

# Planning for the Future

East  
Devon

District Council

## East Devon Local Development Framework

Core Strategy: Preferred Approach  
Consultation Events



Autumn 2010

East Devon Local Development Framework- Core Strategy  
Report on the Preferred Approach Consultation Events  
(Autumn 2010)

## **Table of Contents**

<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Consultation Process.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>LDF Preferred Options Consultation Programme- 6<sup>th</sup> September-30 November 2010 .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>The Structure of this Report.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>General Themes which have emerged from the Consultation .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Meetings, Media and the Internet .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Social Media.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Meetings with Parish Councils in Autumn 2010.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Consultation with Schools and Young People.....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Equalities Forum .....</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Lessons from the Consultation.....</b>	<b>28</b>

## **The Preferred Approach Consultation Events**

### **Autumn 2010**

#### **Introduction**

The Core Strategy Preferred Approach was published for consultation in Autumn 2010. The comments received will inform the production of the Core Strategy itself. This report summarises the public engagement that took place during the 12 week consultation period and explains the techniques used to communicate with as wide a range of groups as possible.

The Core Strategy will be a key document within East Devon’s Local Development Framework (a new type of development plan that will replace the Devon Structure Plan and the East Devon Local Plan). One of the main principles of the new planning system is that local communities and stakeholders should be involved from the outset in the preparation of planning policy documents. In East Devon, numerous meetings were held with local organisations, bodies and interest groups as well as locally elected representatives, through Parish Councils, to ensure that the process was genuinely useful and inclusive. The Preferred Approach precedes the Core Strategy, which will set out an overall vision for East Devon and the strategic elements in the planning framework for the District. It will not allocate specific sites for development, but it will identify which broad areas are suitable for new homes or jobs. The Core Strategy will look ahead to 2026, which is the same timescale as the emerging Regional Plan.

The purpose of this report is to outline the consultation on the Preferred Approach document which will inform the production of the Core Strategy and to summarise the process and results of the consultation.

#### **Consultation Process**

In order to manage the consultation process effectively, and in accordance with the guidance of the Planning Advisory Service, the following process was undertaken:

Step 1- Set Objectives	The objectives for development in the District, at this stage of Core Strategy production, are set out in the Preferred Approach
Step 2- Review Schedule	4 weeks preparation time during August Commence consultation on 6 September, finish on November 30. Feedback early new year
Step 3- Identify who to involve	Equalities Impact Assessment- identify minority groups Stakeholders Including statutory consultees Interest groups Elected representatives Wider Community
Step 4- Choose the right method	Method will depend on consultee group but it is envisaged that standard approaches will be tailored to meet the needs of the process and the attendees- District Council workshops/meetings have already been held, during Spring 2010, and used to inform production of the Preferred Approach. Officer attendance at Town/Parish meetings as requested, if available Press Releases and adverts in the press Spooof video ‘we plan anywhere’ hosted on Youtube Facebook Twitter

East Devon Local Development Framework- Core Strategy  
 Report on the Preferred Approach Consultation Events  
 (Autumn 2010)

		<p>Leaflets to all households in East Devon          Hard to reach/minority/interest groups will be consulted depending on their individual needs.          Visiting all Secondary Schools/Colleges during Local Democracy Week to seek the views of students on particular subjects of interest to them. Debates are followed by formal ballots and are proving very popular. It is hoped that students will choose to become further involved, particularly through Facebook. Early feedback is very positive.          11 million takeover day - where primary school students will visit the Council offices in early November and will have a brief talk by Officers about planning in their areas.</p>
Step 5- Deliver Activities		<p>Officers will speak at meetings facilitated by local Councils          Workshops with children          Issue press releases and adverts, post leaflets and ensure that website and social media are regularly monitored.          Comments can be delivered by post, 'Limehouse' consultation database or 'quick comment' form on the Council's website, Facebook, Twitter, or by telephone.          Hard to reach/minority/interest groups consulted according to individual needs</p>
Step 6- Collate, review and export		<p>As far as possible information will be quantitative to enable statistical analysis and collected through structured proformas or in a standardised format through the consultation database.          Raw, qualitative data (ie from meetings, records of workshop discussions, questionnaire returns and notes) will be presented discursively to minimise subjectivity before interpretation. Everything will be retained to provide an auditable evidence base.          Analysis will be carried out by Officers, assuming sufficient resources are available, then reported to the relevant Committee          Outcomes will be assessed to identify key themes and areas of broad consensus, as well as other relevant points.          Some issues, ie significant objections from key stakeholders, may require additional information and research.          Attendees will be provided with notes of the meetings</p>
Step 7- Evaluate Effectiveness		<p>As part of the 'consultation statement' the methods of engagement, parties involved, key outcomes and their role in shaping the core strategy will need to be set out. The process will need to be shown to be effective and questionnaires to all attendees will inform this process and enable evaluation.</p>

If you have any queries relating to this document please contact:

Planning Policy Section

East Devon District Council

Knowle

Sidmouth

EX10 8HL

e.mail: [ldf@eastdevon.gov.uk](mailto:ldf@eastdevon.gov.uk)

phone: 01395 516551

## LDF Preferred Options Consultation Programme- 6<sup>th</sup> September-30 November 2010

Timescale	Type of Consultation	Particular Target Group	Means of Distribution	Cost
Prior to 6 Sept	<b>Press Releases- Forthcoming consultation</b>	Everyone (but likely to be those who can read/adults)	E. mailed to press	Free (Staff time only)
Prior to 6 Sept	<b>Twitter Release</b>	Everyone (but likely to be those with IT ability)	EDDC Website/Facebook Press Release	Free (Staff time only)
Prior to 6 Sept	<b>Parish Magazine article</b>	Everyone (but likely to be those who can read/adults)	Letter/E.mail 'Press Release' to Parish Councils	Post cost/Free (Staff time)
6 Sept	<b>Notify everyone on the LDF mailing list</b>	Everyone previously interested/involved in the LDF	Letter/E.mail	Post cost/Free (Staff time)
6 Sept- 30 Nov	<b>The Knowledge</b>	Staff Interest Groups Parish/District Councillors	E.mail	Free (Staff time only)
6 Sept- 30 Nov	<b>YouTube 'We plan anywhere'</b>	Young People Internet Users	EDDC Website/Facebook Press Release	Approx £600
6 Sept- 30 Nov	<b>EDDC Website</b>	Everyone (but likely to be those with internet ability)	EDDC Website/Facebook Press Release	Free (Staff time only)
6 Sept- 30 Nov	<b>Facebook</b>	Interest Groups Young People/Families Internet Users	EDDC Website Through web 'Friends'	Free (Staff time only)
6 Sept- 30 Nov	<b>Limehouse</b>	Interest Groups Professionals/Agents Internet Users	EDDC Website (although written, e.mail, phone comments are input by staff)	Ongoing Software Cost/ Staff time
6 Sept- 30 Nov	<b>EDDC Quick comment form</b>	Everyone (but likely to be those with internet ability)	EDDC Website	Free (Staff time only)
6 Sept- 30 Nov	<b>Public Presentations at Parish meetings</b>	Everyone	Letter/e.mail to Parish Councils	Free (Staff time only)
13-20 Sept	<b>Leaflet- Towns/ Rural</b>	Everyone (but likely to be those who can read/adults)	Posted to all households	Around 25p per leaflet
20 Sept	<b>Press Adverts in local papers</b>	Everyone (but likely to be those who can read/adults)	E. mailed to press	Approx £1800 for 4 papers (all ed.)
11 Oct – 5 Nov	<b>Local Democracy Week</b>	Young People through Secondary Schools	Visits to schools- workshops	Free (Staff time only)
12 Nov	<b>11 million Takeover Day</b>	Young People through Primary Schools	Visit to EDDC Offices- 40	Free (Staff time only)
18 Nov	<b>Equalities Forum</b>	Representatives of equalities strands	Attendance at Equalities Forum	Free (Staff time only)

## **The Structure of this Report**

The consultation was undertaken in accordance with the timetable above. The responses varied depending on the technique used but, generally, responses were either thematic or specific. To reflect this, the consultation report is split into sections.

