

Question 8 - How many new homes should we plan for each year?

In Chapter 5 of the Issues and Options report we set out the current Government requirement for us to build at least 928 new homes a year (although this figure can change). Paragraph 5.4 explains that we may need to almost double the number of affordable homes (to 461 every year for the next 20 years) to meet current and future needs. We asked about what level of housebuilding people would favour:

The three options related to question two of the questionnaire

Option 1 – Plan for an average of at least 928 new homes built each year

Option 2 – Plan for a greater number of homes, for example 1,200

Option 3 – Plan to build considerably more homes each year

Option 4 – None of the above

Those that made comment said.

Ref No	Respondent	Q 8	Question 8 Comment
FS-Case-297507653	Kate Duggan	option 1	Set tougher restrictions so more of the 928 are actually affordable. Focus on smaller properties with shared green spaces, rather than the constant 4 and 5 bed barn conversions we see going up all the time. We have a finite amount of spare land. It needs maximising. Consider more apartments in suitable locations, eg Pinhoe, Cranbrook, Exeter etc, that have playparks, shared community spaces etc.
FS-Case-297785613	Kim Sankey Angel Architecture Ltd	option 1	The problem that I think has come to light recently is the number of redundant shops and offices that may become available for conversion to housing - thereby releasing a lot of brownfield sites which are not taken into account in this number. Would it not be better to convert than to build on green field sites in the first instance - retaining all the embodied energy that exists in our town centres?
FS-Case-297949549	Martin Thurgood	option 4	Option 1 - and increase the proportion of affordable homes at all significant developments so as to secure the required number of affordable homes within the 928 target.
FS-Case-299321852	William R Palmer	option 4	Pointless building new houses if the infrastructure does not support them, and employment is not available for residents. Better to concentrate on getting those right, and the housing market will adjust naturally. The lack of social housing following the sell-off of Council Houses is a scandal
FS-Case-299521339	mark readman Rockbeare Parish Council	option 1	Figures can change - your words. The world is a rapidly changing place as this last 2 years has demonstrated. No point building all over the county if this is not needed
FS-Case-299861217	Heath Nickels Exmouth Wildlife Group	option 1	Plan for the current 928 average, ASSUMING this is deemed to be : 1. required by EDDC 2. deliverable in respect of developing a spatial strategy: Distribution of development (see Chapter 13)
FS-Case-300324912	Hugh Waters	option 4	I think all of these options are unsustainable for East Devon. If your objectives are zero carbon and climate change then new houses should be confined to cities and reasonable development in towns but urban sprawl as we are seeing in many east devon town, which completely ruins the area
FS-Case-300714787	Blank - No Name	option 2	I do not see why 'affordable homes' are so difficult to build. However, this should not be social housing that is inadequate. Present laws need to be enforced with more vigour
FS-Case-301179421	Mark HUMPHRIES	option 4	We should set a maximum, not an average, and any social housing should be for those people who already reside in the area. We should not be providing housing so that inner cities, and i know for fact that Nottingham, Greater Manchester, and Birmingham City Council have all moved people from their council/social housing lists to properties in East Devon, most notably Cranbrook. And these are for people who are no net contributors.

Ref No	Respondent	Q 8	Question 8 Comment
FS-Case-301345304	JANICE ALEXANDER Devon Rural Housing Partnership	option 2	As someone who works in affordable housing, this is the most important consideration for me. I feel that Option 3 is not attainable although the delivery of all affordable housing needs would be a wonderful thing. Option 2 gives a greater number of homes than is currently planned but is attainable and will still provide more affordable housing than the current plan. There should be a mixture of house sizes and tenures in this figure including open market, low cost home ownership, affordable rented and self-build accommodation. The need in East Devon is for smaller homes that young people can afford to rent or buy when they leave home and that older people can downsize to when their family home becomes unmanageable. Building in rural areas is important to keep villages vibrant and sustainable and to enable inter-generational support and care.
FS-Case-301424628	ERIC BOWMAN	option 4	HOUSE BUILDING SHOULD BE CARRIED WITH CONSULTATION WITH LOCAL COUNCILLORS AND LOCAL INHABITANTS NEAR A POTENTIAL SITE.
FS-Case-301702992	John Stevens	option 4	Build less review every 5 yrs
FS-Case-302277185	Iain Barbour	option 3	Critical that there is sufficient affordable housing in the local communities - not far away from them!
FS-Case-302312889	john aldrred	option 4	Plan for as little as possible new development
FS-Case-302549497	simon davidson	option 4	Why shouldn't the requirements for affordable housing be met from building "928 houses per year"? There is a contradiction here with the opening paragraphs of this document that states that the "majority of residents are comfortably off". If that is true, then the requirements for affordable housing must be low and therefore easy to meet as part of the 928 house target.
FS-Case-302640746	Hazel Jeffery	option 4	This needs careful consideration with tourism, and second homes. Smaller, affordable residences are bought up for these purposes, which reduces the availability of starter homes and pushes up the price of them, thereby removing properties from the market. Most of these properties are in towns with good facilities. In Sidmouth, nearly a whole street of terraced houses is owned/managed by a holiday company. On the other hand I have seen planning applications for converting outbuildings to tourist facilities attached to a main residence turned down.
FS-Case-302912562	Paul Gamble	option 3	Whilst the previous thinking on the Governments formula for the calculation of new homes has been shelved, it is highly likely that it will be replaced with something that delivers many more houses than are currently being built (the housing crisis is not going away). It is universally accepted that the primary reason for house price rises is lack of new homes being built. Data from the Office of National Statistics (April 2019) shows that the average property in East Devon sold for £303,162, significantly higher than the UK average of £228,147. East Devon saw the eighth-largest average price increase of any authority in the UK over the preceding year that the numbers refer to. (ONS figures from Apr 2019). Put simply, East Devon needs to build significantly more homes than are currently planned. There are many villages across all areas of East Devon that could each accommodate a small number of new homes. East Devon assessment of villages suitable for development should be reassessed.
FS-Case-302971165	Richard Thurlow Sid Vale Association	option 4	The targets appear arbitrary. The ORS report identified a local assessed housing need of 15,143 dwellings over the 20 year period (757 p.a.). Although the standard government methodology gives a figure of housing need at 18,000 (900 p.a.), this includes 1677 dwellings to meet an increase in net in-migration over past levels. We challenge the need to meet this higher figure, given that it provides for increased in-migration. EDDC must challenge the targets as there are huge AONB constraints of land availability, in East Devon. The ORS report also makes it clear that 70% of housing built in the district in the previous plan period is occupied by in-migrants, predominantly from neighbouring districts, in particular Exeter. It is clear therefore that new build is not contributing to meeting needs of the residents of the District

Ref No	Respondent	Q 8	Question 8 Comment
			WE HAVE FURTHER COMMENTS but the box is too small to accommodate them. We have attached a PDF of our full reply.
FS-Case-303140818	David Buller	option 3	I believe it is essential to provide access to good, affordable housing for all in the county who want or need it
FS-Case-303403737	Mr&Mrs Wood	option 4	Look at reutilising existing empty property and developing derelict buildings and previously developed brown field sites. Push to out law the holding of land and property by big conglomerates. i.e Tescos land adjacent on the Salterton Road, Exmouth. NO planning permission to build on green field land.
FS-Case-303473174	Christopher Bargmann	option 4	928 is way to many in the current form that housing is being developed. There is a major need for affordable and social housing to be developed in this country and there should be a focus on providing this in locations that are close to jobs transport links, health and education facilities.
FS-Case-303734212	Cassie Thornton	option 4	We shouldn't just be building new homes; we should be looking at existing buildings and renovating! Giving young people and families the confidence to purchase older buildings me give them new life. Rather than just building new houses all the time! We also need to look at second homes and stop people purchasing up valuable houses for second homes, and impose some rules around this like they're doing in places like St Ives! This will stop locals losing access to housing and pushing up the market rates
FS-Case-303791282	Maureen Chandler	option 4	too many houses means too many cars - this should be seriously checked - but housing for our young people must be put first in every housing development
FS-Case-304172022	Eve Bampton-Wilton	option 4	I'm not sure what the answer is which is why I have responded in this way, but what I think is extremely important to consider is the impact of new housing areas on existing neighbourhoods, density of people, noise, impact on wellbeing and mental health. Many people chose their house based on the current neighbourhood, eg finding somewhere quite with green space - filling that with huge housing estates changes that a lot for a person and that can have big impacts. With the flooding east Devon experiences housing needs to be planned extremely carefully and flood planning put in place. Is there not also a need for looking at disused existing house and putting money into making those into affordable homes?
FS-Case-304210544	David Beazley Sainthill Baptist Church	option 3	'Affordable' housing is important. Too many local people cannot afford to live in their home locality. We ought also to consider the challenge of largely empty second homes and resulting inflated prices. AND we must build on brown-field sites before taking valuable farm land.
FS-Case-304854668	John Catchpole None	option 1	<p>However I would like to direct East Devon to a recent report issued by the Office for National Statistics, "Overview of the UK Population, January 2021. I would recommend review of the follow:</p> <p>Fig. 1 - The UK population has grown year-on-year since 1982.</p> <p>Fig. 3 - Natural change in 2019 was at its lowest level since 2003.</p> <p>Fig. 6 - Coastal Areas have a higher proportion of the population who are aged 65 years and over.</p> <p>Based on the above document I believe 928 new homes per year is too high, more emphasis be placed on Affordable homes. In particular the development of "brown field sites".</p>
FS-Case-305076755	Jeff Powley	option 4	Plan to build no more than are needed to meet government legal requirements, how can you possibly think that building more homes will reduce the carbon footprint of the area.
FS-Case-305765435	Aurora Aykroyd	option 2	I certainly think there should be more homes built. But it's about finding the right kind of home in the right kind of space. you really do need to think more cohesively about low income and High income building planning of homes, and needs to be space for essential community services and also business units that can be rented or shared to create capacity for working and living in the same place without having to travel. More houses should be built with consent space for a studio/granny annexe. this would ensure that many families may be able to work from home, but not only that perhaps fulfil caring responsibilities for an elderly or in need relative more easily. Lastly they may be able to support a young adult living still within the confines of home.You need to build sheltered housing within the housing Estates so that it is easy to access. sheltered

