit-igates its own impact. They cannot be required to address existing shortfalls. It will therefore be es-sential for the Council to have robust and up-to-date evidence around any s106 contributions being sought for infrastructure, play space provision, open space provision and playing pitches and such like and calculate any developer contributions arising at the time a planning application is made.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: 58. The policy wording should therefore be amended to include wording that explicitly states an assessment of provision will be undertaken at the time of an application to ensure any requests for s106 contributions remain evidenced and justified. Any reference to the adopted SPD must be removed from the policy.

Full name: Helene Jessop

Organisation (where relevant): RSPB

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP07

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: This policy will not be sound unless all relevant infrastructure, which crucially includes SANG in relation to the SPA/SAC sites, is delivered at minimum in parallel with the development. SANG must be functional prior to occupation of related new housing, else new residents will look elsewhere for fulfilment of their daily recreational needs, including dog walking, and those habits, once established, will likely continue. Unmitigated, recreational impacts on the SPA/SAC sites will damage the designated habitats and species, and so SANG provision and other mitigation measures must be sufficient and timely. As well as sufficient funding (via developer contributions) for provision and long term management of SANG etc, there must be funding available to monitor its effectiveness so that review can inform decisions on the need for more SANG or amendments to current SANG.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: Para E should include a requirement to monitor the effectiveness of infrastructure such as SANG, with the option to require more if existing mitigation measures are not judged sufficient to avoid adverse impacts on the designated sites.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Rob Martin

Organisation (where relevant): Clyst Honiton Parish Council

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP07

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: This policy is confusing because it requires the applicants to assess the infrastructure requirements arising from their development. This can be understood for non-strategic sites, but surely it is for the Plan to have assessed the infrastructure necessary for each strategic site? This is particularly the case for the new settlement as the infrastructure required will be more than just the road up to the site, for example.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: The policy needs rewording to identify which proposals it is referring to.

Full name: Loretta Commons

Organisation (where relevant): Devon & Cornwall Police

Other party name (if relevant): Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) LLP

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP07

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Devon & Cornwall Police (DCP) and the O??ice of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Devon and Cornwall and the Isles of Scilly (PCC), together with "Police" submit representations in response to the Regulation 19 Consultation on the East Devon Local Plan. The creation of safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime does not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion is a key part of planning for sustainable development and communities, as outlined in paragraph 8(b), 96, 101, 135(f) of the NPPF. Paragraph 8 explains that "Achieving sustainable development means that the planning system has three overarching objectives…" and paragraph 8b) sets out the second of those objectives, which is a social objective. The social objective is "to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by ensuring that a su??icient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by fostering well-designed, beautiful and safe places, with accessible services and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and support communities' health, social and cultural well-being." It is clear that in its objectives for sustainable development, the NPPF recognises "safe places, with accessible services" as key. More specifically, paragraph 101 of the NPPF requires decision-makers to give "significant weight" to the importance of delivering "new, expanded or upgraded public service infrastructure when considering proposals for development" with "public service infrastructure" being recognised "as health, blue light, library, adult education, university and criminal justice facilities" (our underlining). The express reference to the importance of "blue light" services is welcomed by the Police, and as such, the "significant weight" to be attributed to the faster delivery of these facilities which now specifically includes police infrastructure should positively influence the planning balance when considering new development proposals. It follows that paragraph 102 of the NPPF requires that "Planning polices and decisions should promote public safety " and 102b) confirms that "Policies for relevant areas (such as town centre and