The general themes which have emerged from the whole consultation are outlined below, followed by a commentary on each of the techniques used and a summary of any lessons learnt for future consultations. The second section of the report consists of a table listing each Chapter of the Preferred Approach document with a detailed summary of responses received.

## **General Themes which have emerged from the Consultation**

All written comments received on the Core Strategy have/will be logged on the Council's Planning Policy consultation portal. All comments made can be viewed on the software at:

<http://eastdevon-consult.limehouse.co.uk/portal>

We have also produced tabulated reports on comments made that are sorted by:

- a) Comments made in plan order; and
- b) Comments made by postcode of respondents.

These reports are available on the Council web site.

In addition, the minutes of all comments made at the school consultation events, together with all power point presentations and other written documents supplied by the students, will be available to view on the Council's web site. This comprises an estimated body of text of some 20,000 words.

Not counting the words in technical documents submitted with representations, and the schools comments, there are an estimated 600,000 words of text submitted in response to the Core Strategy consultation.

The majority of representations received on the consultation, especially from members of the public/residents of East Devon, were of the view that too much development is being proposed across East Devon in the Core Strategy. These objections typically majored on the scale of housing development being proposed and many cross-referenced to proposed strategic allocation sites and/or were objections to specific strategic housing allocation sites.

Many objectors considered that the Council should not seek to match/meet Regional Spatial Strategy housing numbers but should establish lower levels, as done by some other Council's in other parts of England. There were objections that the number of homes should be completely reviewed and some representors suggested that numbers should be established through 'bottom-up' assessments with the onus placed on local communities determining the scale of development that they wish to see built in their locality.

In addition to objections that refer to District wide scales of proposed growth there are also many objections that highlight or major on the scale of growth at particular locations. The levels of proposed growth at the West End of East Devon, including the proposed 8,000 dwellings at Cranbrook, north of Blackhorse and north east of Pinhoe, were subject to specific objection. Matters raised include site

specific/relevant concerns and for individual sites and the collective impacts of the total scale of development.

Amongst the concerns raised in objection to the scale of proposed development was loss of countryside and open space, adverse impacts on wildlife and protected landscapes and the 'urbanisation' of East Devon.

In contrast to those favouring lower growth rates there were also representations that supported or endorsed the scale of development proposed in the Preferred Approach document. These were mostly from prospective developer/the development industry (and their agents). There was a widely expressed view in these representation that although the RSS may be going the evidence that underpinned its proposed scale of development remains valid and relevant and therefore it is desirable and appropriate to plan for the scale of development that it, in its last draft (Sec of State changes – 2007), proposed. Some of the representors taking this view, did, however consider that an alternative distribution pattern, spreading more of the West End growth across the rest of East Devon, would be appropriate.

It is relevant to note that very few objectors to the plan questioned the basic structure and format of the plan. There were adverse comments about its length and complexity and a number of respondents considered there to be contradictory comments in it or for it to be vague or to have 'loopholes'. The bulk of objections were to the plan content/proposals. Few objections questioned the principal of including strategic sites in the plan (though specific sites were the subject of objection).

## **Meetings, Media and the Internet**

- Press Releases were issued to the main East Devon newspapers- these are listed in the appendix. Generally the Press responded positively to the consultation although, as opposition increased, some negative reports were made and letters opposing the LDF proposals regularly appeared. There is an ongoing issue with some local newspapers who report LDF matters incorrectly- for instance misrepresenting sites submitted as part of the SHLAA technical assessment as sites which are likely to be developed and using press releases produced by LDF opposition groups without checking that they are correct- generating a great deal of unnecessary concern amongst the public. The later press releases were designed to counter this negative publicity.
- Full page press advertisements were taken out in the main East Devon newspapers. These were relatively inexpensive given the degree of coverage achieved and were accompanied in some cases (notably Exmouth, Seaton, Ottery St Mary and Honiton) by Town Council advertisements or editorial reports for public meetings to inform their responses to the LDF.
- Posters were sent, with copies of the consultation documents, to all Town/ Parish Councils with a request to include an article about the consultation in local magazines.
- All material was made available on the Council's website and several response methods were available to make it easier to reply:



- Quick comment box for those wishing to make a brief or general point. This could be anonymous but the first part of the postcode was requested so that they can be sorted by area. Comments are available to the public.
  - Limehouse database for those who wished to make a more extensive response or comment on a specific part of the document. Popular amongst agents and consultees, the comments are public, may receive a specific response and updates are sent as the LDF progresses.
  - By post
- Town specific leaflets were posted to every household in the District telling residents about the proposals most likely to be of interest to them.
  - Officers attended the External Equalities Forum on November 18<sup>th</sup>.
  - Various Town/Parish meetings took place across the District, Officer attendance was possible at most.

## Social Media

We are also trialling some more innovative consultation techniques:

- We Plan Anywhere 'youtube' video- has received approx 6,100 views and very mixed responses, but has generated a lot of media and local debate. Responses on the Youtube site are listed in the Appendix.
- Twitter - Tweets were issued at the beginning of the consultation, with further 'reminder' tweets four weeks and one day before the end. It gained a core following but didn't generate many specific responses, instead encouraging users to comment through the Council website. Text was as follows:

September 7<sup>th</sup> 2010 - "To plan or not to plan that is the question" - we need your help at PLAN-IT East Devon - [www.eastdevon.gov.uk/ldfconsultation2010](http://www.eastdevon.gov.uk/ldfconsultation2010) [5:01 PM Sep 7th](#) via web

September 13<sup>th</sup> 2010 - "Love it or hate it" we have had 3,500 hits on YouTube - find it on <http://www.eastdevon.gov.uk> [10:18 AM Sep 13th](#) via web

November 2<sup>nd</sup> 2010 - We are aiming for one new job for every new house is this the right approach ? - help us achieve our ambitions <http://www.eastdevon.gov.uk/> [2:10 PM Nov 2nd](#) via web

November 29<sup>th</sup> 2010 - Don't forget to send in your consultation responses by tomorrow Tuesday 30th November - Thank you for helping us PLAN IT!!!

- Facebook page - has 75 'followers', has received around 100-150 views per week and around 200 comments on the site. These are set out in full in the appendix. Other Facebook pages and dedicated websites, concerned with specific issues in the Preferred Approach, have been created

East Devon Local Development Framework- Core Strategy  
Report on the Preferred Approach Consultation Events  
(Autumn 2010)

by private individuals and it seems that viewers are using the East Devon pages to view the proposals but are commenting and debating elsewhere.

## Meetings with Parish Councils in Autumn 2010

Set out below are details of consultation events which the Planning Policy Section is aware of but did not organise. Some were organised by East Devon District Councillors, some by Parish/Town Councils and others by local interest groups. The majority were convened so that responses to the Local Development Framework consultation could be informed by local opinion. This was particularly important in those areas where significant change was proposed, and many requested that Planning Officers attend to expand upon the proposals.

As the meetings were organised on an individual basis, the content and format varied depending on the area but all were considered to be useful and all shared common themes- the overall strategy for the District, specific implications for the particular area/Parish, further stages of LDF production with an opportunity for questions.