Ref No	Respondent	Q 8	Question 8 Comment
			housing shouldn't just be tower block flats, which let's face it nothing sheltered about it.
FS-Case-306175815	christopher Burton	option 1	With the redundant shops now available in our towns investigation into redeveloping these sights into affordable houses would be beneficial. People who need affordable houses don't have much spare money to travel to work and to the towns for social pleasures. Houses in town and city centres would better fulfil the requirements of those on a limited budget. It is much cheaper to live in a city than in the country and it will bring back the feeling of life to our dying shopping centres..
FS-Case-306237729	Geoff Crawford	option 4	I believe that there is great overdevelopment of East Devon. Huge new housing developments built on green land whilst brown field and vacant commercial units stand empty. I strongly object to additional house building purely to attract additional population to Devon in order to increase council tax intake. The whole question of population growth and physical development in the South West and specifically in East Devon need to be properly reviewed. At this time I believe that there is a blind view of expansion, expansion, expansion and no question of if expansion and development is in anyone's best interests.
FS-Case-306256851	Simon Rennie		no comment see objective 10 section 12 questions
FS-Case-306308166	Sylvia Meller	option 4	We have already lost too much of our nature. So we need less houses build! The problem in the UK is that everyone wants their own house, so we have less and less space. Build houses with multiple floors instead, so more people can live in the same area without destroying our nature. Existing derelict buildings need to be re-developed. So many places are empty and even if it is more expensive to get them changed into new flats it will save in the long term. And despite it being advertised as affordable housing, most are not. So this had to change!
FS-Case-306915743	Catherine Kingham	option 4	Housing should be appropriate for populations, and current empty housing, or second homes that are only used for, say, 3 weeks a year, should be compulsorily purchased and re-designed/re-furnished for people to live in every day! There are far too many second homes in Devon, which are largely unused, left empty or rented out at impossible rental rates. Same goes for sub standard rental property.
FS-Case-307126895	Daren Richards	option 4	There are so many people needing affordable housing and this should be adlib according to the area
FS-Case-307156482	Emma Molony	option 3	More shared ownership opportunities.
FS-Case-307162450	Karen Moughton	option 4	Im not sure where these 1000+ homes will be built without destroying the environment. I agree that more homes should be available but I think a rule should be brought in where no second homes can be bought for a period of around 5 years. Homeowners would then have to lower their asking price to more affordable levels for locals.
FS-Case-307313176	Jonne Ceserani	option 2	I think there needs to be a fundamental shift in thinking about housing in tourist areas like the South West, highlighted by a series of TV programmes looking at Devon and Cornwall. I think second home ownership should be banned by anyone living outside the local area, (how that is measured will need to be addressed). I think holiday cottage ownership should also be banned except for people whose primary residence is in the local area. Tourists should be encouraged to use hotels, B&B's and locally owned holiday cottages. In this way all of the income generated will go into the local economy, 12 month residency will increase keeping communities and local businesses more active with consistent income streams. Tourists who would have used second homes will almost certainly continue to be tourists, they will simply be stopped from drawing the local economy the rest of the time and will lose the capability to influence local property prices to excessive levels.
FS-Case-307389332	Stephen Crook	option 4	Figures in the report indicate that East Devon's existing plan is for more than the required 928 per year. Even this seems excessive given that many seem to end up as second homes for rich city dwellers and the housing needs of the poor are still unmet. Priority must be given to truly affordable housing, under council control and with much available to rent. No more green spaces should be built on. Newly redundant town centre shops and pubs must be repurposed for housing and civic centres.

Ref No	Respondent	Q 8	Question 8 Comment
FS-Case-307482014	G. Millard	option 1	There is growing evidence that with a lowering birthrate, and the effects of Brexit that Government estimates are inaccurate. Furthermore, The Government should target investment in the North to improve the Northern economy. The provision of low cost housing for local people should be prioritised.
FS-Case-307683611	Dan Lakeman	option 4	928 new homes minimum?! Absolutely not!!! Aim for next to zero
FS-Case-307693356	Michael Horn	option 1	Affordable home provision should be by applying percentages and enforcing them. The current system allows developers to renege on their promises by citing economic difficulties that were obvious from the outset. Developers should be forced to utilise a proportion of their land banks for affordable housing whether developed by them or others.
FS-Case-307956780	Lorraine Snell	option 1	No point in building an excessive amount if the infrastructure and amenities in Exmouth remain as they are
FS-Case-307991316	Susan Cooper	option 1	<p>Planning for more dwellings than the government requirement would have a severe environmental impact on the AONB. Options 2/3 would require new town(s) (outside the AONB) to protect the AONB landscape and ensure villages in the AONB are not overwhelmed and their landscape and character destroyed</p> <p>Windfalls will increase new build over and above that allocated.</p> <p>The more dwellings allocated the greater the risk annual housing delivery targets will not be met. A severe failure not to meet targets could lead to speculative and inappropriate development in potentially environmentally sensitive areas.</p> <p>Affordable housing targets could be increased, not by having a higher allocation, but by assisting Parishes to carry out housing surveys to bring forward sites via what was Strategy 35. These affordable houses would be to meet specific Parish requirements</p>
FS-Case-308043356	David Williamson	option 3	Plan for home building in a Sustainable way. Avoid contract traps where ALL the value is extracted from the development up front by Landowner and developer. Planning permission conditional on Sustainable Development only.
FS-Case-308044688	Edmond Morris	option 3	I would like to see more social housing built as even the so-called affordable homes are too expensive for many people. Affordable usually only means 80% of the market rate or rent.
FS-Case-308045888	roger staten	option 1	No more near Exeter already ridiculously overbuilt around Pinhoe
FS-Case-308046720	Jonathan Page	option 1	But make them quality homes, not the rubbish being allowed at the moment (Cranbrook being a point in case). Quality does not have to mean expensive, just better quality of building or less corners being cut.
FS-Case-308046866	Simon Greenslade	option 4	Where are you going to put them ? Plenty of empty buildings around which could be utilised, or stop people buying second homes.
FS-Case-308049835	Peter Duncan	option 4	Are Government requirements really applicable to East Devon. Green belt land and not over development is more important than just building to hit targets that may or even are flawed. What we do build needs to be energy efficient and affordable. Probably more 1-3 bedroom to reflect typical family sizes of 21st Century.
FS-Case-308057683	Ian Holmes	option 4	No more new homes without infrastructure
FS-Case-308058616	Carol Royal	option 4	Not appropriate. So many houses already being built in close proximity. There is no local demand but there seems to be occasions when there are movements between other areas of the UK being relocated. This is not for the well being of local residents.
FS-Case-308060828	Carol Plunkett	option 4	Let's only build affordable homes of all sizes
FS-Case-308071816	Gillian Cameron-Webb n/r	option 4	As I understand it the CPRE does not believe we need to authorise so many new homes as so many existing houses are empty or are second homes or developments which have already been authorised are not being built because developers are 'sitting' on

Ref No	Respondent	Q 8	Question 8 Comment
			<p>them to keep the prices high.</p> <p>Developers always claim 'feasibility' as a reason for building fewer affordable houses but quite frankly I don't believe them, they just want to make more money from market housing. Even if 1614 houses were allowed they'd still find a way of saying they couldn't afford the affordable houses.</p> <p>I'd rather see a bigger drive towards the council building affordable houses again or helping more self builds, and a move towards pre-fab and modular homes.</p>
FS-Case-308072238	Robert Cooper	option 4	You cannot build these numbers of houses without recognition of the impact on the roads, which are falling to bits, public transport, which is a disgrace. Provide hospitals that can cope with the increased numbers of people, provide NHS dentists. Provide sewage systems that work without putting an unfair burden solely on the new residents. Provide new leisure facilities without putting a burden solely on new residents.
FS-Case-308074183	Benedict McGuigan	option 1	given the scale of new home development to the was of Exeter, it is hard to believe that more homes are needed
FS-Case-308105398	Jane Ashton Please choose	option 2	Think 2 is best compromise because whilst I think we don't need 1200 new homes we DO need those we do build to provide affordable ones for our local people. We can't just keep on building or we'll eventually run out of natural resources.
FS-Case-308105811	Timothy Bell	option 2	It is likely that local demand for housing will increase in the coming months / years as remote working means individuals will move away from towns and cities. Added to this, individuals will see the benefit of having more space and will likely result in individuals wanting larger houses. This is likely to drive up housing prices in the local areas, forcing locals to move away from the area they grew up in. That being said, ambitious housing plans which need to be delivered result in poor quality housing not built for the area. As such a considers 'middle of the road' approach should be taken.
FS-Case-308111547	janice watkins	option 4	Not clear who is supposed to be able to afford the homes which are listed as affordable - will they meet the needs of locals? it is important that any homes built reflect local need and this should be the prime driver
FS-Case-308120902	Nick Warren	option 2	More affordable housing is required and like villages in Cornwall 2nd home ownership should be band
FS-Case-308155966	Vivien Rands	option 2	Affordable housing is essential HOWEVER this should be ring fenced for local families and not an say route in for second homes.
FS-Case-308158461	sally mumford george woods (sw)ltd	option 3	we need to get more people buying homes it will create more people working , better revenue for the country
FS-Case-308168070	Norman Reeder	option 4	The more homes that are built, the less likely a net-zero carbon policy will be successful. I would propose opening more land for self-build with an enforced net-zero policy and only work with developers who can deliver this policy. This may lead to a result somewhere between options 1 and 2
FS-Case-308171880	Colin Rivett	option 4	The fundamental world-wide problem is that there are too many of us. We in UK should be making better use of existing dwelling space and "brownfield sites".
FS-Case-308177703	Judith Ferrier	option 4	Too many houses being built and too much agricultural land being lose, no matter what Government says, and too few people being able to afford houses. Too big an opportunity for people to snap up housing for letting or selling on and making money out of the poor
FS-Case-308199882	Bernadette Steadman	option 1	Do this, and then follow my advice in the previous section. I think we may need to move away from the sacred idea of home ownership for all (thank you Mrs Thatcher) and move to high-quality, secure, local authority housing. Then the rush to build will be less intense, and we can satisfy needs for the long-term.
FS-Case-308200953	Peter Julian	option 1	Essential to build more starter homes and restrict access to second homes.

Ref No	Respondent	Q 8	Question 8 Comment
FS-Case-308210121	Cariad Eccleston	option 3	It's so difficult to find shelter on a self-employed income. More Devon residents are becoming self-employed every year. We need much, much more affordable housing.
FS-Case-308231255	Martin Seymour	option 4	Building any homes must be part of a plan that provides timely support facilities and meets the highest environmental targets.
FS-Case-308256653	Della Cannings	option 1	It's a dilemma as there seems to be a need for affordable housing ... but should not be at the cost of cramming in ore unsuitable unsustainable housing .. potential slums of the future. The new builds will not last as long as the Victorian expansion.
FS-Case-308268315	Tracy Simmons Cranbrook Town Council	option 4	The Committee debated the term “affordable housing” which, it felt, often equated to the low-quality construction of homes. The Committee suggested that council housing stocks should be replenished and rebuilt in order to ensure the provision of quality homes. Therefore, it was felt that the right to buy scheme needed to be revoked at national level. The issues and options document did not explain how the number of 928 new homes per annum (option 1) was arrived at.
FS-Case-308277004	Charlotte Salter	option 4	What empty spaces are there currently that could be developed into housing rather than build new? There are more and more empty retail spaces that could be better used for housing. Stop second home buying, buying to let as holiday homes and 'luxury' housing to allow locals to buy a home.
FS-Case-308288718	Emily Davis	option 4	You need to rethink your ‘building’ and look at redevelopment instead. Rentals are currently in crisis with homes in East Devon being moved at criminal levels of rent. There is no affordable housing in either market, but just throwing up more houses won’t help here because the people buying them and renting them aren’t from East Devon. Unless you can secure a scheme where only people who qualify by living in East Devon with xxx criteria (ie, not for portfolios, buy-to-let, etc) are allowed to buy the houses, then nothing will change. People can’t buy homes here, not because there aren’t enough, but because they can be gazumped by money coming from elsewhere. Not only that, there are some big houses up for sale that could be split into many affordable flats. Salston Manor, for example, will be ‘luxury apartments’. Why? Families need affordable rents not Habitat bathrooms. Those controls are where YOU come in. Higher CT on 2nd homes and no more building on green belt.
FS-Case-308326362	Peter Eastwood N/A	option 4	As the number of 'social' housing projects have fallen behind the private sector, this Council should concentrate on building more social housing, which should never be for sale, to ensure future generations have affordable rental accommodation. This should be a priority.
FS-Case-308401840	Duncan Harvey	option 4	Obviously there is a need for more housing including affordable homes. However, there needs to be a rethink regarding future population trends and housing usage. I was born just after WW2 in what was known as the baby boom - unfortunately many of us will be gone before too long - will this affect the demography of East Devon? In relation to the type of housing, our example is: two of us live in a 4 bed house -we have looked at downsizing but when we look it often means a reduction in facilities i.e. smaller reception and kitchen space. Specific housing for the fit and active elderly, with a place to park the electric car would free up our 4 bed house.
FS-Case-308410804	David Forward Domestic	option 2	A concentration on homes for local young people who are at present being priced out of the housing market.
FS-Case-308433805	Kerry Carr	option 4	I think that is a lot of houses which will be built on our countryside, taking away valuable farm land which won't ever be recovered once houses are built on it. I think that a new approach to building needs to be considered. Perhaps one which takes up less space on the land, ie build higher? More creative thinking required about meeting housing needs. Liaising with Central government about housing policies & appropriateness of single people living in large social houses, a more fluid social housing system where people only have a property which meets their needs at that current time& have to move to a larger/smaller home depending on their circumstances.