regeneration frameworks)...should be informed by the most up-to-date information available from the police." The Police advising East Devon District Council (EDDC) of its policing requirements as a result of the developments within the District is evidence of the engagement which the NPPF encourages. Whilst DCP has recently submitted their feedback to EDDC in connection with the preparation of a new Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP), the NPPF requires that local policies are "informed" by information from the police. The Police therefore request that their comments are treated as such, and that the information contained within is used to inform the Council's approach to local policy, including the preparation of the emerging East Devon Local Plan 2020-2042. Paragraph 3.45 & Strategic Policy SP07 2 Paragraph 135 of the NPPF states that "Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments.....f) create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience" (our underlining). It is the Police's position that to achieve this, police infrastructure is necessary, and should be protected in policy. Section 17(1) of the Crime and Disorder Act 1988 (1998 Act) places a duty on all local authorities to consider crime and disorder implications. Local authorities must exercise their various functions with due regard to the likely e??ect of the exercise of those functions on, and the need to do all that they reasonably can to prevent: a) Crime and disorder in their area (including anti-social and other behaviour adversely a??ecting the local environment; b) The misuse of drugs, alcohol and other substances in their area; c) Re-o??ending in their area; and d) Serious violence in their area. Section 17 (1)(A) of the 1998 Act provides that "The duty imposed on an authority by subsection (1) to do all it reasonably can to prevent serious violence in its area is a duty on the authority to do all it reasonably can to – (a) prevent people from becoming involved in serious violence in its area, and (b) reduce instances of serious violence in its area." As a result, when formulating policy and when determining planning applications for any new development within its administrative area, EDDC must comply with the above Section 17 duties, otherwise there is a risk of challenge to such policy and planning decisions. The Police have made it clear that police infrastructure is necessary to o??set the harm of new development which is clearly linked to the prevention of the types of behaviour set out in Section 17 of the 1998 Act. Therefore, to assist in compliance with its Section 17 duty, the East Devon Local Plan must acknowledge the Police's need for su??icient provision of police infrastructure and policing facilities. The Publication Draft of the emerging East Devon Local Plan 2020 - 2042 recognises the need for safe environments. For example, Chapter 8 confirms that the Plan's strategic policy "aims to meet the housing needs of East Devon by providing a mix of decent, a??ordable homes that are safe, secure, and adaptable to changing needs" (our underlining). Strategic Policy DS01 which considers design and local distinctiveness states that "Proposals will only be

permitted where they: E. Have due regard for important aspects of detail and quality and should incorporate:

1. Attractive, secure layouts with safe and convenient access for the whole community, including disabled users, and incorporating appropriate measures to reduce the potential for crime and antisocial behaviour;

6. Appropriate activity levels to maintain safety and reduce fear of crime at all times;

7. Well-designed security features to support passive, safe design." Paragraph 3.45 & Strategic Policy SP07 3 In order to comply with EDDC's own proposed policy, there is a clear need for policing infrastructure to be in place to su??iciently provide for safe and healthy communities for the existing and future residents of the District. The proposed Strategic Policy SP07 of the Publication Draft Plan under the sub-heading of 'Infrastructure' seeks to ensure that new development is supported by appropriate infrastructure, and delivered in a timely manner to support the needs of the development and the wider community. It also confirms that draft Strategic Policy SP07 applies across the whole local plan area, including the Cranbrook Plan area. This is supported by the Police. Whilst proposed Strategic Policy SP07 does not include a definition of what "appropriate infrastructure" entails, the justification for draft Policy SP07 at paragraph 3.41 states that "The East Devon Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) provides a comprehensive assessment of the district's infrastructure needs and priorities. Developers should consult the most recent version of the IDP when assessing infrastructure requirements for their proposals." The Police note that EDDC's IDP 2017 acknowledges in its "infrastructure list" that "emergency service facilities" are one of the items which EDDC intend will be or may be wholly or partly funded by CIL. Additionally at paragraph 2.2, the IDP states that CIL can be spent on "police stations." DCP submitted feedback to EDDC in respect of the Police's updated and new infrastructure requirements to support the emerging East Devon Local Plan 2020-2040 (Our Ref:CFM1/SW23/345591.6). The Police acknowledges the current IDP February 2025 version 1 includes priority 1 projects for extension to police stations at Ottery St Mary, Axminster and Exmouth. So as to ensure su??icient deliverability of police provision and police infrastructure in the delivery of new development and to reflect the most recent version of the NPPF, paragraph 101 the Police propose a modification to draft Policy SP07. On the issue of "Infrastructure Provision" which is considered within the explanatory text that accompanies draft Strategic Policy SP08 at paragraph 3.45, it is critical for the provision of the safety and security of communities that Police Infrastructure is supported. As such, "Blue Light" services which falls within the scope of "public service infrastructure" that is now included under this umbrella within NPPF should be cited within paragraph 3.45.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified

above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: Strategic Policy SP07: Delivery of Infrastructure New development proposals must be supported by appropriate infrastructure, delivered in a timely manner to support the needs of the development and the wider community. The Local Planning Authority will require that applicants: A. Assess the infrastructure requirements arising from their development, and take account of infrastructure capacity and need. D. Consult and cooperate with relevant infrastructure and service providers to ensure e??icient and e??ective infrastructure delivery which also reflects the requirements of the Council's Infrastructure Development Plan. Paragraph 3.45 & Strategic Policy SP07 Paragraph 3.45 Delivering infrastructure alongside housing and economic development is crucial for sustainable communities. This includes essential services like transport, flood risk measures, utilities, blue light, and habitat mitigation, as well as daily access to education, health, open spaces, and play areas.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : The Police wish to have the opportunity to participate to be able to provide comments on the amendments proposed and address any issues directly.

Full name: Harriet Fuller

Organisation (where relevant): Environment Agency

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP07

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: We have concerns that this policy lacks clarity and may cause confusion amongst applicants/developers. The requirement of point A of the policy should, in theory apply to only windfall development and the expectation is that the LPA has already undertaken this assessment of infrastructure requirements for the allocated development sites through the evidence base, in particular the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. We would therefore suggest that point A reads: "Where not already identified in a development allocation policy, applications will be required to assess the infrastructure requirements arising from their development." Further, point E requires applications to simply 'consider' the long-term maintenance and management of new infrastructure. This wording fails to require applicants to ensure that provision. As such, we would suggest point E is reworded as follows: "Applications will be required to: E. Include a mechanism for the long-term maintenance and management of new infrastructure". This wording better ensures the applicant undertakes the 'consideration' of the matter as well as setting out exactly how that may happen- e.g. adoption by a third party/undertaker, or developer-led maintenance which can be secured in a plan/strategy document. In SP08 (comments directly below), the third paragraph of the policy states "Services must be built to regulatory standards and details of appropriate mechanisms for in perpetuity management and maintenance, with adoption by a regulatory body being the preference, will be subject to the agreement of the local planning authority.". This wording is entirely appropriate for policy SP07 as well.

Full name: Harriet Fuller

Organisation (where relevant): Environment Agency

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP07

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.:

6. Infrastructure Delivery Plan The introduction sets out the benefits of infrastructure to communities and the risk of development being suboptimal if the necessary supporting infrastructure is not provided. We would recommend this introduction also includes a reference to the potential environmental harm of not providing necessary infrastructure alongside growth. Utilities Projects UTI – 1 to UTI – 5: All infrastructure is required to serve proposed growth; however, the method of funding is cited as the 'new connection Infrastructure Charge' from developers. This infrastructure needs to be provided alongside the growth and should not be delivered retrospectively following connection of new homes if this growth is to be sustainable. Forward funding of this infrastructure may be needed. UTI-5 Countess wear 2029-2035: This is also referenced in Exeter City Council's IDP which was recently at Reg 19 consultation stage, and the recent South West Water Business Plan. The dates referenced in the IDP for the 'Investment at Countess Wear' to accommodate growth are dated 2030-2035. Given these are deemed priority 1 we consider it essential that this date in the IDP be revised to echo the South West Water Business Plan which states a delivery date of 2030 for this (rather than the 2030-2035 currently in the EDDC IDP). UTI – 6 New East of Exeter Waste water treatment works: This is also referenced in the recent Reg 19 Exeter City consultation IDP and recent South West Water Business Plan. This additional East of Exeter Sewage treatment works in East Devon is programmed for a date of 2030-2035 in the IDP. The SWW business plan states 'our new East of Exeter WWTW will be designed and delivered by 2035', so we welcome the alignment of this infrastructure in the IDP with the SWW Business plan as it is critical this is delivered alongside, not following, the housing growth it will serve.

