

An open meeting was held for residents on 15 August to discuss the development brief. This was attended by EDDC's Claire Rodway and Matt Dickins, together with some 100 members of the community. The general response from the meeting and from individual submissions is as follows:

Support for the development principles

-) General approval for proposed layout, design and materials for the buildings and the potential for local people to be able to afford the smaller dwellings were welcomed.
-) There is some limited resistance to the development now that (controversial) approval has been given for 15 new houses in Doatshayne Lane to meet the expressed housing needs. What is needed is more social housing to rent by local people at affordable rates.
-) One parishioner questions the proposed alterations to the farmhouse itself, a dwelling understood to have been built between 1580 and 1650, in that internal structures may make it difficult to divide into 2 buildings and proposes construction of a new building in the large garden of the Farmhouse. Another is of the opinion that the original farmhouse and stone barns be demolished leaving a blank canvass for development. Yet another has concerns about the garden space on the site and suggests the conversion of the granary into an annex. However a full structural survey by an experienced surveyor/ engineer should resolve or confirm these concerns.
-) A community orchard or green space – a project for residents was supported by the majority of those who expressed a view. East Budleigh offers a precedent.

Essential additional requirements

-) Many more parking spaces (at least 2 per household and additional numbers for local businesses and visitors) to alleviate the village's growing and significant parking problems.

Considerations

-) Pedestrian access only to the development from The Street; builder and traffic access from the A358. However there are vehicles currently emerging from 5 separate points, including a busy farm, onto the A358 and 'near misses' are frequent.
-) Reduction of speed limit along this stretch to 30 mph with central double white line.
-) Inclusion of small business units/ workshops would be an asset. Take-up of such facilities in Harbour Rd, Seaton and Axminster Hunthay is understood to be good.
-) Inclusion of a mixed Parish Council office/Musbury heritage centre, standalone or Village Hall extension, would offer a legacy project.
-) The brief states it will re-open a former PROW across the site. As there is no record of a PROW the brief should talk about pedestrian access.
-) Musbury is described by local estate agents as "one of the most sought after villages" in East Devon but it is now in jeopardy of becoming over-developed with the granting of permission for new houses in Doatshayne and little attention being given to improvements in essential infrastructure.

-) There is some concern about building close to the Village Hall because of the potential of disturbance to residents from noise from its functions and events.
-) One resident commented negatively on the sagacity of building new homes opposite a dairy farm which frequently smells strongly of silage or slurry

Fundamental Opposition to Travellers site on the basis of

-) Its visual amenity – far better to improve the village architecture and the conservation area, not detract from it. There are a number of Grade 2 listed buildings nearby
-) Musbury is a small village and minority groups will be very visible and difficult to integrate.
-) [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] It will put off developers and reduce the value of new and neighbouring houses
-) It will likely negatively impact on the two closest and largest Musbury businesses- the Spar/ Garage and the pub, as potential customers are likely to be put off.
-) Screening is likely to aggravate the differential between adjacent styles of living.
-) The Parish Council notes that in a letter from DCC to the Strategic Planning Committee (24th July), they state that they as owners of the site are exploring alternative sites in the locality where they believe provision for travellers would be more appropriate.
-) All mention of the site should be removed from the brief.

11.9.2018