Ref No	Respondent	Q 8	Question 8 Comment
FS-Case-308520714	Peter Brain	option 3	This may be unpopular depending on the location. But our local 'industries', primarily caring and hospitality, are traditionally lower-paid and more affordable family housing is needed. There are areas for development which are neither beautiful nor scientifically significant. There are even some so-called brown-field sites even in Devon.
FS-Case-308527556	Kevin Staddon	option 4	Already excessive build up, go to the city and their brown areas. Won't make any difference to homeless numbers anyway as these are far fewer than proposed builds
FS-Case-308546698	Noel Allan	option 4	Protect the green belt, it is there for a purpose. Concentrate on using all brownfield sites before building on farmland. More consideration of amenities before building allowed and certainly more consideration to restricting new homes to locals not second home owners (it's been done in Cornwall). Don't just allow building for the sake of new home targets, think more about where builds are appropriate; no good putting vast estates miles away from work centres if serious about carbon footprint.
FS-Case-308594020	Michael Harris	option 1	Option 1 should apply but it is not acceptable that this would provide such a low proportion of affordable housing. This aspect should be re-visited to explore different and innovative ways of providing affordable housing.
FS-Case-308638086	Robin Barker	option 4	It's not just about new homes but making better use of existing homes - rent a room schemes, using parts of larger properties etc
FS-Case-308655667	Jan Gannaway Exmouth Wildlife Group + Active Travel Exmouth	option 2	The plan should also include at least some 'social/council houses' where those who cannot afford to buy will be able to rent decently maintained and managed housing.
FS-Case-308685349	Carol Wheeler Company Name (optional)	option 4	Need areas of housing that are all affordable, not just sticking in a percentage in each estate.
FS-Case-308690532	Martin Weller	option 4	Consider real needs.
FS-Case-308724025	Damian Coombes	option 1	We need to be realistic on the housing supply, vs the houses already sat empty or Holiday Homes that are used 2-3 times a year. If you build 928, how will these be made available or ensure they are available for people who need housing or those who would produce a net economic benefit to the region if they lived in East Devon ? Priority for economically active people to assist with coming out of Covid recession.
FS-Case-308801635	L Martin	option 3	Having two children who will never be able to afford their own homes, I can only encourage you to consider building more affordable homes. I love the countryside but there are plenty of non-green spaces to build on if we could just improve transport links at the same time!
FS-Case-308861482	Sophie Cook	option 1	In Exmouth it is the infra structure that needs to be addressed before anymore housing as the roads are becoming so congested it is dangerous..
FS-Case-308930499	Lisa Bowman Exmouth Town Council	option 2	Option 1 does not address identified need for affordable and social housing. What about a second home policy?
FS-Case-308931289	clive paul	option 4	New homes are simply a developers charter, and are not necessary to the scale suggested. Most of these houses are bought by people coming in to the area---not locals!
FS-Case-308948443	Karin Goodfellow	option 2	It is important to clearly define 'affordable housing'. Is this housing which will help local people to buy homes, is it social housing, or a combination of both? Too often affordable housing means social housing only and this is unfair to local people who are working but cannot afford to buy their own homes without local government help. A fair balance is essential.

Ref No	Respondent	Q 8	Question 8 Comment
FS-Case-309036671	Nigel Norkett	option 1	The historic growth in household formation could be in state of flush post Brexit and Covid.
FS-Case-309058862	Suzie Mack	option 4	I don't understand why we need to keep building more homes. Population for U.K. is projected to reduce by the end of the century; when does this start? East Devon has an ageing population. Are we building homes for people to move to East Devon? Are we building to accommodate second homes? Are we building to support the construction industry?? I don't understand why we are building large homes on greenfield sites. I want young families to have an affordable home.
FS-Case-309114723	Robert Anthony	option 2	Look actively at "recycling" properties, eg redundant retail space.
FS-Case-309139032	David Lord	option 3	With the decline of the retail high street there are many opportunities to revitalise our town centres with affordable residential redevelopment of brown field sites.
FS-Case-309142890	Camilla Mathison	option 4	I understand the need for more housing but I don't think arbitrarily imposing a large number of new affordable home's for an area is the way to do this. There is significant housing stock taken up by rented property with those that are wealthy able to afford several properties. It is not the amount of housing stock the prevents people from being able to afford a home it's the cost and this is pushed up by those able to own multiple properties.
FS-Case-309231413	April Arnatt	option 4	Use brownfield sites for housing and ensure that building on greenfield sites is adjacent to existing infrastructure and employment and education opportunities
FS-Case-309293778	Paul Smith	option 4	<p>With East Devon homes costing 10 times annual salary, a large unaddressed LOCAL need for AFFORDABLE & SOCIAL HOUSING has arisen. Primarily 1 & 2 bedroom dwellings.</p> <p>Planned development, not exclusive to the West End has exceeded all projections. Figures for the last 3 yrs build, indicate an excess of 1550 homes, whilst localised AFFORDABILITY/SOCIAL provision remains unaddressed.</p> <p>District demographics indicate 1 in 3 residents over 65yrs and 5.2% over 85yrs, highlighting that within the next 20 yrs a considerable volume of existing dwellings will return to the open market.</p> <p>Covid 19 has dictated a change of life style. Increased home working. The rise of internet shopping & home deliveries, and myriad retail job losses on the High Street. The employment draw towards Exeter will further diminish from 2024 when peak time road access reaches saturation, and outdated rail infrastructure is unable to compensate. A complete review of District focus & housing need is necessary!.</p>
FS-Case-309318809	SUSAN AVIS	option 3	BUT Do we need NEW homes? There are many under-used holiday lettings homes and rural buildings which might be adapted.
FS-Case-309383731	Val Ranger	option 4	The CV-19 crisis has changed the housing landscape. This has pushed house prices in the area, so I disagree that there is a reason we should fall short on affordable housing. Affordable housing and preferably council housing should be insisted upon in each site, tender blind. We should not be pushing for higher numbers than we have to, and I disagree with the high housing numbers according to government requirements. People want to live in rural Devon, not the same urban and busy sprawl they are moving away from in theory. We should be meeting local housing need and using the high demand for rural property from those out of area to fund this.
FS-Case-309385676	Roger Pell	option 4	we do not need excessive affordable . we need social "Family sized" houses , (not rabbit hutches)
FS-Case-309401093	Philip Jordan	option 4	The GESP had a worrying aspect. East Devon would have a huge number of new houses on hundred of acres of green field sites. learn from Cranbrook and other new towns through out the country..., they simply do not work. I live in Exton where EDDC has banned any infilling. This has meant no growth and as an ageing population doesn't allow larger family houses to become available and allow smaller eco and energy efficient houses to be built within the garden.

Ref No	Respondent	Q 8	Question 8 Comment
FS-Case-309425268	Pamela Dean	option 4	It is affordable homes that are needed. Developers aren't interested in providing their quota as only interested in profits on luxury housing,
FS-Case-309456508	Ian Birch	option 4	I would like to see the government's figures on housing needs challenged: the CPRE has done significant work on this, and came up with much lower figures for housing needs (please take this up with them?). And I don't see why lower build figures should compromise the number of affordable homes built?
FS-Case-309465143	Daisy mclauchlan	option 3	This number would depend on where you think these houses would be built. Green field sites should not be encouraged and we certainly need to go up and not out. If the plan was to build low rise modular then we could go for a higher number of housing BUT if we are still depending on the developers telling us what is viable and what is not then we may never see our young people affording homes of their own or even being able to afford to rent in this area.
FS-Case-309478869	Rosemary Birch	option 2	Can one regulate more on the number of 'affordable' homes that have to be included on any new development? In recent times I have seen some new small scale developments offer nearly 66% of homes as affordable, yet large developments only 5%!
FS-Case-309529320	John Stuckey	option 3	Unless more new homes are built prices will rise overall due to shortages making it harder for future generations to buy. More single occupancy provision is needed to meet current demographics.
FS-Case-309560982	Helen Dimond	option 1	There is no option but to comply with govt figs. Affordable housing is still out of range of many people and there is a need for more social housing , Can this not be included within the overall provision. What should really happen is to stop the further depletion of the existing Council House stock and for incentives given to Councils to increase it . Could this be done through an arms length body as has happened elsewhere.
FS-Case-309561897	Maria Malinowska	option 4	Repurpose empty buildings and shops as dwellings.
FS-Case-309579334	Anne Tombs	option 4	Put affordable/social housing to the forefront not the back. only plan for homes where there is a sustainable infrastructure and not have a block number that disadvantages the smaller areas and increases strains on schooling etc
FS-Case-309583339	Andy Bourne	option 4	Setting new build targets risks inappropriate housing developments, the Axminster plan, once again, being a case in point. Builders can afford build "affordable" homes without having nonsensical targets!
FS-Case-309588076	Carol Jay Transition Exmouth	option 1	Other options than new-build should be explored. Undertake a survey to identify unused / underused properties for renovation or conversion. All new build should be 'affordable' if not actually EDDC or housing association for rent; this should address housing need instead of just housing aspiration.
FS-Case-309614514	DAVE LEWIS	option 4	We should ONLY be building home that are affordable for the local community, and the sale of those homes should be restricted to local people.
FS-Case-309879551	David Goodfellow	option 2	The Plan should also (a) define what exactly is "affordable" housing - e.g. is it to be available to first-time buyers just out of college/university in their first jobs; is it for social housing; etc. (b) include provision for proper infrastructure that goes hand-in-hand with a large number of new homes - e.g. schools, shops, doctor surgeries, transport. These issues affect the local town planning and development, not just the house building for political targets,
FS-Case-310067578	Terry Redgers N/A	option 4	We live in a lovely part of the world, the recent pandemic has shown that people in large cities are now more than ever wanting to relocate. Property prices are increasing, so it is becoming more important to provide affordable housing for our local young people
FS-Case-310194190	WAYNE SUMMERS	option 3	We need to build more houses but by locals for locals only no more new towns or encouraging more people to move here
FS-Case-310202766	Anthony Derrick	option 4	Don't plan for any new houses. prevent homes being sold for 2nd homes and put levy/tax on existing 2nd homes and holiday lets so demand is reduced.