Full name: Steve Havers

Organisation (where relevant): National Highways

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP07

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Strategic Policy SP07 relates to the timely delivery of infrastructure to support the needs of development, and identifies the requirement for developers to assess infrastructure needs at the application stage with improvements thereafter delivered either through direct provision or financial contributions. Supporting text refers to various sources of potential infrastructure funding, with paragraph 3.47 advising that "As the local plan progresses, detailed assessments of infrastructure needs and provision plans will be required". 29. National Highways supports the objective of the policy to ensure that infrastructure delivery keeps pace with development build-out, and for applications to consider the long-term maintenance and management of new infrastructure. Nevertheless, it is important to note that the need for strategic transport infrastructure to support delivery of the Local Plan and the Second New Community site in particular is not yet agreed with National Highways, and the Plan is considered unsound pending this evidence. 30. Noting both SP07 and Objective 10 of the Plan seek to secure infrastructure needs at an appropriate time to support new development, it is critical that the strategic transport needs of the plan are understood and agreed at an early stage. Given work on the Greater Exeter Transport Strategy and evidence base for the New Community remains ongoing, it is not yet clear that the published IDP provides a comprehensive assessment of the district's infrastructure needs and priorities, as is stated in paragraph 3.41 of the publication draft. Further work is needed to inform revisions to the submitted IDP and any separate IDP for the Second New Community. Should physical SRN works be required then it is likely that additional public funding will be necessary. 31. We recommend that the wording of Strategic Policy SP07 should be expanded to refer to transport infrastructure and services identified through the Greater Exeter Transport Strategy or other strategic transport strategies, the role of the individual development in contributing to the outcomes of the strategy, and the potential need to seek other sources of funding should strategic transport infrastructure be required.

Full name: Craig Hatton

Organisation (where relevant): Network Rail

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP07

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: Yes

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: Yes

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: Network Rail supports the Policy which seeks to secure developer contributions to ensure infrastructure is funded and to be phased. As an infrastructure provider, this approach is essential to ensure any impacts are mitigated.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Malcolm Dicken

Organisation (where relevant): NHS Devon Integrated Care Board and Royal Devon University Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP07

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: NHS Devon ICB and RDUH have been engaged in the Local Plan process and have now reviewed the East Devon District Council (EDDC) Regulation 19 Local Plan. New housing developments have a direct impact on the NHS services that are provided locally which requires a directly related increase in the capacity of both GP Surgeries and Hospitals. Within the current EDDC plan it is only the Cranbrook development that collects S106 developer contributions for the additional health infrastructure required to meet the needs of the new population. Whilst CIL is collected by the council from all other planning applications there are no guarantees that this will be allocated to mitigate the direct impacts on the local health services.

The additional health infrastructure requirements are covered by The Strategic Policy SP07: Delivery of infrastructure however within the justification for the policy it states in 3.46 that the infrastructure funding can come from various sources including Direct Provision, S106 or CIL. To meet the requirements of the new NPPF and to meet the objectives of the Local Plan, the NHS requires that the mitigation measures from an application are from either Direct Provision or S106. Within the proposed plan it is not clear to prospective developers that this would be the requirement, and we ask that consideration is given to providing further guidance within the plan or as a Supplementary Planning Document. NHS Devon ICB | 3 A Health Contributions SPD has been adopted as part of the Isle of Wight Local Plan which currently covers the impact and mitigation methodology for primary care (GP services) and NHS Devon ICB and RDUH would like to see a similar approach for East Devon, and we would be very happy to draft an appropriate SPD in collaboration with the council. The SPD or an additional Health Infrastructure policy could then be included as part of the following policies

where the NHS has provided evidence that there is insufficient primary care infrastructure to meet the additional housing:

• Strategic Policy WS01: Development of a second new community east of Exeter

• Strategic Policy WS10: Development next to the M5 and north of Topsham

• Strategic Policy SD01: Exmouth and its development allocations

• Strategic Policy SD02: Axminster and its development allocations

• Strategic Policy SD03: Honiton and its development allocations

• Strategic Policy SD04: Ottery St Mary and its development allocations

• Strategic Policy SD07: Development allocations at Broadclyst

• Strategic Policy SD09: Development allocations at Colyton

• Strategic Policy SD10: Development allocations at Lympstone

• Strategic Policy SD11: Development allocations at Woodbury NHS Devon ICB and RDUH look forward to working collaboratively with East Devon District Council to deliver the East Devon Local Plan, ensuring healthcare infrastructure meets the needs of East Devon residents.