Date	Town/ Parish	Approx no of Attend ees	Key Issues Discussed
Fri 8 <sup>th</sup> Oct	Ottery St Mary (West Hill)	120	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• VDS 2006- 83% against development of 30+ houses, over 50% against any outside existing centre</li> <li>• Cllr Bloxham- preferred approach should be redrafted to include localism</li> <li>• Hub towns/villages policy means that each will be treated the same: local circumstances not mentioned. Location of employment worrying</li> <li>• Built up Area Boundaries to be retained but flexible-interim policy mentioned. Lack confidence in DM Cmtee.</li> <li>• People asked to copy comments to EDDC to the WH Residents Assn so their view is representative</li> <li>• Cllr Bloxham- C Strategy doesn't match feedback on the 2008 consultation</li> <li>• Numbers are summed up by We Plan Anywhere</li> <li>• Built up Area Boundaries shouldn't be flexible</li> <li>• Website shows SHLAA sites of 47ha in West Hill - (only 1.6 ha found suitable) but shows no. of applications likely. Wrong to treat applicants as clients- Local Plan may not be followed.</li> <li>• Protected areas should be strictly controlled and all should respond to the consultation- current unambiguous policies should be retained.</li> <li>• Doubts as to whether EDDC would take any notice; less people live in villages than in the past. Does West Hill need new homes- sewage and poor transport. Don't want big settlement outside village.</li> <li>• Concerns could be allayed/ increased by the details- how would it be done? Listen to taxpayers.</li> <li>• Sainsburys in OSM will result in downgrading of West Hill: lots of elderly people need WH's shop</li> <li>• Cloakham Lawns (Axm.) permission a concern</li> <li>• Risks to planning for amenity</li> <li>• Wonderful place to live: people must have a place to live- should not pass the buck then complain- WH can't be only place exempt from development.</li> </ul>

East Devon Local Development Framework- Core Strategy  
 Report on the Preferred Approach Consultation Events  
 (Autumn 2010)

Tue 19 <sup>th</sup> Oct	Ottery St Mary Town (Alfington)	25	<p>Following presentation from Cllr Bloxham and an Officer of EDDC the question and answer session covered a wide range of planning policy and implementation matters including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scale of proposed development across East Devon and specifically at/around Alphington;</li> <li>• Potential impacts of development on the environment;</li> <li>• How local housing needs (for market and affordable housing) can be met through planning policy;</li> <li>• The impacts of in-migration on housing availability;</li> <li>• Adequacy and mechanism for securing appropriate developer contributions and ensure 'gains' are delivered.</li> <li>• The role of Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) and concerns that it (sites recorded as achievable, deliverable and available) become default allocations and planning permission will be granted on the because they have 'passed' the SHLAA 'test'.</li> </ul>
Thur 21 <sup>st</sup> Oct	Rockbeare		The Parish Council organised and staffed a 'drop-in' session.
Fri 22 <sup>nd</sup> Oct	Tale Vale	30	<p>An Officer of EDDC gave a presentation on the Core Strategy Preferred Approach document and along with Cllr Diviani and Cllr Skinner responded to questions. Amongst the matters of concern and interest raised were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scale of proposed development in villages and rural areas making up the Tale Vale ward, and in surrounding areas;</li> <li>• The potential for expanding village development boundaries to accommodate extra housing/development or other means to promote/support/accommodate development;</li> <li>• Need for affordable housing and various mechanisms and means for provision and if policy will meet local needs.</li> <li>• Whether there are alternative means, to the register social landlord model (social rent and intermediate provision) to provide affordable housing and the role that these can or should play.</li> </ul> <p>How the planning process and policy can help support villages and community facilities.</p>
Thur 28 <sup>th</sup> Oct	Rockbeare	30	<p>The evening meeting was preceded by a 'drop-in' session staffed by the Parish Council held in the afternoon. An Officer of EDDC gave a presentation on the Core Strategy Preferred Approach document and responded to questions. Amongst the matters of concern and interest raised were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall scale of proposed development in the West End and the need for this level;</li> <li>• The technical evidence and justification behind this evidence and how matters have changed post Regional Strategy 'abolition'.</li> <li>• The impacts of the overall development on Rockbeare village, there was strong support for retention of a Green Wedge between the village and Rockbeare.</li> <li>• Status of current planning applications for development in the West End, especially at Cranbrook.</li> </ul>
	Ottery St Mary	25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cllr Dobson (Mayor), Cllrs Giles and Cox (Ward Members).</li> <li>• 90 units projected at Cutler Hammer site – how does this fit with Preferred Approach's 180 over 10 years?</li> <li>• Cllrs Giles and Cox in public meetings in October 2007 and with parish councils in August and October 2007.</li> <li>• Built up area boundaries a concern, and SHLAA areas.</li> <li>• Sense of betrayal in respect of Cranbrook and its likely effect on existing settlements.</li> <li>• Junction 39 (of the M5) funding contributions agreed.</li> <li>• Waste management plan required.</li> </ul>

East Devon Local Development Framework- Core Strategy  
 Report on the Preferred Approach Consultation Events  
 (Autumn 2010)

Thur 4 <sup>th</sup> Nov	Broadclyst	100	<p>This meeting received presentations from the New Growth Point team and the District Council. Specific attention was paid to the major proposals in the West End of East Devon. Officers gave a presentation on the New Growth Point proposals, an update on schemes and the Core Strategy Preferred Approach document. Officers and Cllr Bowden responded to questions. Amongst the matters raised were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall scale of proposed development in the West End and the need for this level of development;</li> <li>• The technical evidence and justification behind this evidence and how matters have changed post Regional Strategy 'abolition'.</li> <li>• The distribution of development proposed through the CS and whether this was justified.</li> <li>• Stresses and pressures that the proposals will place on social and community infrastructure (including schools, roads, medical facilities and other services).</li> <li>• Issues surrounding potential flooding and adverse environmental impacts</li> <li>• The status of current planning applications for development in the West End and concern that proposals are being approved ahead of the policy process.</li> </ul> <p>The Broadclyst Parish Council – planning Chair sought a vote of those present on the various major proposals in the West End. There was very highly levels of opposition to the major proposals presented in the Core Strategy from the public in attendance.</p>
	All Town and Parish Councils Invited	35	<p>As part of an annual update the planning service does a presentation to <b>all town and parish Councils</b>. This year there was specific interest in Core Strategy work.</p>
	Lympstone	40	<p>Based on notes from Cllr Ingham and Officer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Over 600 people objected to the large Courtlands development, a very clear message to EDDC</li> <li>* Lympstone has reached saturation point. The school and village infrastructure is overloaded. The drainage system is at capacity, as proved by annual flooding.</li> <li>* Need to keep a defined edge to the village and the Parish.</li> <li>* Lympstone's shape should be defined by the people of Lympstone, not EDDC policy.</li> <li>* Lympstone doesn't want completion of Dinan Way as it would make A376 traffic problems worse.</li> <li>* Affordable housing should be allocated locally by village.</li> <li>* Excessive housing will adversely affect tourism.</li> <li>* Lympstone has no extra space to become a hub village without ruining it.</li> <li>* Building small bungalows for the elderly could free up bigger properties for families.</li> <li>* Businesses are suffering because of the number of empty holiday homes within the village.</li> <li>* Small business units are definitely needed in the village.</li> <li>* Lympstone fears boundary encroachment from Exmouth. Developments must not cross from Exmouth into Lympstone.</li> <li>* Elderly and bereaved would like specialised living space instead of rattling around in large houses – would prefer small developments.</li> <li>* Travel facilities lagging behind other villages.</li> <li>* From the meeting, it is my opinion (Cllr Ingham) the vast majority of attendees did not want Lympstone to become a hub village as this would overload its infrastructure rather than help it (the exceptions are some landowners). Almost everyone accepted some minor development- in line with the remaining East Devon villages that are not hub villages.</li> </ul>

East Devon Local Development Framework- Core Strategy  
 Report on the Preferred Approach Consultation Events  
 (Autumn 2010)