Ref No	Respondent	Q 8	Question 8 Comment
FS-Case-310214396	Karan Bennett Bishops Clyst Parish Council	option 1	There is some doubt about the figures being used by government to justify housing forecasts. Unless and until these are resolved, we should stick to the current recommendations. Not convinced by government housing forecasts!
FS-Case-310279572	Patricia Goddard	option 1	We don't need more homes which are expensive. We need affordable homes for families. All of the options above say 'may', or potentially. Somehow we need to set up funding for affordable homes. This has been done before and should be investigated.
FS-Case-310327426	Amy Roberts Bell Cornwell LLP	option 2	Please see attached sheet.
FS-Case-310448600	Anne Double	option 1	The lower figure (or your figure of 950) seems a reasonable balance between the need for homes and possible future variations of need following the change in people's lives and working patterns since Covid. The need for affordable housing will never go away though, and more emphasis should be placed on this when developments are planned. Your ideas on using smaller, more local developers rather than big national building giants could be a step towards this?
FS-Case-310456969	Penny Kurowski	option 4	I question the Government requirement to build some many new homes. The CPRE has done some research to show that the Government requirements around house building are not necessarily correct. Additionally, in the past 3 years, East Devon has over delivered by an average of 22% against Government requirements. Therefore there should be some easing now. I am in favour of building affordable homes, but unfortunately in housing developments these are often reduced in number.
FS-Case-310479155	Mary Pike	option 4	Only on Brown sites
FS-Case-310532925	Mike Cordery	option 4	It isn't the number of houses that is important it is the number of affordable homes. Meeting central government requirements misses that point.
FS-Case-310579594	Richard Lawrence	option 4	The number of houses built should be measured by local requirements, not just building hundreds of houses and then looking around the country to see who can fill them. Housing should be a local affair and if people live in say Birmingham they should be accommodated in Birmingham where they already have the infrastructure to support them. We are building hundreds of houses without the requisite infrastructure causing unnecessary strain on services which are already struggling.
FS-Case-310604804	Sarah Alana Sayers Farringdon Parish Council	option 4	Ensure housing development meets a recognised local housing need
FS-Case-310728087	Josephine Ash	option 4	Perhaps allow the total number to be driven by filling the need for affordable homes rather than determining a number and seeing how it impacts affordable homes.
FS-Case-310963665	Wendy Rowing	option 4	Build homes in appropriate places where there are jobs or all you are doing is making more 2nd homes. Also put a stop on people owning 2nd 3rd 4th etc homes (not applicable to caravan parks), this would help ease the need to build houses, and makes sure communities still exist as people will live in the houses and use the surrounding facilities all year round.
FS-Case-310965690	Victoria Serag-El-Din	option 1	Too many new homes has a negative impact on the environment and property market. Affordable housing is a need that must be met but I feel a compromise is necessary in order to meet the objectives set out. I also wonder how excess affordable housing will inspire those in need to build a future for themselves where they no longer need it.
FS-Case-310970995	Rob McCreddie	option 4	Just running with arbitrary figures for the sake of it should not be the approach. There should be a more planned approach that takes into account local needs and the impact this will have on established communities. Repurposing retail or brownfield sites in larger towns should be the primary focus to inject life into areas that will take years. (if ever) to recover from the pandemic.

Ref No	Respondent	Q 8	Question 8 Comment
FS-Case-310974350	Ian Smith	option 1	But any number must respond to trends in birth rate, poulation movement and the success of the housing that is built in terms of take up and satisfaction of those in and affected by the new homes
FS-Case-310982347	Peter WRIGHT	option 2	I am not too sure about my response here. Are the homes required to meet East Devon's need for it's own residents and employment need? Are we to provide ever increasing numbers of housing for people who, probably naturally, wish to retire here - or if East Devon has to provide housing for residents relocated from other parts of the country. People coming to work and local young people looking for their first home should be welcomed but a 'master plan' is needed to identify where the work need is. If not there will be excessive car journeys!
FS-Case-311441601	Janet Andrews	option 4	"New affordable homes are typically built as a developer contribution on market housing development schemes." Would it not be better to offer nil or very low deposit schemes for first time buyers? In the 1970s it was possible to get a low deposit mortgage from the council on very favourable terms. I believe the government is considering something similar now. We could then stick with the 928 government requirement.
FS-Case-311530475	Jon Brown	option 3	I have chosen option 3 because I believe that we need to ensure that we have the required minimum level of affordable homes and Option 3 delivers this. That said I don't understand why we have to over supply homes (if our expected need is 1000 / year) in order to deliver the need for affordable homes. What we need is a plan to build 1000 homes per year and to eliminate the number of affordable homes that are needed. I presume that we are so far adrift from the number of affordable homes required because we have failed in the past to get this right. This should be the number one on our list not the last.
FS-Case-311637333	David Lloyd	option 4	There must be an urgent review of infrastructure of the places facing new housing developments. These must include local facilities, roads, water control (flood risk), recreational space, etc. You can't have more people without more of everything else!
FS-Case-311663864	Jim Moon	option 4	The East Devon District is already far to congested with new homes. We have exceeded the last Local Plan by over 600 homes and yet developers are still proposing yet more housing plans. The district just cannot cope with more homes.
FS-Case-311693209	Jeremy Woodward Vision Group for Sidmouth	option 1	The Sid Valley NP complies with its quota of new homes under government requirements In addition: Whilst this falls short of the affordable housing needed, simply increasing the commitment to new-builds will not necessarily lead to more affordables being built, as admitted in the Issues and Options report. Population and economic growth rates have decreased since the current LP was created: https://tinyurl.com/2mnjnxbz and https://tinyurl.com/abrdhbye Using algorithms to determine such rates have since been discredited: https://tinyurl.com/a3t9znsh Moreover, "East Devon has over-delivered by 37%, 5% and 28% over the past three years (average 22%); by 33% overall over the past five years (1,155 excess houses)." https://tinyurl.com/hxcuvs5w
FS-Case-311810037	Charles Hopkins	option 4	A District wide survey of unoccupied and under-occupied properties should be undertaken (including office, town centre and commercial property) to provide a basis for assessment of future provision.
FS-Case-311868155	Martin Dowse	option 4	Most of the new developments to date are speculative and many will not stand up to scrutiny. The need must be real for localpeople and local industry. Not to provide a dumping ground for large conurbations to buy up and move some of its problems to another authority? Cranbrook comes to mind? Building big creates more problems than it solves. Lots of small developments intigrating into local established communities are the way forward.
FS-Case-312087808	Gill Akers	option 1	Our town's housing stock has increased by 25%, yet there are no extra school places.
FS-Case-312095051	Terry Darrant	option 4	Residential development is a necessity but needs to be heavily balanced against the fact that East Devon is a rural district and the countryside, that would be lost, needs to be protected. Priority should be shifted to brown field sites with the onus of restricting

Ref No	Respondent	Q 8	Question 8 Comment
			residential development on commercial land scrapped. Councils should be also concentrating on the provision and sustainable development of council housing.
FS-Case-312184112	Linda Lowes N/A	option 4	I do not believe these numbers are sustainable. Where can you build year on year without destroying the natural beauty of the area.
FS-Case-312251067	Neal Jillings Place Land Ltd	option 3	One of the greatest challenges we face as a nation is adequately housing younger generations and also those who cannot compete on the open market for housing. It is a shame that the decision makers and those who are able to influence policy the most usually don't have to worry as they are adequately housed, most probably where they want to live. It is of the utmost importance to plan to over-deliver on the basis that more affordable housing can be provided. limiting housing growth should not be the role of the Local Plan where the planning system falls so short in meeting the basic human right of a roof over ones head for a large section of our society.
FS-Case-312255566	Stephen sadler	option 4	This is an arbitrary number that has no reality in the situation faced in East Devon. There is not a NEED for these houses but a WANT. Where are the jobs for these new arrivals, where are the capacity in resources (schools, health, social services, Leisure!). Organisations like Campaign to protect Rural England have already expressed their concerns on these arbitrary numbers as they end up being built on prime agricultural land. Maybe the focus should be on food and water security - if we continue to import so much food then there will be a global crisis --- how is importing so much food environmentally sound when we under utilise our land. Also Affordable houses is a misnomer ---- they are not affordable for the vast majority of people who NEED them. In fact it is suggested affordable homes in fact inflate house and rental prices which makes it worse for those in NEED!!!
FS-Case-312317917	Steven Walton	option 4	There should not be set targets. House building should be flexible, by building to targets major destruction to the local environment occurs such as Cranbrook which has destroyed a large area of rural communities which goes against objective of improving residents wellbeing. Cranbrook also oncreases commuting and goes against the objective of reducing carbon emmissions and came about to meet housebuilding targets.
FS-Case-312431413	Bruce Thomson	option 2	We need to keep young people in the area in order to keep businesses running and building more affordable homes will encourage young people to stay in the area and take up jobs.
FS-Case-312449388	George Williams Greenslade Taylor Hunt	option 3	Our client wholly supports option 3. At both a national and local level there is an undersupply of housing, and Local Authorities often seek to deliver their targets as a maximum, and many fall short of that figure. This has a knock on effect onto the affordability and suitability of housing, which in-turn has an effect on people's standards of living, as well as inequality in wider society. East Devon should set itself ambitious targets based on the figure of 1,614 dwellings which formed part of a sound plan by the Government of delivering in those areas that were capable. Increasing housing supply across the district not only helps to address housing shortages, but will also act a catalyst for further economic, social and environmental growth, helping East Devon District Council to achieve more of their objectives previously mentioned. Through the construction of new housing, comes the creation of more jobs, through construction as well as increased patronage of local services.
FS-Case-312482944	Peter Bowler NA	option 1	Houses should only be built where people need them, that is near facilities and employment.
FS-Case-312484135	Frances BRUEN	option 4	We have already built more houses than we need for this area
FS-Case-312560519	Catherine Pester	option 3	There are not enough affordable homes in the area. There needs to be new developments, similar to cranbrook, on the outskirts of each Devon town to meet the need of local communities.
FS-Case-312655834	Theresa Sanders	option 2	at least quarter of all new homes built should be 'affordable'. These should be not for profit and be Council Houses