SP08

Full name: Dee Woods

Organisation (where relevant): Otter Valley Association

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP08

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Policy SP08 is good, but again does not go far enough to ensure timely provision of all required infrastructure, or its upgrading where necessary. How will the necessary infrastructure be delivered in time of severe economic constraints? It is noted that the Infrastructure Delivery Plan 2025 has very little input from South West Water in terms of new and improved sewage facilities. In relation to this, there is rising concern about the number of houses proposed in the catchment area of the Otter Valley. This river is already in a poor ecological condition due to the frequent discharges of sewage. The housing allocation for the catchment is 1,037 homes, giving a total of 1,642 over the plan period. The existing sewage works along the river cannot cope at the moment, so some serious investment needs to be undertaken by South West Water in the near future, before any further homes are built.

Full name: Robert Jones

Organisation (where relevant): River Otter Fisheries Association

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP08

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: SP07/SP08 – 3.41 states that developers and landowners will need to consult the EDLP – IDP Version 01-Jan 2024 in order to identify and assess Infrastructure requirement associated with their proposals. In our view the IDP is seriously lacking due to the inadequate responses from SWW in particular when consulted by EDDC. https://eastdevon.gov.uk/media/g54jh2qx/ksd-001-infrastructure-delivery-plan.pdf There are no infrastructure proposals in relation to improvement and enhancement of clean water supply or more importantly plans to upgrade / improve / replace existing foul water treatment plants in the valley. This has to be reviewed in order to ensure that both landowners and developers fully understand the costs associated with their proposals and accordingly a new response should be required from SWW and the plan should be reviewed in the light of the Water Cycle Study when produced. It is our view that the results of investigations by citizen science groups active in the valley now as to the level of pollution evidenced from treatment plants and water monitor 'spill' EDM records should all be taken into account by EDDC when evaluating the realities of water quality issues in the river rather than relying solely upon SWW whose views and responses are clearly compromised.

-3.39-3.34 Justification for Policy. This makes no mention whatsoever of the natural environment and seems to us to be a fundamental blindspot in the philosophy of this plan. Beautiful East Devon / 'Our outstanding landscape' will not stay beautiful or outstanding if it is not made clear in the plan that all and any development has to above all else improve not damage the natural environment.

Full name: Daniel Rogers

Organisation (where relevant): Bell Cornwell LLP

Other party name (if relevant): Acorn Property Group

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP08

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: ACORN PROPERTY GROUP REPRESENTATIONS ON THE EAST DEVON LOCAL PLAN (2020 – 2042) REGULATION 19 CONSULTATION DRAFT (MARCH 2025) BY BELL CORNWELL LLP 1 INTRODUCTION Acorn Property Group is a very well-established, locally based housing developer and land promoter with interests across the district. Acorn Property Group has helped to facilitate new homes, affordable housing and other uses in the area. They are an independent development and regeneration specialist that has, successfully created a range of residential-led refurbishment and new build schemes. Specifically, Acorn Property Group has interests in land at Hillhead, Colyton, which is an allocated site in the Emerging Local Plan which is suitable for residential development. Given the nature of their long-standing delivery of housing in the district, Acorn Property Group is an important local stakeholder within interests in the proposals in the East Devon Local Plan for future development in the district. Against this background, Bell Cornwell LLP has reviewed the policies and information set out in the East Devon Local Plan (2020 - 2042) Regulation 19 Consultation Draft and makes the following representations. CHAPTER 3. SPATIAL STRATEGY Strategic Policy SP08: Phased Delivery of Infrastructure and Services Strategic Policy SP08 includes a requirement for any developments to be brought forward in phases to be designed so that each phase or parcel provides pedestrian, cycling and vehicular access up to the boundaries of each development parcel/phase. Such developments shall also ensure that all services including electricity, water, sewerage, broadband and district heating services (where applicable) are also delivered up to the boundaries of each phase or parcel. This is a sensible policy to include, which can give housebuilders flexibility to build in phase to deliver across the plan period. It will allow both above and below ground services and infrastructure link up between different parcels of phased developments to ensure that no party is held to ransom by another at the expense of the quality of the development, and to minimise disruption in the delivery of adjoining phases or parcel.