Wed 10 <sup>th</sup> Nov	Tipton St John		<p>Following presentation from Cllr Bloxham and an Officer of EDDC the question and answer session covered a wide range of planning policy and implementation matters including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scale of proposed development across East Devon and specifically at Tipton St John and in the parish of Ottery St Mary;</li> <li>• Potential impacts of development on the environment;</li> <li>• How local housing needs (for market and affordable housing) can be met through policy;</li> <li>• Whether Tipton St John should be a focal point for growth and the overall scale of this growth.</li> <li>• The role of Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) and concerns that it (sites recorded as achievable, deliverable and available) become default allocations and planning permission will be granted on the because they have 'passed' the SHLAA 'test'.</li> </ul>
	Seaton	40	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Retention of and extension of existing green spaces</li> <li>• Seafront improvements</li> <li>• Attract tourists and provide accommodation and facilities eg putting more loos on the sea front</li> <li>• Better sports facilities (pitches) for the youth</li> <li>• Regeneration scheme- need for high quality design and range of shops, not just supermarket</li> </ul>
	All Town and Parish Council's Invited		As part of an annual update the planning service does a presentation to <b>all town and parish Councils</b> . This year there was specific interest in Core Strategy work.
Fri 12 <sup>th</sup> Nov	Aylesbeare		Officers did not attend so no notes available
Mon 15 <sup>th</sup> Nov	Exmouth		Officers did not attend so no notes available
	Woodbury	8 (All Parish Cllrs)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Woodbury Salterton has had a lot of development in the last 20 years.</li> <li>• Exton's boundary has been removed – why? (no facilities except pub).</li> <li>• Will results of Preferred Approach be subject of further consultation (Yes).</li> <li>• Differing views as to whether further development acceptable.</li> <li>• Concern at continued growth of Greendale Barton.</li> </ul>

East Devon Local Development Framework- Core Strategy  
 Report on the Preferred Approach Consultation Events  
 (Autumn 2010)

Tue 16 <sup>th</sup> Nov	Exmouth	30	<p>Jobs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need a sound evidence base to support Employment Strategy – one job / one home. Is this achievable and more than one job may be required?</li> <li>• Small businesses/ properties adapted to include workspace (Live/work)</li> <li>• What is the Strategy to attract jobs, potential entrepreneurs? Answer – show how the area will be protected long-term to retain the quality of life, etc (Exmouth’s ‘unique selling point).</li> <li>• Education / Training centres (Bicton, Rolle, etc)</li> <li>• ‘Green’ Tourism – lots of opportunities (Cycleway, WHS, etc)</li> <li>• Can they view the brief for the consultants?</li> <li>• ‘Transform’ towns – what is being done to promote this...?</li> </ul> <p>Landscape and Environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts on the natural environment are of concern - what evidence is there to support this level of growth? Particularly, the extent of growth right up to AONB boundary, etc. Mentioned the Survey being undertaken and need for Appropriate Assessment</li> <li>• Website –hard to find information on the website – eg the SHLAA</li> <li>• “Safeguarding” – important landscapes, features, etc – can LDF be altered to take account of these.</li> <li>• Geographic location and catchment (Quadrant) – brings specific constraints (or opportunities?) unlike anywhere else in East Devon. How does the Strategy reflect Exmouth’s special circumstances? eg, distance to travel to the town centre not feasible with peripheral growth</li> </ul> <p>Housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Given proximity to Exeter along A30 corridor, rail, etc – why have Honiton and Axminster not been given greater housing numbers? This would appear to make sense in creating this Hub town network?</li> <li>• The group were concerned that LDA’s work timetable leaves little or no time to deal with outcomes? Exeter’s similar plans (with full public involvement) likely to produce SPD’s? Why is this not the case for Exmouth. Need to maintain the momentum give the Strand work, etc</li> </ul> <p>Transport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must align with Employment brief/strategy</li> <li>• Sustainable Construction Policy has been diluted? Aim for Code 6 CfSH?</li> <li>• Climate Change key concern- developers must not avoid requirement</li> </ul> <p>Consultation Process – Identified twitter, facebook, leaflet, website, etc and events but group felt not enough had been done to engage the population? Explained PAS felt we had achieved a very positive campaign to reach as wide an audience as possible.</p>
	All Town and Parish Councils Invited		As part of an annual update the planning service does a presentation to <b>all town and parish Councils</b> . This year there was specific interest in Core Strategy work.

East Devon Local Development Framework- Core Strategy  
 Report on the Preferred Approach Consultation Events  
 (Autumn 2010)

Fri 19 <sup>th</sup> Nov	Newton Poppleford		<p>The Parish Council would like to see sufficient development to help finance a Community Hall, a replacement Primary School, provision for light industry and office accommodation and new shopping facilities to reverse the trend of shop closures.</p> <p>The meeting declared 19,400 new homes were far too many. It felt that in order to “sustain and improve the quality of life of residents and conserve and enhance the environmental quality of our towns, villages and countryside” 12,000 new homes would be sufficient.</p> <p>The meeting also expressed the view that the ‘Model’ was wrong in that provision for the infrastructure before building homes was not made clear.</p>
Mon 22 <sup>nd</sup> nov	Musbury	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggested 50 houses for hub village is a high proportion of the population of the parish.</li> <li>• Drainage and sewerage are problems.</li> <li>• Check the Parish Plan contents and whether they have been taken into account.</li> <li>• There should be an embargo at Whitford, which has grown considerably.</li> <li>• Local affordable housing was not allocated to local people.</li> <li>• ‘Market’ houses in Seaton are cheaper than ‘affordable housing’ in Musbury.</li> </ul> <p>Would prefer not to be a hub village, despite its facilities.</p>



## **Consultation with Schools and Young People**

A programme of fifteen LDF consultation events took place within secondary schools during October and November 2010, which directly represented the views of at least 1700 students (individually contributed, or by delegation). The events were arranged as a variation on a theme to the Local Democracy Week events normally organised by the Democratic Services Team in October each year. Officers from the LDF, DS and Communications teams collaborated to produce a series of events which informed and engaged young people in the workings of Local Government in a real-life real-time situation. In a relatively short period the Council gathered and logged a huge number and range of views from the students participating in the events. This information has formed a relevant, genuine, immediate and representative sample of young people's opinion on issues relating to, and the actual content of, this stage of the LDF preparation.

Councillors from the LDF Panel and the Young People's Champion attended all sessions and Ward Members were invited to observe. Every secondary state school in the District signed up to at least one consultation event, providing extensive coverage of the whole district.

A member of the LDF team made an initial visit to, or contact with, teaching staff in each school to introduce the LDF consultation, to provide materials, to decide the format, and to discuss subjects for debate. All schools undertook different preparation according to the number and age range of the participating students, the curriculum fit and the time available. This preparation involved at least one discussion within each class or school council prior to the event with Councillors, and in some cases included the preparation of power point presentations, written statements to support or oppose an extract from the Preferred Approach document, or debates to garner the opinion of a large class to inform its delegate who would then attend the event with delegates from other classes within the school.

A wide range of issues within the Preferred Approach document were discussed, including climate change, renewable energy production, transport, jobs, social and recreational facilities, affordable housing, ecology, and the environment. A number of formal ballots and/or straw polls were undertaken in each event, and a record of the discussions, ballots and polls was taken.

All students were provided with copies of the Summary Document, were asked to discuss its content with their families, and were encouraged to make further comment on the Preferred Approach via any of the methods available (especially social networking). The full record of comments gathered for each event is available, together with the text of some of the students' speeches, and PowerPoint presentations, on the Council's web site. The following table provides a snapshot of the programme and findings.