Ref No	Respondent	Q 8	Question 8 Comment
FS-Case-312726461	Anthony Bevan N/A	option 1	We should require that there is a greater % of affordable housing in all planning applications for new build. For single house developments we should insist on it being affordable housing as single building development is primarily driven by the desire to maximise profit from land rather than meet affordable housing needs. We should also insist that developments are on brown field sites as a first requirement. We need affordable housing more than we need additional general housing and we should put that need ahead of profits, second homes and the desire for people to move to this area.
FS-Case-312743967	Dee Woods	option 1	There are many empty homes which should be used, and also a great many 'new' homes could be recreated in our town centres, in the spaces above shops and offices. This would encourage vitality in town centres and also reduce the need for new builds. They would also be much more affordable than new builds.
FS-Case-312744056	Christina Skinner	option 1	Could be adjusted to meet government requirements each year but being mindful that villages don't get swamped by new housing and become mini towns. Look at ways of creating housing in built up areas or on industrial or brown field sites.
FS-Case-312781179	Carine Silver	option 4	This area needs to do its own study on how many homes actually are needed, and how many EMPTY properties we currently have. It is my understanding that the government's numbers are entirely self-serving (i.e. to make money for developers) and have little to do with actual requirements.
FS-Case-312786958	Joanna Davis	option 2	Affordable housing is essential. It is difficult to put a figure on how many houses should be built, certainly current Govt requirements but this figure means we fall short of affordable housing. I would have to opt for Plan 2 if pushed.
FS-Case-312788353	Rosemary Walker	option 1	Developers seem to prefer to build 3/4 bedroom houses. More bungalows are needed for old people to downsize, more flats for single people and affordable homes.
FS-Case-312793696	Margaret Hall West Hill Parish Council	option 1	The housing number is largely a political decision. There may be little option to ignore the algorithm that is imposed by central government. We would not wish to see more houses than the local need required. However, we acknowledge that there is a need for affordable housing.
FS-Case-312802318	Alan Dent	option 2	Affordable housing is essential
FS-Case-312979176	Helen Connor	option 4	The country is being overwhelmed with new build and it is becoming hard to juggle the need for more housing and the need for open space and people's wellbeing.....in my opinion, it is important to consider new build on brown field sites only and stop the increasing encroachment into green belt.
FS-Case-313070314	Kevin Finch Whimple Parish Council	option 4	The number of houses built should be measured by local requirements, not just building hundreds of houses.. Housing should be a local affair . We are building hundreds of houses without the requisite infrastructure causing unnecessary strain on services which are already struggling. Just running with arbitrary figures for the sake of it should not be the approach. There should be a more planned approach that takes into account local needs and the impact this will have on established communities. Repurposing retail or brownfield sites in larger towns should be the primary focus to inject life into areas that will take years. (if ever) to recover from the pandemic. A controlled growth plan with each parish/ area, decided by the local parish/town council, with a good spread of affordable, joint ownership, starter home inc bungalows/ flats for the older residents, but must also include family homes
FS-Case-313116054	A Davidson	option 4	More needs to be explored to re-purpose commercial buildings for homes and this has become, certainly in towns and cities, an opportunity where commercial units are no longer occupied. There is an opportunity for planners to look at how to regenerate town centres and bring people back to a more mixed, independent and vibrant place to live and work. Empty shops does nothing to bring people back. Smaller local housing developments could then supplement this rather than the large scale developments that currently seem to be favoured.

Ref No	Respondent	Q 8	Question 8 Comment
FS-Case-313155665	Catherine Dandridge	option 2	New housing must be planned to avoid using reserve land that perhaps was not best area for developing thus impacting negatively on the wildlife & bio diversity. Good planning will help mitigate this along with greater utilising of brown field sites prime for redevelopment.
FS-Case-313198806	Vicki Whatley	option 2	BUT don't forget to include brown field sites and reclaiming abandoned or derelict buildings.
FS-Case-313233811	Phil Golder	option 4	There are many empty homes in the south west due to them being used as summer or second (or third) homes. This and letting properties be bought for private rental (especially when they could be used by the council as affordable lets), creates a false demand driving up prices beyond what most people can afford. This benefit to the few penalises the many and results in these ridiculous targets to further destroy the natural landscape that we live in. Owners of empty homes should be penalised with prohibitive taxes to free up housing stock.
FS-Case-313269010	stephen haynes	option 1	House building levels should align with increases in job numbers and demographic demand rather than being fixed with no reference to demand.
FS-Case-313343575	Joanna Burkey	option 4	Why if you only build 928 does it mean you have to fall short on affordable housing. Housing should be for the people not just about money. I think these developers are rich enough already, so they can take a hit on profits to actual build what we need. Maybe we need to think about clamping down on second homes in East Devon and then we can free up some housing stocks and not need to build on new green field sites. A lot of the holiday homes in East Devon are fairly small cottages that maybe slightly more affordable.
FS-Case-313428092	John Cooper	option 1	Planning for more dwellings than the government requirement would have a severe environmental impact on the AONB.
FS-Case-313453872	Tony WOODWARD	option 4	ED is already ahead of gov targets. We should not build more new homes than 928. Affordable housing should be within that figure. Where an affordable housing requirement is set then this should not be waived during the planning process. In any event EDDC should start to build its own Council Houses which are not for sale ie no right to buy attaches to them. This in some part will compensate for the lack of affordable housing. Employ an appropriate manager to build council houses.
FS-Case-313459444	Mike Allen EDDC	option 1	The population growth in East Devon does not justify much if any growth because demographically the population is shrinking. After suitable consultations with neighbouring authorities and HM Government any housing growth should be highly focused on homes for younger families, single people and disabled people
FS-Case-313468624	Caroline Dartnall	option 2	there has to be a balance between houses and green/open space
FS-Case-313490034	Ian Kirvan	option 1	Affordable housing is a buzz word but what does it mean in reality???.We should aim to provide a suitable mix of rental,buy to let and properties suitable for single people as well as families.
FS-Case-313521692	Louise Dean	option 3	Too many houses are old and damp in the region, or out of peoples price range particularly for first time buyers and new homes are more efficient and create a community as well as more affordable housing
FS-Case-313523282	Gary Barlow	option 1	We already have way too many 2nd homes in the county that sit unused for 90% of the year. Create a residency policy or something to stop it happening.
FS-Case-313523797	Heather Broadbent	option 2	I think we should make more effort to use empty properties, and also restrict how many houses are sold as second homes. There are lots of empty properties, but people seem to want to buy news houses
FS-Case-313529843	Simon Spencer Simon Spencer MCIAT	option 3	reasonable levels of affordable housing cannot be achieved solely through developers sites, as mitigation reduces the numbers on viability grounds. So another way is needed to be added for example Council houses, funded by Councils with their CIL levy from other developments. The comments on developers standard houses apply particularly to Cranbrook, which is an architectural tragedy in may areas, and this must stop. Design of estate housing has to improve and buildings need to be in and reflect the 21st Century, not the 1980's mass housing that we have around Cranbrook. There are areas

Ref No	Respondent	Q 8	Question 8 Comment
			that are not so bad, but it is nevertheless, an absolutely lost opportunity to have created something really special. (look at Poundbury like it or not it is special!). Look also at Gravenhill just outside Bicester for inspiration on housing styles in the 21st Century, most are custom built and many really outstanding in design. Cranbrook could have been like this.....something to be proud of
FS-Case-313533757	Patrick Sinnott	option 4	I don't see why you have to overbuild, in terms of overall housing numbers, in order to meet the affordable housing needs. Meet the government norm, sure, but come to grips with the proportion of affordable houses within that total.
FS-Case-313534234	Sally Galsworthy	option 4	Start to work out how council houses can be built. Not rely on largess of developers as targets will never be met.
FS-Case-313542858	Judith Heathcock	option 4	NO NEW HOMES ARE NECESSARY. USE THE CURRENT EMPTY HOMES AND SPACE ABOVE RETAIL SPACE. CERTAINLY NOT AFFORDABLE HOMES. NO NEW ESTATES WHICH ARE AN EYESORE.
FS-Case-313549755	Caroline Wallbank	option 4	There should be a considered approach based on actual need rather than theoretical figures from above.
FS-Case-313560398	Elaine Tant	option 4	A bigger proportion of affordable homes should be built in each commercial development
FS-Case-313579157	Timothy Brown	option 3	I support a larger target of new builds provided that the emphasis is on affordable rented homes for people with low incomes.
FS-Case-313584761	Richard Norman Musbury Barn	option 3	the SW should continue to be the location of preference and thus more people will wish to move here and thus we must provide more residences. However we should discourage their being purchased as 'holiday homes' for individuals/families -they must be lived in (local economy!)
FS-Case-313603740	Eileen Beech	option 4	From population forecasts the judgement must be made on the number of new homes needed. There must be more social housing for those who do want to buy. Some people prefer to rent, the rents must be affordable. Mixed developments of different types of housing are preferable.
FS-Case-313608804	Susan Child	option 4	It's probably not profitable, but I think there should only be affordable housing built until the backlog of local families have decent houses to live in. The old original council houses in the local towns & villages, with their decent sized gardens were so good for low-paid local working families. There are so many "executive" & retirement houses for wealthy people from richer parts of the country who often don't add to local communities. Also there should be some sort of disincentive for people buying village properties for holiday homes (for themselves or for renting). Maybe much larger council tax contributions? We wouldn't need all these extra houses if people could live in the existing ones!
FS-Case-313613307	Madeleine Blu	option 4	There are factors like saving the countryside and planting trees rather than destroying what we have already. We are in a pandemic, the birth rate has dropped as has immigration. I do not think we should be held to a specific figure. There are many buildings at present that could be converted into living homes e.g. disused factories, office blocks etc.
FS-Case-313618009	Elizabeth Twining	option 4	Explore ways of providing affordable housing that do not depend on developers - some creative thinking seems required.
FS-Case-313629840	Cathy Gardner	option 1	"Affordable" homes are not enough, we need to build social housing. Just building more houses does not solve affordability.
FS-Case-313643991	Douglas Smith	option 1	The rush to build is not providing the right houses in the right places, this needs to be identified first
FS-Case-313653593	ALISON MCLAREN	option 4	I think there are far too many homes already being built without sufficient infrastructure. For example, Exmouth has hundreds of homes being built and more planned, but the connecting road to Exeter is overcrowded.
FS-Case-313672954	Brian Ward	option 4	need affordable homes. Private homes just bring in people to the area, with many being "second homes".

Ref No	Respondent	Q 8	Question 8 Comment
FS-Case-313678330	june glennie	option 1	each new home must have a dedicated parking place or garage
FS-Case-313682721	Heike Hollerung	option 2	Affordability and quality are equally important. Also, it is important to be clear who are you building for. Small flats for pensioners, homes for young people. Personally I think we don't have to live in big houses, occupied by one or two people. Building flats for a wide range of demographic is my preferred option.
FS-Case-313693362	Gary Tubb	option 4	As previously stated there are plenty of lower priced properties available in and around towns which are already part of a sustainable development that could easily be restored or larger properties, including commercial property to subdivide into apartments enhancing our town centres and villages. A town centre could be revived by this method of housing as there would be jobs, low carbon footprint, whereby people could walk to work, use local shops and restaurants and create a close community. Whilst this may not meet all housing needs it would certainly make a considerable contribution to them and utilise and give value to existing property.
FS-Case-313698487	Craig Daley	option 4	As a Council you no longer build new homes, so this is a nonsecual question. As developers are the only builders of new homes in this area, and they tell you what they are doing, why waste time asking this question?
FS-Case-313708247	Samantha Smith	option 4	We do not have the infrastucture in Axminster for the current population. More housing seems a poor judgement.
FS-Case-313710620	Jacqueline Cox	option 4	Ensure that all developments provide a balanced mix of housing affordable/open market, regardless of numbers. Over 50's developments restricting opportunities for young people to buy and do not offer affordable or family units as part of the community.
FS-Case-313712377	Susan Mackie	option 4	Far too many. Existing developments remain unsold. Road links and lack of employment dire for more house building. Not a suitable area for young families as my son states Devon is where people come to die. Sadly i cannot disagree with most employment in social care.
FS-Case-313718525	Robert Maynard	option 4	Option 4 - Plan for an average of at least 928 new home being built each year (or a more recent Gov advice or robust independent projections) and make provision to accommodate the current backlog of 460 affordable houses. In future years the planned provision of 928 dwelling per year (or any updated figure) should be adequate to include all housing needs (i.e. open market home, affordable housing, second/holiday homes, plus allowances for vacant homes.
FS-Case-313757512	Jane Nelson-Smith	option 2	Would it be possible to provide small affordable housing for single and homeless people such as bedsit style homes eg as in IKEA. These could be make in vacant existing buildings such as offices no longer needed now people are working from home.
FS-Case-313771026	John Connolly	option 1	Under the current regime, developers agree a number of affordable houses in order to obtain planning permission. Then in the time between permission and construction (often years) they incrementally re-write the original deal and eventually deliver many fewer affordable houses and (usually) many more private sale plots. Goodmores Farm development in Exmouth is an excellent example of this behaviour. Developers should be held to delivering the number originally agreed - if their costs have risen then they should manage those costs not expect what amounts to public subsidy of their profits. EDDC should consider returning to the role of house builder direct - as councils used to do. There are significant Council owned brown field sites that could be used in housing. The Council has ownership of these sites and could convert them with no land purchase costs, thus making the build cost wholly affordable in relation to rental income.
FS-Case-313777879	Janice Low	option 3	Option 3 should be the minimum and we should have ambitions to go far beyond this to meet the needs for real low cost, affordable homes for local people.
FS-Case-313779995	Stephanie Hidson-Jones Seaton Town Council	option 2	Whatever the number of homes planned for in the new East Devon Local Plan there needs to be a realistic and achievable number of affordable homes planned for and delivered.