Full name: Daniel Rogers

Organisation (where relevant): Bell Cornwell LLP

Other party name (if relevant): Combe Estates

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP08

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Strategic Policy SP08: Phased Delivery of Infrastructure and Services Strategic Policy SP08 includes a requirement for any developments to be brought forward in phases to be designed so that each phase or parcel provides pedestrian, cycling and vehicular access up to the boundaries of each development parcel/phase. Such developments shall also ensure that all services including electricity, water, sewerage, broadband and district heating services (where applicable) are also delivered up to the boundaries of each phase or parcel. This is a sensible policy to include, which can give housebuilders flexibility to build in phase to deliver across the plan period. It will allow both above and below ground services and infrastructure link up between different parcels of phased developments to minimise disruption in the delivery of adjoining phases or parcels of land.

Full name: Daniel Rogers

Organisation (where relevant): Bell Cornwell LLP

Other party name (if relevant): Various - see pdf attachments

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP08

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: Yes

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: Yes

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Simon Coles

Organisation (where relevant): CarneySweeney

Other party name (if relevant): C R Down Farming Ltd and Stuart Partners Ltd

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP08

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: CarneySweeney acts for CR Down Farming Ltd and Stuart Partners Ltd in connection with land south of A3052 and east of A376, Clyst St Mary, East Devon.

The intention of the policy is acknowledged. However, the provisions of Policy SP08 relating to S38 approvals and the design of services and utilities duplicate other legislation and standards and should be deleted.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: Remove reference to other consenting regimes.

Full name: Jess Perminter

Organisation (where relevant): CarneySweeney

Other party name (if relevant): CR Down Farming Ltd and Stuart Partners Ltd

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP08

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: The intention of the policy is acknowledged. However, the provisions of Policy SP08 relating to S38 approvals and the design of services and utilities duplicate other legislation and standards and should be deleted.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: Remove reference to other consenting regimes.

Full name: Neil Mantell

Organisation (where relevant): LRM Planning

Other party name (if relevant): The Cherwell Group

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP08

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: Yes

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: Yes

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: Policy SP08 of the emerging Local Plan requires the developers of proposals that are being delivered on a phased basis to provide pedestrian, cycle and vehicular access up to the boundaries of each phase, as well as to ensure that adequate infrastructure capacity can be provided to service future phases/parcels without the need for retrofitting.

The Cherwell Group are supportive of this approach, which will ensure that development is delivered in a coordinated and comprehensive manner, and without unnecessary delays and additional costs. Their masterplanning proposals show pedestrian, cycle and vehicular access to the boundaries of their land parcels, which could also be controlled by condition. They intend to revisit their access arrangement on to the A3052 after the publication of the Greater Exeter Transport Model is published and more accurate traffic data is available. This will ensure that the access is sufficiently sized to accommodate not only the development proposed by the Cherwell Group, but also all other development to the north that will utilise the southern access point.

They therefore consider Policy SP08 to be effective and justified.

4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: Yes

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : Due to the significant policy issues concerned

Full name: Oliver Keates

Organisation (where relevant): OBK Land and Planning Ltd

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP08

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: No

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: The part which says, “up to the boundaries” should be removed and this should read as follows – “layouts should be designed in such a way that further phases are not prejudiced or compromised in any way and can come forward for development having regard to the provision of pedestrian, cycling and vehicular access”.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Full name: Karime Hassan MBE

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP08

3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.: [Representation on behalf of Exeter Rugby Group based in Exeter close to Junction 30 of the M5 at Sandy Park. See also upload of full representation]

Strategic Policy SP07: Delivery of Infrastructure; and Strategic Policy SP08: Phased Delivery of Infrastructure and Services are essential, and supported, and to be read along with Strategic Policy WS01: Development of a second new community east of Exeter.

Full name: Digby Morrison

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP08

2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?: No

2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.: I don't know if it's legal. The commonplace platform doesn't describe what constitutes legal compliance. It simply names the acts and regulations that describe this. Hardly accessible for anyone other than a chartered planner to be able to comment on legality of the plan when the parameters of legality have not bee described!