School, date and session length	Councillors (observers)	Group size + school yr	Issues	votes	quotes
<b>Axe Valley Community College</b>  <b>12 Oct</b>  <b>1.5 hours</b>	Drew, Green, Key  <i>(Burrows, Hull, Jones, Jeffery)</i>	44  Yrs 7 to 13	Town regeneration; Tourism	<u>Regeneration</u> <i>The old buildings in Axminster should be kept and converted to new uses.</i> Agree- 37 Disagree- 7 <u>Tourism</u> <i>We should only encourage and allow tourism developments (green, art, food and heritage) that respect the environment</i> Agree- 31 Disagree- 13	“I believe that the vandalism is because the [Webster’s garage] site has become everything the youth do not like about Axminster. We need to support community activity and make new businesses more exciting.” “Restore old buildings but change their function e.g. youth cafe.” “Create an art walk that’s flat and safe to walk on for everyone. Connect people to the landscape. “
<b>Clyst Vale Community College</b>  <b>20 Oct</b>  <b>1 hour</b>	Drew, Green, Key <i>(Bowden)</i>	80 Yrs 12 and 13	Housing no.s; Affordable housing; 1 home 2 jobs; Infrastructure provision; Landscape protection	<u>Employment</u> <i>The Councils proposed policy of one home, one job is not enough. There needs to be more jobs per home- 45</i> <i>One home, one job is enough- 0</i> <u>Renewable Energy</u> <i>There should be a gradual approach to ensuring all new developments include renewable energy sources- 43</i> <i>We should be enforcing renewable energy in new developments all right now- 9</i> <u>Food vs Energy Production</u> <i>Land should be used for both food production and energy production e.g. biomass crops and wind farms Agree - 45</i> <i>Against- 1</i> <u>Affordable Housing</u> <i>The Council should pitch for 40% or more of all developments of any size to be affordable- 40</i> <i>40% or more is too onerous and you won’t get any houses built at all- 1</i> <u>Scale of Housing</u> <i>16,000 new houses is about right for the whole District- 21</i> <i>16,000 new houses is too many- 8</i> <u>Countryside: develop or protect?</u> <i>The countryside is too precious for any development- 31</i> <i>Development that is necessary for the economy is acceptable- 30</i>	“There are no cycle paths around here, it’s too dangerous. Light the cycle paths using solar energy.” “Need to put jobs where the houses are, think about transport to jobs and houses.” “16,000 [new homes] would be too many; are there 16,000 people in East Devon that need housing?” “Put solar panels on the roofs of all new houses.” “We want cheap homes, if they have renewable energy homes will cost more. We won’t be able to live here.” “30% of affordable housing being shared equity is not enough. There should be a higher proportion, to assist more people to get on the housing ladder. Suggest 60%”. “We need to use the countryside sustainably for good reasons and pick carefully where we put housing.” “Isn’t the whole point of an AONB to protect it?”

School, date and session length	Councillors (observers)	Group size + school yr	Issues	votes	quotes
<p><b>Colyton Grammar School</b></p> <p><b>12 Oct</b></p> <p><b>1 hour</b></p>	Drew, Green, Key	38 Yrs 7 to 13	Climate change; Energy	<p><u>Energy Industry</u> <i>Should East Devon be a centre of excellence for renewable energy?</i> Yes- 35 No- 3</p> <p><u>Securing renewable energy</u> <i>Are regulations more useful than incentives?</i> Yes- 32 No- 3</p> <p><u>Wind farms</u> <i>Should wind farms be on-shore?</i> Yes- 26 No- 12</p> <p><u>Landscape importance</u> <i>We should be prepared to sacrifice our landscape in order to minimise the effects of climate change</i> Agree- 24 Disagree- 13</p>	<p>“The nearest buses to where I live are in town, we have to drive to get there. Need more buses in villages.”</p> <p>“When we build new shops etc they need to be in places accessible by public transport but where they don’t harm the landscape.”</p> <p>“Focus on housing insulation and planning ecologically sound homes and heating systems.”</p> <p>“Get the community involved in renewable energy: they are already aware of the problem it’s just too expensive for them to use it as householders. There will be no effect unless it’s easier for people to afford them.”</p> <p>“It is important people should be required to do things but also have incentives, maybe a reward for having solar panels.</p> <p>“Have a green levy- money going straight back to an incentives scheme to help the environment.”</p> <p>“The Council should use a carrot and a stick. You are the Local Authority, there is not a problem with you enforcing things, you have the authority to tell people how eco-friendly their houses have to be. Don’t be scared of being the stick.”</p>
<p><b>Exmouth Community College</b></p> <p><b>20 Oct</b></p> <p><b>1.5 hours</b></p>	Drew, Key, Green (Cham-berlain, Nicholas)	30 Yrs 8 and 10	Improving the town centre; Tourism impact on the environment; Energy conservation and production	<p><u>Town centre regeneration</u> <i>It is up to businesses to regenerate the town centre- 10</i> <i>The Council should drive the regeneration of the town centre - 20</i></p> <p><u>Local or supermarket businesses?</u> <i>We need a large supermarket to provide jobs and bring money into the town- 11</i> <i>We need to spend money and time on improving our town centre for local business development- 19</i></p> <p><u>Environment</u> <i>We should exploit the natural environment to promote tourism for the benefit of our economy- 11</i> <i>We need to protect our environment for its own sake, for our enjoyment and the future- 19</i></p> <p><u>Biomass</u> <i>I would support a proposal to put a biomass plant just outside Exmouth - 20</i></p>	<p>“More improvements like The Strand.”</p> <p>“Improving the town centre will get better revenue than new big supermarkets.”</p> <p>“There needs to be an option of supermarkets available.”</p> <p>“Have an extra carriage on the train to Exeter. A lot of people currently have to stand up.” “More signposts for the cycle path- promote it more.”</p> <p>“Conserve the estuary. It brings in a lot of income for fishermen, Stuart Line Cruises etc. A lot of local businesses need it.”</p> <p>“Every litter bin should have a recycling compartment.”</p> <p>“Have more bird hides- make it easier to watch the wildlife.”</p> <p>“Don’t build many more houses or it will make the town too crowded.”</p> <p>“Exmouth is quite full up. Stop building houses but invest in tourism.”</p> <p>“Give households money to buy solar panels and they can</p>

School, date and session length	Councillors (observers)	Group size + school yr	Issues	votes	quotes
				<p><i>I would be against putting a biomass plant just outside Exmouth - 4</i></p> <p><u>Energy</u></p> <p><i>We should try to conserve energy and use less of it - 1</i></p> <p><i>We should focus on creating renewable energy- 27</i></p> <p><u>Wind turbines</u></p> <p><i>We support large scale wind turbine generation near Exmouth on the estuary, sea and/ or land- 15</i></p> <p><i>Our countryside and wildlife are too precious to damage- 14</i></p> <p><u>Renewable energy production</u></p> <p><i>The Council should be tough on requiring all new households and businesses to incorporate renewable energy in their development – 14</i></p> <p><i>The Council should not require these measures - 9</i></p>	<p>pay the Council back when they make a return. “</p> <p>“Totally against wind power. Exmouth is a naturally nice place and it would destroy the environment. “</p> <p>“Some in favour some not - the estuary is good for tidal power if it’s not in the way of ships.”</p>
<p><b>Honiton Community College</b></p> <p><b>1 Nov</b></p> <p><b>1 hour</b></p>	<p>Drew, Key, Green (Olive, Ash)</p>	<p>98</p> <p>Yr 12</p>	<p>Whole range of issues within Preferred Approach</p>	<p><u>Renewable energy on new homes</u></p> <p><i>If someone wants to build a new home should it have green energy production methods?</i></p> <p><i>Yes- 22</i></p> <p><i>No- 25</i></p> <p><i>It should be somewhere inbetween, the Council should subsidise it.</i></p> <p><u>Recreation</u></p> <p><i>Who should provide recreation?</i></p> <p><i>Private businesses- 15</i></p> <p><i>The Council- 7</i></p> <p><u>Community centre</u></p> <p><i>Would you support the use of a Council car park for a community centre?</i></p> <p><i>All voted ‘Yes’</i></p> <p><u>Housing development</u></p> <p><i>Should we allow and promote development that will pay for better facilities (transport, jobs, leisure)- 90</i></p> <p><i>Keep Honiton as it is- 8</i></p>	<p>“Agree with housing development as long as it does not taint the outstanding beauty we live in. Loss of this would ruin the tourism. Only expand within the town. “</p> <p>“Affordable housing is needed but only if there are jobs for people. “</p> <p>“Should locals have a priority on housing?”</p> <p>“Surely we should require energy efficient housing but this will make housing less affordable.”</p> <p>“The vast majority walk to school. “</p> <p>“Make more buses and trains more often. There is no good coverage of buses in the evenings. “</p> <p>“A lot of people come to Honiton for the lace and antiques but it needs a more diverse approach.”</p> <p>“Have a more diverse town centre. There is nowhere for younger people to shop.”</p> <p>“The Council should subsidise the building of a cinema in Honiton. “</p> <p>“Wind farms don’t generate that much energy and we wouldn’t want to live next to them. Solar energy would be a better idea.”</p> <p>“Land is necessary for agriculture, keep agriculture or we are not going to have enough food in this country.”</p> <p>“Have a farm/ trekking attraction, paintballing to bring people</p>