Ref No	Respondent	Q 8	Question 8 Comment
FS-Case-313780058	Megan Lowe	option 1	Personally I think that sounds like a lot of homes! 'Affordable housing' is barely fit for purpose. More new houses = higher house prices. I'm not sure what the answer is. Houses need to good quality, in the right place and not at the cost of biodiversity, the natural environment or community wellbeing. It should not be a 'tick box' exercise in my opinion.
FS-Case-313812606	Richard Bates	option 4	Just let developers build wherever without interfering all the time.
FS-Case-313840169	Alan Hughes	option 4	Affordable housing is very important to keep people from being forced from the district. The current 'formula' seems unable to meet this requirement without unacceptably large areas being developed. Given that most developments include larger houses that are primarily designed for people moving into the area ,often from more expensive areas has anyone considered that houses of 3 or more bedrooms be charged a premium to subsidise the affordable home provision. If applied throughout the county builders would all have to pay it and be on the same footing.
FS-Case-313846023	Paul Garnham	option 4	There is already far too much housebuilding going on in East Devon and the outskirts of Exeter on rural farmland/greenfield land. Cranbrook - itself hugely unpopular - was supposed to be the holy grail of solving the perceived housing crisis in East Devon, yet despite the huge number of houses built (& planned for the future) there, there seems to be an almost obsession from EDDC, Mid Devon DC & Exeter CC to concrete over as much rural space as possible. One of the attractions for many people living in Devon is living in the countryside!
FS-Case-313848718	Julia Bove	option 2	Keep the design of new homes 'traditional' and in line with existing nearby historic developments.
FS-Case-313849237	Kathleen Ellett		Again it concerns me that this country is not meeting our affordable housing needs. We seem to need more than just 20% of housing in a development being affordable. So we have to increase the average just to ensure our population needs can be met?
FS-Case-313857211	Linda Johnson	option 3	There seems to be a big demand for all types of housing in East Devon that isn't being met.
FS-Case-313882518	I Godfrey	option 4	The number of homes that are built is not so important as where they are built and how they are built. for example some locations are not suitable for housing developments and others are. Houses should be built using Zero Carbon specifications. These are the important considerations and distilling it to a number does not help the process.
FS-Case-313884230	Andrew Roberts	option 1	My view is that population growth likely to be less than current predictions (following departure from EU) think should stick at lower limit of house building - see what ONS say after the 2021 census results and future forecasts are available. However given that I understand that EDDC have not made target levels of development in previous year would like to know what is to be incorporated into plan for catch up.
FS-Case-313997024	Richard Holman	option 4	EDDC needs to build more housing. On every level EDDC fail to engage properly with landowners and developers except when they are effectively are made to build housing by the government. The EDDC need to increase available housing over and above the government guidelines (possibly 2000+) and meet their responsibility in this area and not try to push this responsibility onto other surrounding areas such as Exeter.
FS-Case-313999789	Jayne Blackmore	option 1	It makes no sense in building houses for the sake of it! Local needs should be informed bt a proper housing needs assessment.
FS-Case-314090147	Rob Longhurst	option 1	Given changes to lifestye how confident can you be on 928?
FS-Case-314113114	Caroline Wilson Chardstock Parish Council	option 4	The recent report by Devon CPRE shows that 30 per cent more houses have been built during the past five years than was required (more than 6,000 units), and that the countryside is being ravaged as a result. East Devon has provided 33 per cent more housing than was required over the past five years (1,155). Building in the AONB in particular needs to be better controlled. What does need addressing is the lack of affordable homes for local people rather than large new homes for people moving to the area from elsewhere.

Ref No	Respondent	Q 8	Question 8 Comment
FS-Case-314133727	Ian Jewson Walsingham Planning Ltd	option 2	The Plan should make provision for more than the 928 homes identified by the 2020 standard methodology. This will ensure it includes flexibility and meets as far as reasonable, the need for affordable housing. The housing requirement will also need to ensure it addresses any unmet need from adjoining authorities such as Exeter.
FS-Case-314181450	Iain Ure	option 1	Concentrate of houses for locals only. More houses are not sustainable.
FS-Case-314217529	Don Mildenhall	option 1	Should be able to flex if population growth now falls as a result of Brexit and COVID
FS-Case-314261371	David Valentine Gittisham Parish Council	option 1	The EDDC target of 928 dwellings per year is supported. Greater support for community led developments to assist with the affordable housing shortfall, is also supported. New build developments need to be located where appropriate infrastructure is available or where deficiencies can be met by developer contributions and where intrusive impacts in the countryside can be avoided. No development should be permitted within a flood plain.
FS-Case-314278250	Keith Bungay	option 1	It is only right that East Devon plays its part in providing for housing NEEDS but we question the requirement to provide for all housing DEMAND. The Exmouth Neighbourhood Plan requires that in housing schemes of +10 units, 25% of the houses should be affordable. Crazy that at present the provision of affordable housing appears to be dictated by financial viability arguments rather than by social planning needs.
FS-Case-314345492	Martyn Smith Feniton Parish Council	option 1	Building houses just for the sake of it, makes no real sense. Local needs should be informed by a proper housing needs assessment.
FS-Case-314437283	Jacqui Baldwin	option 4	I don't agree with the assessment of housing need for this area. Taking into account the explosion of house building around Exeter I cannot see the justification for this level of building in East Devon. If we need Affordable Homes then they should be built but their provision should not be reliant on market rate developments.
FS-Case-314500910	Graham Kingham	option 4	Use empty houses, restrict holiday lets. reflect the needs of local communities, not just Exeter's needs.
FS-Case-314585169	Peter Faithfull	option 4	We are having well over the average of 928 homes per year. We need to slow down to allow our communities to adjust.
FS-Case-314601466	Julia Daniell	option 4	We should resist pressure to just build and build. If we build lots of miserable little overcrowded boxes, then that is how real people will be condemned to live. This shows poverty of ambition and can only be bad for all our futures - creating more crime and ill health. Instead, all rented property should be occupied on a Rent-and-Buy basis, with ownership increasing each year, run by non-profit housing trusts. These trusts should adapt existing premises to the needs of their customers and build new, imaginative long-term properties. All other new-builds should be single, 'Grand Design' type properties. No more Estates!! Please!
FS-Case-314606312	RICHARD GETLIFFE	option 1	areas should be identified where large numbers of low energy homes can be built on low energy infrastructures, not putting new house in and around old infrastructure. maybe use of old industrial or warehouse locations. even demolition of old housing stock
FS-Case-314622730	Timothy Legg	option 4	This question has been skewed to ensure we cannot recommend fewer new houses to be built. 928 (at least) per year is far too many, and we are irreversibly losing the countryside that used to make east Devon so lovely.
FS-Case-314627836	Wes Healey	option 1	Majority of new homes are sold to outsiders. Reduce second home ownership
FS-Case-314731257	Fiona Lawson	option 4	People in council houses should not be in them for life. They should be a temporary solution. To be used for people to set them up. Affordable housing is not affordable for young people. Build more one bedroom and more bungalows, so the elderly can free up larger family homes.

Ref No	Respondent	Q 8	Question 8 Comment
FS-Case-314758581	Peter Ball Kilmington Parish Council	option 2	Primary focus should be on homes for locals, building too many new homes in excess of available jobs will result in greater unemployment as people relocate from cities to the area, which in turn will result in a greater need for affordable homes. If attracting the elderly retirement community into the area is seen as beneficial for the local economy, then are sufficient accessible dwellings being planned?
FS-Case-314760502	christopher Heal Private	option 3	Plans to increase the housing allocation would generate more affordable homes and reduce the price of all housing enabling more families to purchase their first home.
FS-Case-314762361	ZOE H BETTERTON Cornerstone Design and Build	option 2	As long as they are appropriated sited in areas with community facilities and good transport links for work.
FS-Case-314771914	Ian Cherry	option 4	Until there is a common UK environmental standard for all new builds of affordable housing which would eliminate the need for re-work in future years as stricter standards are introduced then we are simply throwing money at this to get a tick in the box toady rather than future proofing what should be considered as an investment.
FS-Case-314782794	Nicola Daniel	option 4	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Government's figures for housing growth are not based on firm evidence and are far in excess of local needs. There has also been some depopulation. 2. The acceptable number is the lowest figure that would be approved by the government 3. The housing need of East Devon is primarily that of affordable homes. 5. The EDDC Local Plan includes the provision of 25% affordable homes in a development. Due to viability arguments this percentage is regularly reduced . eg at Goodmores Farm,Exmouth, 88 affordables to 16.6. The new local plan must include a policy stating that the developer provides the assessment of the viability of a site and that the developer must be able to build the number of affordable homes initially approved for that site. 6. Neighbourhood Plans will have to be taken into account when determining housing numbers for the whole district. Many of the NP have policies limiting housing growth to local needs, not large 4-5 bedroomed houses which go to incomers.
FS-Case-314806759	Stuart Yerrell	option 4	What about zero growth as a planning objective? Saving the planet, if not the profits of the landowners and builders?
FS-Case-314832307	Anthony Carthy James Carthy and Company Limited	option 3	East Devon already meets a substantial part of Exeter's need and that will continue. Due allowance should be made in the figures to cover this.
FS-Case-314846841	Wendy Van Der Plank The Beehive- community complex	option 1	The lettings market really needs to be looked at within towns in order to free up more affordable homes and restrictions on the numbers of holiday homes in the villages.Or more council tax on 2nd homes??The constant spread of homes is going to trash all the wildlife corridors and do nothing for the environment, that really worries me for the future of our young folk.
FS-Case-314852216	Jenny Ashmore	option 4	Priority for all new build to be affordable housing with emphasis for local people working in the area not luxury family homes - too many already. Land is at a premium so really careful consideration where it is build so as not to put a strain on the roads and infrastructure. Flood plains should never be built on especially with climate change and the need for water to be soaked up not blocked..
FS-Case-314862733	David Sherwin	option 4	We agree with CPRE conclusion that government numbers are too high and would recommend the figure they have in their report.
FS-Case-314894688	John Colby	option 1	Option 2 is also a possibility. Exmouth has seen enough of new housing development over the last few years, in future it should be generally in-filling with an emphasise on housing for younger people/families and adaptable housing design
FS-Case-314910549	James Barnes- Phillips	option 1	928 per year is far too many. We don't want to end up with thousands of new homes that local people can't afford so they end up being sold to outsiders putting even greater strains on our infrastructure. We need to make sure that the minimum of 25% affordable housing limit is adhered - preferable 30% or more. Affordable Housing