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: Policies SP07 & 08 are not Effective. They are too weak and general to ensure that sufficient and adequate waste water treatment infrastructure is in place before homes are occupied. Policies SP07 & 08 are also not Justified. To date development has continued without the commensurate upgrading of waste water treatment infrastructure, when combined with more regular significant rainfall events, this has resulted in increased overflows of sewage into the Exe Estuary and the sea. Evidence of housing being built ahead of waste water infrastructure, or more regular significant rainfall events has not been included in the development of the plan and no work has been conducted to establish policies and plans which would mitigate this issue. The only waste water project mentioned in the East Devon Local Plan Infrastructure Delivery Plan is UI-5 Investment at Countess Wear Sewage Treatment Works to increase capacity for growth. There is no mention of the waste water pollution issued in Exmouth (or any other coastal towns and villages) and investment required to resolve these before further housing is developed.

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: Further work needs to be conducted on this issue, included in the

evidence, and policies redrafted to make them more specific and robust on this topic of waste water infrastructure and pollution.

4(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.: I don't know, I haven't read any description of the collaboration entered into with other councils.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?: Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. : To more specifically represent the lack of evidence and weakness of policy wording.

Full name: Rachel Danemann

Organisation (where relevant): Home Builders Federation (HBF)

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP08

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: The policy is not considered to be sound as it is not positively prepared, effective, justified or con-sistent with national policy

59. It is unclear from the policy wording how a developer would show compliance with the policy, particu-larly for sites are being developed by different developers. The policy is therefore ineffective and un-sound

Full name: Helene Jessop

Organisation (where relevant): RSPB

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP08

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: It omits mention of the need to ensure delivery of measures essential to ensure no adverse impacts on the SPA/SAC sites, eg, via timely provision of effective SANG. In addition, there is yet no strategy to address the increased emissions arising from new development (increased nitrogen deposits from the increased vehicle traffic will damage the heathland habitats).

3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Introduction chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.: Include wording to the effect "All proposals for developments that would, unmitigated, directly or indirectly adversely affect the designated habitats and species of SPA/SAC sites, must include details of how adverse effects will be avoided or satisfactorily mitigated. In the case of the developments that would directly or indirectly affect heathlands, this includes how increased damaging recreational impacts will be avoided (eg, provision of SANG) and how the heathlands will be safeguarded from increased emissions from vehicle use arising from the development." There is currently NO strategy for ensuring satisfactory mitigation for vehicle emissions to ensure no damaging effects on the East Devon Heaths SAC/SPA.

Full name: Rob Martin

Organisation (where relevant): Clyst Honiton Parish Council

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP08

3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?: No

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:

- Incomplete – deferring to developers will lead under-provision and overloading of current (already overloaded) infrastructure
- Timelines for infrastructure unclear which will lead to overloading etc
- Highways and sewage already overloaded but not acknowledged
- Third party involvement for education and public transport not demonstrated

Following on from the comment on SP07 above it is not clear which infrastructure provisions will be included here, it just seems to apply to those developments up to a certain size where the thresholds for wider infrastructure work such as main road improvements, sewage provisions etc are not me by the one application. The cumulative effect of all of the developers however exceeds the thresholds. The masterplans for large developments need to have identified what needs to be provided for overall so that appropriate contributions can be obtained from developers from the beginning. In the past, successful provision of infrastructure has been obtained by working with consortia of developers to build out a large site, rather than letting each one get away with not providing enough. Whilst the Local Plan outlines the Housing and Employment allocations and, in each case identifies the infrastructure requirements, this is all done piecemeal. What is missing is a Strategic Plan for Infrastructure delivery to go alongside the other strategic policies in the Local Plan. What is required is the identification of all infrastructure requirements brought about by the delivery of the whole plan and how this is going to be delivered when it is needed, rather than when it is afforded, or not. In the case of just the many strategic allocations, both residential and commercial, in and around the Clyst Honiton parish boundary the following will need to be provided if sustainability is to be demonstrated:

Highway improvements –

- The main improvements relating to Clyst Honiton are laid down in policy TR02 being the alterations to the Clyst St Mary Roundabout which is essential before the New Community development even starts and Improvements to the A30 Airport Junction which is also adjacent to Clyst Honiton Village.

- There are, however, many other conflict points on the London Road which are going to be needed because of the many commercial developments enabled by other policies in the plan. This highway is already at peak capacity or beyond and will need upgraded junctions and other traffic management facilities to be able to cope with the traffic.