School, date and session length	Councillors (observers)	Group size + school yr	Issues	votes	quotes
					in. Use the countryside sensitively.” “I think that if you want the younger generation to flourish and remain in Honiton you must entertain us! Give us the facilities, housing and jobs we require.”
<b>Honiton Community College</b>  <b>5 Nov</b>  <b>1 hour</b>	Drew, Key, Green (Olive, Ash)	35  Yr 13	Whole range of issues within Preferred Approach	<u>Climate change</u> <i>Do we have a responsibility to combat climate change?</i> Yes- 31 No- 5 <u>Wind farms</u> <i>I agree with large scale wind farms to provide renewable energy- 12</i> <i>The landscape is too precious to put up large scale wind farms- 17</i> <u>Energy</u> <i>We should focus on cleaner generation of energy- 22</i> <i>We should focus on using less energy- 5</i> <u>Energy efficiency</u> <i>There should be incentives provided to encourage people to be more energy efficient- 18</i> <i>There should be regulations that ensure people have to become more energy efficient- 17</i> <u>Employment land</u> <i>There should be one new job provided for every new household- 22</i> <i>To provide this much employment land would destroy the countryside too much- 10</i> <u>Community centre</u> <i>A community centre would improve quality of life in Honiton- 17</i> <i>I am against the community centre- 17</i> <u>Ottery Moor</u> <i>I am supportive of redevelopment of Ottery Moor for mixed residential and commercial uses- 25</i> <i>I am against the redevelopment of Ottery Moor for mixed uses- 10</i>	“If we go to University we can’t use our degrees round here. All the jobs are up North or in London.” “Can we have more graduate employment and jobs without ruining the environment?” “No one has heard of the business centre.” “I would get to Exeter for a job by train but it’s expensive.” “The Park and Ride in Exeter should run later and on Sundays” “If we want to do something about climate change we have to do something big which would ruin the appearance of the countryside.” “Although bio-fuels are seen as a good alternative to petrol we already have a shortage of food for people.” “The countryside should be used for farming.” “Mobile phones have now progressed to the point where it’s a competitive market and the same will happen with renewable energy technology. Solar energy should be subsidised by the Council or Government until it becomes more competitive and cheaper as technology progresses.” “What evidence is there that Honiton requires more housing? Will these homes be cut off from the rest of Honiton?” “If you put more housing in they will take up the jobs that are needed for the people of Honiton.” “Affordable housing should be given to local people as they are part of Honiton already with children in schools etc.” “It would be better to develop empty homes and brownfield sites before building new ones.” “New housing should be diverse in appearance.” “Villages need to be able to grow 20 – 30 houses but they also need the infrastructure to support it.” Ideas for Ottery Moor site redevelopment: cinema, arcade, night club, shops, go-karting, paintballing, abseiling,

School, date and session length	Councillors (observers)	Group size + school yr	Issues	votes	quotes
					cycling... "Can't have the benefits of the city <u>and</u> countryside at the same time. Honiton is a countryside town and we don't want it to be a city."
<b>The King's School Ottery St Mary</b> <b>13 Oct</b>  <b>1 hour</b>	Drew, Key, Green (Bloxham, Cox, Giles)	90  Year 11	Housing  Development of Town Mill site  Other topics	<u>Housing</u> <i>250 new homes to be built within Ottery St Mary is about the right number – <b>not supported</b></i> <i>250 homes is too many - <b>supported</b></i> <u>The Mill</u> <i>The Mill site should be developed for accessible, cheap recreation- 81</i> <i>The Mill site should be developed for social housing- 9</i>	"Extra homes are a good thing. If the town expands it will be a more 21 <sup>st</sup> century vibrant town. People moving in make the town diverse and interesting. It's also good for the economy." "The environmental impact of 250 extra homes will be flooding, loss of greenfields and extra traffic. Ottery is a closeknit community already. The children from 250 extra homes would put a massive strain on the school." "Building in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty is not a good idea. Don't build outside of the town - regenerate houses we've already got rather than building new ones." "Need homes to be affordable for us." "Recreation areas for young people are necessary, and the Mill site would be a good place. Need jobs for adults and to attract more young people to live in Ottery St Mary." "Build part residential affordable housing. Local people can't afford to buy properties. Have a mixture of housing and heritage/cultural facilities." "New builds would look odd there. Take into account what's on the other side of the road. Put a park in the middle with things for teenagers." "The Mill is too far out of town to provide a transport hub." "We need something to do at night. More night time buses needed for villages. The bus services are really bad. It's very expensive to get around if you can't drive. Even if there are buses we have to get driven to the bus stops." "I get quite angry when we're called yobs. Stop labelling us as yobs. There are loads of things happening such as the skate park. Kids are <u>not</u> people who drink, smash things up and then run away." "Whatever activities for young people are put in they need to be free or cheap. If it's £10 we can't do it!" "We need a youth cafe to chill out in."

School, date and session length	Councillors (observers)	Group size + school yr	Issues	votes	quotes
<p><b>The King's School Ottery St Mary</b> 13 Oct</p> <p>1 hour</p>	<p>Drew, Key, Green (Bloxham, Cox, Giles)</p>	<p>90</p> <p>Year 11</p>	<p>Housing</p> <p>Development of Town Mill site</p> <p>Other topics</p>	<p><u>Housing</u> We want 250 homes for OSM 37 votes We do not want 250 homes for OSM 46 votes</p> <p><u>The Mill</u> The Town Mill site should be used only for recreational facilities - <b>supported</b> Part of the site should be used for housing – <b>not supported</b></p>	<p>“Not enough homes at present so prices are high” “Not enough jobs now so no new houses needed” “More houses will bring shops and jobs” “OSM is an historic town which needs to be kept small” “Spend money in doing up the area now to encourage people into the town in future” “Say to developers – you must provide new playing fields and sports facilities for school. Train station should be provided” “Use part of Town Mill site as internet cafe, providing a place to go for teenagers. The Youth Club is too structured, we need somewhere less rigid where we can chill out” “Turn the site into flats for students and young people” “It’s a listed building so can’t be knocked down – you have to be careful what you do with it” “Turn it into a big attraction like an aquarium (it floods!) which will bring people into Ottery St Mary. Windsor has Legoland – let’s do something similar. Bring money into the town and put it on the map” “We need a cheaper, later shuttle bus service between Ottery and Exeter” “Later buses from the villages to Ottery are needed” “We don’t cycle into town – it is too dangerous and too far (when asked if they cycle, only a handful of students put up their hands)”</p>
<p><b>Sidmouth Community College</b> 11<sup>th</sup> Oct</p> <p>1 hour</p>	<p>Drew, Key</p>	<p>30</p> <p>Year 8</p>	<p>Tourism</p> <p>Facilities for young people</p>	<p><u>Tourism</u> Sidmouth should expand to provide more facilities for tourists AND local young people - 26 Sidmouth should be conserved at the size it is - 3</p>	<p>“Tourism recognised as being important to the local economy – brings money into the area;” “Town centre very busy during the summer period – causes congestion in the centre;” “Too many empty shops in the town – commercial shops need to be broader in what they offer. Very few shops for young people;” “Recognise that any development in and around Sidmouth needs to fit in with the character of the area;” “Increase the hopper bus service which operates from the Knowle car park – less traffic in the town and therefore less pollution;” “Suggestion of a bike hire facility on the edge of the town to help improve congestion in the town centre;” “Sidmouth should move towards green tourism;” “Need to be flexible and diverse in what the town offers</p>