Ref No	Respondent	Q 8	Question 8 Comment
			needs to be just that. Four-bed houses at around £400,000 are way out of reach of our youngsters. We need 2-bed homes with gardens and private parking at less than £250,000. Let the developer build luxury homes alongside affordable ones, but subsidise the affordable with the excess profits from the larger houses.
FS-Case-314915803	Naomi Parkinson	option 1	As well as building new houses we need to repurpose and renovate empty properties and other buildings
FS-Case-314921504	robert wiltshire	option 1	Whoah. The population is increasing, more land is being taken up by housing and solar farming and reforestation. The area of land available for food production is shrinking. We already import 40% of our foodstuffs. This is not a healthy state of affairs.
FS-Case-314926201	Richard Crabtree	option 2	We need to have open spaces and East Devon will continually have to manage the pressure to build more houses from Exeter City Council.
FS-Case-314926952	Kathy Hackman	option 4	Given the need for 'green lungs' around/within towns which experience high levels of traffic pollution, as Axminster does, I am against high levels of housebuilding here, which only adds to the pollution factor and effectively 'bricks in' the town and its toxic air.
FS-Case-314937410	Eleonore Pang		Why 928 houses p.a. - who decides on numbers and how is this balanced with actual local need - must be affordable incl service infrastructure.
FS-Case-314943918	Des Senior	option 1	I don't think excessive amounts of building benefits the area. Unemployment in the south west is already quite high and simply encouraging more people to settle here won't improve that situation. The problem of affordability is not driven by the number of homes available but by the market sucking up every new lending scheme. The best way to improve the supply of affordable housing is to prevent access by the BTL sector buying up most new properties.
FS-Case-314951782	Daniel Mumby N/A	option 1	Low cost social housing has to be a priority, and you need strong policies to ensure it reflects not only need but the character of the local areas
FS-Case-314963509	Trudi Franklin	option 3	Especially local authority housing , affordable and environmental houses
FS-Case-315062740	Ann UPCHURCH	option 4	This seems excessive and in light of town centres retail changing, emphasis should be on redeveloping these areas into residential rather than building on green fields
FS-Case-315078619	David Venner	option 4	We are fortunate enough to live in a beautiful, green and wildlife vibrant part of the UK. Rather than continuing to build and spread our concrete jungles further, we must look at utilising what we already have first. Are there industrial areas that can be converted, with the potential to include shopping, leisure and other services. Do we have neglected and run down buildings, or overgrown plots of land within existing housing areas that can be used. This MUST be the priority.
FS-Case-315100989	Elaine Wade	option 4	We need a better way forward in ED; a sharing of more housing with other towns other than Exeter and ED. I would not want to see Exmouth join Woodbury and up the Exeter corridor, which will happen if we allow more building. We would then be a city environment, much like other suburbs of other cities in the UK. We need a more creative plan on housing, especially here in Devon and across the UK. I do not believe that more homes and building would mean more affordable housing, or at least enough affordable housing for those waiting for a home here in ED. Developers pay lip service to open spaces, build quality and types of housing. Most as we know is for those who can afford to uplift to a larger property, but mostly it is bought by outsiders wanting to move here and this includes escaping from Exeter. Pankhurst area in Exmouth: is an example, many houses have been demolished for the second time as surveys on land have not been thorough enough. A pain for everyone living nearby.
FS-Case-315126013	George Williams Greenslade Taylor Hunt	option 3	Our client wholly supports option 3. At both a national and local level there is an undersupply of housing, and Local Authorities often seek to deliver their targets as a maximum, and many fall short of that figure. This has a knock on effect onto the affordability and suitability of housing, which in-turn has an effect on people's standards of living, as well as inequality in wider society. East Devon should set itself ambitious targets based on the figure of 1,614 dwellings which formed part of a sound plan by the Government of delivering in those areas that were capable.

Ref No	Respondent	Q 8	Question 8 Comment
			Increasing housing supply across the district not only helps to address housing shortages, but will also act a catalyst for further economic, social and environmental growth, helping East Devon District Council to achieve more of their objectives previously mentioned. Through the construction of new housing, comes the creation of more jobs, through construction as well as increased patronage of local services.
FS-Case-315148483	Sara Arthur	option 1	Whilst option 1 may fall short of affordable housing needs. This can be addressed during planning application reviews.
FS-Case-315168747	Liz Shortland	option 4	Ottery has already had more new houses than planned in the previous neighbourhood plan. My option would be to pinpoint another "Cranbrook" area and therefore get all the new building in one place and with all the relevant health, environment. infrastructure etc issues addressed easily and attainable in one go.
FS-Case-315169040	Bryan Rayner	option 4	The priority needs to be for affordable homes and not mansions. If Government policy favours the latter, it must be resisted.
FS-Case-315184341	Richard Pratt	option 1	It does not seem right that the only way to achieve the required amount of affordable homes is by building more and more homes. No matter how many affordable are planned for, developers determine the quantity built depending on the profits they desire for each development. The planning authority needs to have the final say on the quantity of affordable homes that are actually completed per development.
FS-Case-315216760	Elizabeth Campbell	option 4	I am unclear how Options 1, 2 and 3 work as it is surely down to you as local government to define what percentage of any new build is affordable or social. It also should not be driven by Government but by genuine local needs. Its like roads - the more you build the more they will fill up until there is no open space left. I am also concerned about the lack of consideration given to sites other than large developments on the outskirts of towns and villages which destroy more of our environment - every household has usually one or more cars - and do not support developing our failing town centres. I also do not approve of setting defined targets for such new builds before we have addressed upgrading and refurbishing older properties and development sites which are often more centrally sited and hence reduce unnecessary car journeys.
FS-Case-315224273	ROY OSBORN	option 2	BUILDERS ARE NOT KEEN ON BUILDING AFFORDABLE HOMES WHEN EXPENSIVE ONES ARE WHERE THEY MAKE THEIR MONEY. SHOULD COUNCIL BUILT HOUSING MEET THESE NEEDS?
FS-Case-315275424	Rob Phillips Broadhembury Neighbourhood Community Land Trust (BNCLT)	option 4	Q8 implies that there exists an unchallengeable connection between two points: (1) The need for Affordable Housing, and (2) The building of other housing. Firstly, consider the Affordable Housing need – the question suggests that the total number of Affordable Homes that are needed is well established - we consider the methods used to measure the Affordable Housing need requires close scrutinization and possible reassessment. Secondly, consider the connection between the number of affordable houses needed and the building of other housing - Q8 (option 3) suggests, without justification, that 7 homes characterised as non-affordable need to be built to support every 2 affordable homes. Without challenging the connection between points (1) and (2), and without establishing an accurate basis for the actual Affordable Housing need, then we are potentially entering an endless cycle of unnecessary development.
FS-Case-315285428	Paul Foster	option 4	Many more affordable homes need building, the old system of "Council houses" should be re-introduced, and some effective way of retaining ownership by councils must be looked into. Retention of housing stock for use by local people instead of Holiday Homes MUST be a priority.
FS-Case-315287680	Jennifer Hiley-Payne N/A		This is difficult to judge as I am not an expert in this field, but certainly brown field sites and infill could be utilised where appropriate, the housing needs for the existing area population need to be addressed if possible, before rehousing from different areas of the Country. It is good to create village areas with good facilities, and 'add-ons' to large towns and cities, also with car parks, bus/train routes, but also to maintain the farming land and natural areas.
FS-Case-315320410	Richard Power Diocese of Exeter	option 3	The affordable homes crisis needs to be addressed and cannot be ignored/pushed back further.

Ref No	Respondent	Q 8	Question 8 Comment
FS-Case-315328621	Chris Burhop	option 4	928 homes should be the maximum. More % affordable. Developers will get used to it. Maintain BUAB in the AONB. Develop around other urban clusters - expand existing large towns not villages.
FS-Case-315423597	Kim Dearsly	option 1	Covid will have an impact on our town centres and there will be opportunities to convert existing buildings into affordable housing.
FS-Case-315449037	Darren Roberts East Devon District Council, Central Planning	option 1	The percentage of affordable housing should be set and reviewed regularly, with reduced numbers only being allowed in extreme circumstances
FS-Case-315455012	Rachel Hughes	option 4	Building swathes of more new homes is not the only answer. Disused buildings, infill and subdivision sites, upper stories of empty high street premises and brown fill sites can be developed into housing, hopefully with more affordable options, by not using large developers with all their overheads and driven profit margins - but rather, local contractors, thus encouraging more money into the local community.
FS-Case-315476876	Graham Long Upottery Parish Council	option 2	This country has never built the number of home (of all types) that our growing population needs. It would therefore be madness to aim for less than the 950/annum that the current plan calls for. The new plan must aim to exceed that. Determining by how much it should exceed it should be part of an ongoing continuous needs analysis built into the new plan.
FS-Case-315516791	Mary Truell None	option 4	Clarification of how new house building is forecast why and where, nobody has ever explained to me. Is it government use of disastrous algorithms or "guesswork"? Recently a govt paper gave details of house building in the last three years in every district in Devon. All except one had overbuilt "required" houses in the county adding up to a total excess of 6000+! I ask why then do we need ANY more houses at all? Yet I am told, that in East Devon 900 people are on a waiting list. There is a lot the public is not told. I suggest an urgent, thorough reassessment of true housing needs should take place at once and a moratorium placed on any large or small developments either started or about to start, until further notice. We cannot sacrifice any more sacred land to housing when there is potential empty accommodation in abandoned offices and shops after Covid, ripe for resurrection and restoration in declining towns, very suitable for small, local building firms.
FS-Case-315539551	Gary Parsons Sport England		no comment
FS-Case-315542900	Joanna Boyce	option 4	Sensitive, careful and environmentally sound planning for infrastructure needs to happen BEFORE any plan to build more homes is put in place.
FS-Case-315550412	Iain Fairbairn	option 3	The issue should not be how many homes we build but where they are built; what standards they meet and what style is appropriate for large developments (e.g. apartments, not all family houses)?
FS-Case-315556156	David Pickhaver Torbay Council	option 4	Paragraph 60 of the NPPF also indicates that "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". When the Greater Exeter Strategic Plan (GESP) was in existence, I advised the GESP team as part of the Duty to Cooperate that Torbay is unlikely to be able to accommodate its standard method derived housing need figure (586 dpa) beyond the current Torbay Local Plan termination date of 2030; and indeed the delivery of this level of growth is proving very difficult. Whilst East Devon is no longer in the GESP, it is within the Greater Exeter Housing Market Area (HMA) and Functional Economic Market Area (FEMA) that directly abuts and overlaps with Torbay. I would ask that the East Devon Local Plan Update takes into account neighbouring needs, as part as ongoing consideration of cross boundary matters. I have set out more details by email sent 12 March 2021. Thank you