- The new town being proposed will have an even bigger effect on both the A30 and the A3052 and is only briefly referred to in the narrative relating to this. The effect on both highways is going to be significant. Not everyone in the new town will work in East Devon, a good proportion will be working in Exeter and the traffic here will increase significantly adding to the delays experienced already. People will not be cycling from the new town to Exeter in large scale, no matter the aspirations in the Local Plan.

- The assumption in the Local Plan with regard to EVs is that people will need infrastructure to charge the vehicles, but will not use them to get to work, plainly not the case. Assuming EVs are a good thing, they will still need highway to be able to use them.

Sewage Disposal

- The only reference to provisions for additional sewage treatment facilities is in the allocation of land for treatment site on the new town site. This is unlikely to be provided at the front end of the development and could have to wait until the after the end of the plan period in 2042. Twenty years is too long to wait for improvements to the already under-strain infrastructure currently in place.

- The plan has a total of 5,000+ dwellings allocated in this plan, with a further 5,000 likely in the next plan in the Clyst Honiton area, alongside a number of employment and commercial allocations with sewage all heading in the same direction, through an inadequate pumping station in Clyst Honiton, on the River Clyst which already discharges into the river hundreds of times a tear.

- All parishes on the River Clyst from Broadclyst to the Exe at Topsham will have similar tales to tell about this. In short, it will make a mockery of the Clyst Regional Park aspirations.

- Sewage Disposal Facilities have to be improved in the short term otherwise the whole area is going to be compromised. Including the need for as part of the Local Plan is absolutely essential, which will require a commitment from South West Water to provide it.

Education

- The level of housing in one area will impact on education provision and it is important to consider this from the outset.

- With large scale development there will be a need for additional primary and secondary education and with evolving government policies pre-school as well. The difficulty is that these provisions will need to be in place at the outset rather than waiting until the development takes place. The number of extra children resulting from development comes with a demand at all age levels, rather than starting at the youngest and building up, so there is often not an identified demand for extra places as development take place. With a potential build period on the new town site of more than 10 years, the eventual need for both primary and secondary provision should not be left until the houses are all built.

- This is a situation where the provision needs to be in place before it is needed, with school populations filling at the end of development. There is a danger that each new tranche of pupils end up being absorbed within the current schools, meaning the student population having to travel to school, which is not sustainable.

- There is a need to get information from Devon County Council on a plan to deliver the school provision required. Transport Options

- There is an assumption that public transport will be available for the large developments, but the new town, unlike Cranbrook, has no easy access to the rail network.

- The only form of public transport available to get to and from the site is that of many more bus services and the assumption here is that this will be provided by the bus companies in the free market.

- This is an assumption that will not come to fruition without potential substantial subsidy to the bus companies, particularly initially. A plan needs to be drawn up with the bus companies to make sure the services are there from the outset. Once people get used to using their car (EVs is the plan) they will not go back to buses.

- It should be remembered that transport is not just for people going to work, but young people have to get to school and particularly to Exeter College so they have a daily need for a consistent provision. Medical Services

- A particular problem with large new communities is whether there is going to be an accessible doctors surgery, again from the outset, rather than looking 20 year in advance.

- In addition, the increased call on hospital services has to be accommodated which is a problem if the highways are gridlocked with ambulances unable to get through the traffic.

- Maybe, there should be provision in the plan for an Air Ambulance landing site to ensure that badly injured people, perhaps as a result of an accident on over capacity highways, can get to hospital in good time.

Full name: Harriet Fuller

Organisation (where relevant): Environment Agency

Proposal:

3. The Spatial Strategy

1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?: Policy

1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.: SP08

3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: From our experience, it is imperative to ensure that the wording of this policy does not leave scope for unfinished/disjointed infrastructure regardless of original land ownership or sequencing problems. Therefore, we consider that the wording in the first paragraph of 'up to the boundaries' should be changed in both sentences to "go up to the boundary and align with infrastructure on neighbouring parcels/ sites…". We support the wording "Services must be built to regulatory standards and details of appropriate mechanisms for in perpetuity management and maintenance, with adoption by a regulatory body being the preference, will be subject to the agreement of the local planning authority". And that a masterplan or phasing plan will be secured also. We also think the justification paragraph 3.49 is suitably specific in wording and it is positive to highlight both above and below ground infrastructure.