School, date and session length	Councillors (observers)	Group size + school yr	Issues	votes	quotes
					<p>tourist in order to attract a range of people to the area;"</p> <p>"Suggestion that the town centre be closed to cars at weekends/summer period – bus access only;"</p> <p>"Sidbury has little to offer to young people – need a footpath to Sidford "</p> <p>"Sidmouth swimming pool should offer more fun swims and slides;"</p>
<p><b>Sidmouth Community College</b></p> <p><b>11<sup>th</sup> Oct</b></p> <p><b>1 hour</b></p>	Green (Reed)	<p>30</p> <p>Year 8</p>	<p>Energy (Solar panels, wav/tide power, watermill, underwater sea turbines)</p> <p>Tourism</p>	<p><i>Students voted on which method of renewable energy generation they preferred:</i></p> <p><i>A Solar Panels 6</i></p> <p><i>B Wave/tidal power 5</i></p> <p><i>C Watermill 8</i></p> <p><i>D Underwater sea turbines 13</i></p>	<p><b>A</b> - "Need to be less expensive for people to buy"</p> <p>"Will save average family £800 per year"</p> <p>"Using subsidy, recommend solar panels for all schools in East Devon"</p> <p><b>B</b> - "Tidal power would be economically viable as it wouldn't be dependent upon the weather and waves, but would be linked to tides which don't vary"</p> <p>"Hidden so won't spoil landscape"</p> <p>"Unclear whether it would affect fishing"</p> <p><b>C</b> - "Build a mill to collect and use rainwater for power"</p> <p>"To be sited either in the Byes or in a local field"</p> <p>"The site could attract visitors to Sidmouth"</p> <p><b>D</b> - " The sea is never still so they will always work"</p> <p>"Expensive to install, but in the long term will save money"</p> <p>"Needs to be sited in an area in which fish stocks are low so fishing boats have no need to go near to them"</p>
<p><b>Sidmouth Community College</b></p> <p><b>19<sup>th</sup> October</b></p> <p><b>1 hour</b></p>	Drew	<p>24</p> <p>Year 8</p>	<p>Transport</p>	<p><i>Public Transport</i></p> <p><i>Buses should be free for children under 16</i></p> <p><i>Agree – 22</i></p> <p><i>Disagree – 2</i></p> <p><i>Half the children in the class walk to school, 8 catch the bus, none cycle.</i></p>	<p>" Buses should run more frequently, and be larger to be able to carry more passengers"</p> <p>"Public transport in Sidmouth isn't good."</p> <p>"There should be a park and ride in Sidmouth"</p> <p>"My mum won't let me cycle to school from Sidbury because of the traffic"</p> <p>"There should be a new cycle path from Sidbury to Sidford"</p> <p>"Most children want to have a car when older"</p> <p>"We should take away car parks in town so people have to use the park and ride"</p> <p>"Pedestrians along the seafront hold up the cars"</p> <p>"The Byes is good for walking and the cycle path is safe and pleasant, we need more like that"</p>
<p><b>Sidmouth Community</b></p>	Key	<p>25</p> <p>Year 8</p>	<p>Climate change,</p>	<p><i>How many of you would support energy converted from biomass? 5</i></p>	<p>"Even if we change the way we behave, the problem [of climate change] is likely to keep getting worse, so we can</p>



School, date and session length	Councillors (observers)	Group size + school yr	Issues	votes	quotes
College 19 <sup>th</sup> October 1 hour			flooding and renewable energy	<p><i>How many of you would want to live next door to such a development? None</i></p> <p><i>Is climate change a problem?</i> Yes - 25 No - 0</p> <p><i>Can and should we do something about climate change?</i> Yes - 24 No - 1</p> <p><i>It's not possible to do anything effective.</i> Agree - 1 Disagree - 24</p> <p><i>Would you use your bike more often if there were safer cycle routes?</i> Yes - 22 No - 3</p> <p><i>Should we change the countryside to make cycling safer?</i> Yes - 7 No - 18</p> <p><i>Should we build big sea walls to protect existing coastal development?</i> Yes - 0 No - 25</p> <p><i>Should we sacrifice some development, as sea level rise is a natural process?</i> Yes - 21 No - 4</p> <p><i>Must we have renewable energy of some sort?</i> Yes - 18 No - 7</p> <p><i>Should there be a wind farm outside Sidmouth?</i> Yes - 18 No - 7</p> <p><i>Will harvesting energy from the waves be bad for the tourism industry?</i> Yes - 12 No - 11</p>	<p>only hope to slow it down.”</p> <p>“We should cut down on carbon emissions.”</p> <p>“The road into Sidbury is really dangerous. Cars come quickly along it and my Dad says to me to be careful on that road.”</p> <p>“At Beer, pavements need to be widened to allow for a cyclepath.”</p> <p>“Perhaps the Council could advertise ways to use your car less, on posters on something? This would make people think twice about using their car for every trip.”</p> <p>“Our hotels are near the seaside, and if they flood, we won't get any tourists coming.”</p> <p>“You could build bigger sea defences, but the cliffs near Sidmouth will continue to fall, and there are houses on these cliffs.”</p> <p>“Energy saving devices should be automatically installed on new houses.”</p> <p>“We shouldn't <i>make</i> people have solar panels, but should make strong case for it – persuade, rather than force people.”</p> <p>“Rather than asking individuals to install their own renewable energy on houses in Sidmouth, the town has fields all round it which could be used for large-scale solar energy instead.”</p> <p>“Devon Council could introduce a ‘power plan’, which works like a mobile phone contract, with a range of budget.”</p>
Sidmouth Community College 19 <sup>th</sup> October 1 hour	Green	25 Year 8	Recreation, entertainment and transport	<p><i>Do we need to provide new recreational facilities? 13 votes</i></p> <p><i>Do we need to improve existing facilities? 10 votes</i></p> <p><i>Should recreational facilities be provided by the public or private sector?</i></p> <p><i>Private sector: 6 votes</i></p>	<p>“Free travel to and from activities would encourage young people to go out and be active. If both our parents work regularly and can't drive us to events and activities, then a free bus pass would allow us to get there ourselves.”</p> <p>“Existing play areas are only for small children. They do not cater for the Sidmouth students' age group. An outside gym with keep fit equipment was suggested. Some students said</p>

School, date and session length	Councillors (observers)	Group size + school yr	Issues	votes	quotes
				<p><i>Public sector/Council: 9 votes</i></p> <p><i>To pay for these facilities, should we put tax up or stop doing other things?</i></p> <p><i>a) Put tax up: 2 votes</i>  <i>b) Stop doing other things: 15 votes</i></p> <p><i>When asked what we could stop, one suggestion was play parks for toddlers.</i></p> <p><i>Would you pay £5 per swimming session? 5 agreed</i></p> <p><i>Would you pay £10 per swimming session? 0 agreed</i></p> <p><i>Do you expect to work in Sidmouth when you are older? 6 agreed</i></p> <p><i>Do you expect to live in Sidmouth when you are older? 8 agreed</i></p> <p><i>If you moved away from Sidmouth, would you return when you are 65? Overwhelming majority said NO</i></p>	<p>they would use it – they would certainly be more likely to use it than a play park.”</p> <p>“Local people should be given a ‘shopping list’ and asked to vote for their top 3 – 5 facilities which would then be implemented.”</p> <p>“Shuttle buses from outlying villages should be provided.”</p> <p>“We would like a Child Councillor Committee where we can vote and make a difference to issues which affect us. Ideas <b>from</b> children are better <b>for</b> children.”</p> <p>“People would stay if there was more for young people. The town is boring at the moment so no-one wants to stay.”</p> <p>“Floodlights in the skate park. EDDC said they would put them up but nothing has ever happened. Injuries happen when young people ride in the dark”.</p> <p>“Floodlights on the rugby pitches. Four teams take part in rugby training and it isn’t always possible to see what is going on on the far pitches when the light begins to go.”</p> <p>“Floodlights on football pitches to enable older children to use the pitches later at night. At the moment they have to finish training early. Would cost between £500 - £1500.”</p>

## Equalities Forum

On 18 November 2010 Matthew Dickins and Jamie Buckley attended a joint meeting of the EDDC External Equalities Forum and Corporate Equalities Group to discuss the Local Development Framework Preferred Approach document. A brief introduction to the LDF and previous consultation was given and discussion was encouraged amongst the attendees.

Points raised in discussion:

- You (EDDC) have really gone out of your way to involve children and young people, who usually don't have a say in documents such as this when it is so important to them.
- By sending a leaflet to every household you really have covered a lot of bases including ethnic groups.
- For people who don't have internet access it is good that they can talk to you over the phone or can send a letter, and you will send out paper copies of the documentation. Would you be able to go and visit disabled people?
- The variety of ways in which people can give their views is excellent, not just relying on the internet and complicated software.
- It is good to have produced a fairly accessible summary and leaflet alongside the main document.
- It would be good if people could go to their library, see a copy of the document and leave a comment on a postcard in a 'postbox' there and then. There could also be 'suggestion' boxes in places like the Open Door Centre.
- Where there were equalities groups that have specific planning needs it is good that you invited them to be involved in earlier stages e.g. Gypsies and Travellers.
- What about people like those just out of prison and on probation?
- Could the methods you used with schools be transferred to other groups?
- Could we follow up comments from equalities based groups and find out how they became engaged in the LDF? So we know what works.
- Maybe people are generally happy with their lot, and it's not apathy.
- You have recognised those with learning disabilities will not usually be motivated or able to get involved, we may have to just appreciate their needs and plan for them through their representatives
- People are only going to respond when it interests them. You need to find out what is appealing

Comments on LDF:

- Faith groups who are not prepared to share a premises could be an issue.
- Some homes will need to be adapted for disabled people, as well as being affordable.
- GPs and medical services are out in the community- these services have to be expanded if there is any more development. Exmouth surgeries are chock a block now, we need to make sure health services are maintained for all, including new residents. Also schools.
- Devon has a good reputation of caring for older people and those with disabilities, this attracts people
- DDA regulations are empowering, surely planning now always bears those in mind.
- Make sure you don't ignore the minority voices.

Members of both groups were asked to consider the document and submit their comments in one of the many ways available.

Those members of the group who were not able to attend this meeting were sent the information on the LDF Preferred Approach and were encouraged to submit their comments on behalf of their equalities groups.

## Lessons from the Consultation

Whilst the consultation was generally well received and very few complaints have been made regarding the actual methods and implementation, a number of key points have emerged which could be used to improve future participation.

### Branding

- All material was clearly branded so that it was recognisable. There is scope for this to be refined.
- There was some confusion as to the name of the campaign and what to electronically search for with “LDF Preferred Approach”, “Plan it East Devon” and “We Plan Anywhere” all being used, individually or in combination.

### Press Releases and Advertisements

- These worked well and were effective in countering the negative publicity that was given by some Press. Further encouragement should be given to corroborating facts so that the Press does not misinform readers and generate unnecessary concern.
- The adverts were effective and relatively inexpensive. Future consultation could involve the Town Councils at an early stage so that adverts could be shared and local public meetings/questionnaires included on behalf of the Town Councils. Where consultation takes place over several months, adverts could be taken out at the beginning and end of the process to remind readers to respond.

### Posters

- These were eye-catching and clearly branded but they were put up at the discretion of Local Councils and this was outside the control of EDDC.

### Town specific leaflets

- These were posted to every household in the District and complaints about the expense had been anticipated. In fact, very few complaints were received, possibly because the source of the funding was clearly identified on them. There is scope to reduce costs in future by combining mailings of information across the Council.
- The leaflets were criticised as, despite being area specific, containing little information about housing numbers etc. This required further research on the part of recipients and generated a lot of requests for further information.

### External Equalities Forum

- Attendance at this Forum ensured that minority groups could express their views. This was considered worthwhile, as these groups would not have been identified and targeted specifically otherwise, but, as leaflets were sent to all households, they would have been included anyway.
- Advance briefing, or a follow up meeting, would have enabled Officers to respond in detail to any particular queries the Forum had.

### Various Town/Parish meetings

- These were organised locally and so varied in their format and content and the degree of feedback given to the District Council. A standard approach would have made any analysis easier and a few complaints were made that the District Council should have organised events in every parish.
- Officer attendance took place at most, but not all, events. This could be improved but current resources would not permit attendance at almost 70 evening meetings in a 12 week period.

#### EDDC Website

- The 'Quicklinks' box was very widely used and appeared to reduce the number of complaints relating to the Limehouse software. Previously a significant number of users experienced difficulty with multiple login details (mainly agents responding on several clients behalf) and with password resetting but the 'quicklinks' box provided an immediately accessible alternative.
- The volume of responses (particularly at the end of the consultation), and the variety of contact means, meant that comments could not be immediately uploaded for the public to view as all had to be checked and, in many cases, information had to be typed into the database from written correspondence. This caused some concern as to whether comments had actually been received, however it was necessary for all comments to be 'approved' to ensure that nothing inappropriate appeared on the Council's website. Further encouragement to comment early or additional staffing in the final week would address this problem. An automated response explaining that the comments had been received but there may be a delay in processing would also reduce complaints.

#### Youtube

- The 'weplananywhere' video that was created and uploaded onto Youtube generated a lot of press coverage, some at a national level. The content was much criticised, particularly in terms of cost although the degree of publicity far outweighed this, but EDDC was also congratulated for being innovative and for trying new techniques. Other authorities have produced videos but these have mostly been dull and have not appealed to a wide audience. If this were to be tried again then a greater level of serious informative content should be included, although the 'fun' format could be retained.

#### Facebook

- Facebook was slow to gain followers over the first few weeks but gradually increased its audience as the proposals were advertised. This was particularly noticeable when an opposition campaign included links to it. Facebook was not extensively used in the way that had been anticipated- to provide direct feedback to the Council about the proposals- but was used to view proposals and then stimulated debate on other websites, outside the Councils control. In future, a clearer title should be given to the page (preferably with 'East Devon' in the title as 'weplananywhere' attracted complaints from those unable to find the page through search engines) and feedback on other sites should also be monitored.

#### Twitter

- Twitter did not generate as much activity as had been anticipated. It was slow to gain followers and the consultation did not lend itself to regular news updates. This method would be better used on a Council wide basis so that there is already a list of people to contact and regular news to impart.