Ref No	Respondent	Q 8	Question 8 Comment
FS-Case-315583497	Ann Kelf	option 2	Option 2 may be achievable, my concern with option 3 is that difficulties finding sufficient sites might mean that fewer houses are actually built.
FS-Case-315591470	Brian Carpenter	option 2	This is a very difficult one. I would favour Option 2, with the proviso that pressure has to be put on developers to fulfil expectations around ‘affordable’ housing (the definition and context of which will continue to change over the life of the plan). A way needs to be found to ensure developers stick to their promised commitments in these areas, although I recognize that this may be beyond the scope of EDDC.
FS-Case-315622017	Robert Martin Clyst Honiton Parish Council	option 2	<p>There is a fundamental flaw in this question, making the overall target the measure of how many affordable homes can be delivered. This implies that any policy for the delivery of affordable units to meet the need will not be delivered, so the overall numbers need to be pushed up to meet the targets.</p> <p>One thing that concerns is the statement in Option 2 about the lack of deliverability of affordable homes because overall numbers are lower. If the policies you set are appropriately knitted together then the two will be linked. It just needs the planners to insist that affordable housing is delivered on the back of full market housing rather than being bullied into lesser numbers (if any) on the back of spurious ‘viability’ claims.</p> <p>The other danger here is that setting the overall target too high means that the 5-year list also becomes higher and, with developers in charge of actual delivery, a large part of the Local Plan becomes useless.</p>
FS-Case-315672889	James Dorey Plainview Planning	option 3	<p>It provides the most flexibility and places the LPA in the strongest position to ensure a 5yhl is maintained.</p> <p>It is nationally accepted that there is a housing crisis and that the lack of supply is primarily felt in the South East.</p> <p>Housing statistics from web sites such as Zoopla, advise that house prices have increased in the last 12 months and have increased within the Borough by circa 7%, compared to the national average of 2.5% for the same timeframe (GOV.UK), confirms the real world impact the lack of housing has on local affordability.</p> <p>The need for housing is highlighted by the new standard method for calculating housing need in the area is presently suggesting a 73.9% increase in housing required per year. This is up 686 units per year from present which totals an annual need of 1,614.</p> <p>The current LP provides for 950 per year, this will need to be greatly increased to meet the coming demand. Benefits include a boosted economy and a potential reduction in house prices.</p>
FS-Case-315678300	George Williams Greenslade Taylor Hunt		<p>Our client wholly supports option 3. At both a national and local level there is an undersupply of housing, and Local Authorities often seek to deliver their targets as a maximum, and many fall short of that figure. This has a knock on effect onto the affordability and suitability of housing, which in-turn has an effect on people’s standards of living, as well as inequality in wider society.</p> <p>East Devon should set itself ambitious targets based on the figure of 1,614 dwellings which formed part of a sound plan by the Government of delivering in those areas that were capable.</p> <p>Increasing housing supply across the district not only helps to address housing shortages, but will also act a catalyst for further economic, social and environmental growth, helping East Devon District Council to achieve more of their objectives previously mentioned. Through the construction of new housing, comes the creation of more jobs, through construction as well as increased patronage of local services.</p>
FS-Case-315678845	Paul Hayward Newton Poppleford and Harpford Parish Council	option 4	This method of calculating affordable (and social) housing is flawed. The RLP should seek to deliver a defined and agreed level of affordables first and foremost and then, once built (or consented), then consider the Market Value housing delivery. Developers must be given no leeway to shirk their responsibilities via viability, loopholes or creative accounting!
FS-Case-315681467	Jacqui Best	option 2	There needs to be an increase in the amount of government social housing funding provided (and bidding for it locally) to allow for more RSL and Local Authority affordable social housing build / provision.

Ref No	Respondent	Q 8	Question 8 Comment
FS-Case-315685113	Lauren James MMO	option 2	I am responding to this consultation from the marine planning side of things so it is difficult for me to comment on housing. However, by increasing the number of homes being built considerably each year, with this could come a number of issues such as a strain on resources and substantial damage to the natural environment. However, it is most definitely essential to try and meet the targets set for housing to provide for the requirements, so I am in the middle.
FS-Case-315690761	Naome Glanville	option 4	Even 928 houses per year is shocking. EDDC should count how many houses were actually built during the period of the current local plan together with the number built between the last plan and the current one, which slipped through the net as a result of the time taken to get the current plan agreed, against what was democratically agreed for the current plan. Any additional houses built should be held against the extra houses it is claimed we need to build for the next plan.
<p>As East Devon commands high house prices, it is obvious that developers can make more profit here, creating pressure to build speculative developments, not based on housing need. As East Devon has already suffered from over-building, we should only allow for houses that NEED to be built. As far as possible new building should be on brownfield sites, in preference to greenfield sites, so that the natural environment suffers as little as possible and we maintain as much agricultural land as possible.</p>			
FS-Case-315694995	John Labrum	option 1	The situation where many families have to pay high rents to private landlords no doubt contributes to financial difficulties felt by many of those families. High rents probably reflect the demand for housing, but the situation is neither reasonable nor satisfactory. This is a major issue affecting families. We need more affordable homes and more council houses, but not at the expense of developers being allowed to build vast numbers of expensive houses (giving more opportunities for private landlords), with just a minor proportion of affordable homes. The Council needs to meet this issue head on, and find a way to ensure that many more of the houses built are the affordable homes that we need. Surely the house building companies can afford to have a little less profit.
FS-Case-315697980	Terrence Blackler	option 4	I feel that housing should be provided depending on the employment opportunities available. The danger of over building means destruction of the environment which would make East Devon a less desirable location.
FS-Case-315772728	T Moyle	option 4	Build affordable housing needs first, stop second home ownership & holiday homes & landlords with multiple home ownership.
FS-Case-315804855	Sophie Minter	option 4	Do not plan or commit to any specific figure of new houses. Thoroughly assess AGAIN how many houses/buildings/commercial units there are already which are unused, need refurbishment, could have change of use etc and you will realise that the so-called 'need' for all these new houses is a myth. Then, assess on an individual basis, and with the explicit involvement of neighbourhood plans and local groups, where and which potential builds might be appropriate.
FS-Case-315843780	James Holman	option 3	Your obligation under government guidance is of the utmost importance. There are no where near enough homes in east Devon . This situation has been Caused by decades of planning applications being blocked by east Devon .the total lack of affordable and family homes to buy is at a crisis level In east Devon and is getting worse . It's an abject failure to be laid at the feet of east Devon district council and its planning officers .
FS-Case-315852527	Cindy Collier	option 2	All of new housing built needs to be evenly distributed over all areas in East Devon and not as proposals are now building huge developments in one area. This type of development does not give access for choice and often people have had to move away from the area they live in to access more suitable housing for their and their children's future needs eg, Young people not being able to find accommodation in the area they have been bought up in as there is no suitable housing for first time buyers.
FS-Case-315858124	Jeanette Rivers	option 1	Do not exceed this number
FS-Case-315873808	Stephen Harris Emery Planning	option 2	In the context of national guidance, the Council should apply the Standard Method figure of 928 dwellings per annum which was published in December 2020. The Standard Method figure is only the starting point and paragraph 2a-010-20201216 of the PPG states that where previous levels of housing delivery in an area, or previous

Ref No	Respondent	Q 8	Question 8 Comment
			assessments of need (such as a recently-produced Strategic Housing Market Assessment) are significantly greater than the outcome from the standard method, authorities will need to take this into account when considering whether it is appropriate to plan for a higher level of need than the standard model suggests. Option 2 would enable a greater proportion of affordable housing needs being met. The LPA should consider all the aspects in the above paragraph of the PPG to inform the housing requirement.
FS-Case-315892586	Carolyn Bowles	option 4	I think you should build as few houses as possible, in the last few years developers have been building in nearly every town and village that you go visit
FS-Case-315937332	Fiona Anderson	option 4	New homes must be energy efficient homes and new homes that are not are not affordable to anyone except the developer.
FS-Case-315939416	linda aucott	option 1	There is no excuse for not meeting the new homes requirement and not providing affordable housing at the same time. If houses are to be built they must first meet affordable housing requirements! Building 5 bedroom 5 bathroom houses luxury should not be a priority. Well designed affordable housing requires creative thinking. A local fund or investment scheme could be promoted to facilitate this.
FS-Case-315947650	Rosalind Rapley	option 4	Unfortunately this needs to be changed from the top. There is housing standing empty in other parts of the country that need re-development, new jobs etc. rather than developing areas, where green sites end up being built on. We need to address the north/south divide. Affordable housing has become a joke, no recent developments have been forced to provide the so called affordable housing they have put into their applications. What is affordable anyway? More council housing needs to be built and proper starter homes, but this wouldn't be profitable for developers.
FS-Case-315959715	Paul Warren	option 4	I believe the council should invest heavily in building social housing (council housing) for local people to rent at realistically affordable prices. This would in turn free up privately rented properties for others to buy.
FS-Case-315961800	David & Mrs Wendy Lewis	option 4	Somehow, the development of new housing needs to be needs-driven, not profit-driven, and the provision of affordable housing for local people needs to be properly protected. That of course means action at Government level, but are there ways in which we could perhaps help that process locally? The beauty of East Devon makes it inevitably attractive to retirees and second-home owners, which in turn inflates prices and excludes poorer local people. Is there anything we can do to protect the latter? Is there a policy for, where possible, the reuse of appropriately refurbished empty and abandoned homes? (We note that is touched on later)
FS-Case-315962975	Nicolette Bitschi	option 4	Less building new homes, more conversions from industrial sites, ie Otter Mill and redundant shops and stores. No more builds on agricultural land, Must use brown field sites.
FS-Case-315963133	George Koopman	option 2	Consider whether excess numbers in one year can be carried forward into subsequent years (Hayne Farm, Honiton)
FS-Case-315967632	David Daniel	option 4	We need to resist the arbitrary Government figure which is based on "out of date" ONS data and seek a lower target. It is not sustainable. For example we will find it challenging to meet the employment numbers to match.
FS-Case-315968014	Eleanor Cozens	option 2	Suggest allocating total per community for the duration of the plan so that once reached, no more additional houses imposed. Consider increasing social housing through investment in Council Housing and/or Housing Associations. Include conversion of current retail properties into housing as part of targets.
FS-Case-315984133	Daphne CURRIER	option 1	The problem with the government directive is that it is not linking housing with local housing need or job opportunity. Other ways of providing affordable homes would be banning sale of new homes as second homes, levying a high council tax on second homes and unoccupied properties which could be rented out as social housing, introducing more council tax bands at the higher end to cover for lost CILS. In Exmouth I have been told- anecdotally- that the Marina was only about a third fully occupied

Ref No	Respondent	Q 8	Question 8 Comment
			before Covid. People bought these flats just as investments and not to live in or rent out. This is the problem with Devon.
FS-Case-315991192	Susan Clarke	option 4	Look at Brown land and allow more in filling before using prime green farm land.
FS-Case-316012231	Terry Sweeney	option 1	The Letwin Review showed how the housing market is broken. Small sites and self build should all count as affordable, and I would like you to work with HAs, CLTs, and others to maximize the mix of housing type that YOU identify as needed for the residents of East Devon. The New Town (NT) option may be a big help here. I would support EDDC becoming a developer, and being more proactive in master planning to achieve what is locally needed.
FS-Case-316013464	Michael Street	option 1	Is it possible for EDDC to build affordable homes independently of private developers
FS-Case-316014168	Nick Hookway	option 4	Increase the developer contribution from 25% to 33%. The Local plan must require an increase in affordable housing
FS-Case-316016071	David Hayler none	option 4	Consider the number of affordable housing then make up numbers with commercial housing rather than automatically build "Say 1.200" HOMES not houses.
FS-Case-316019373	Anthony Green	option 4	I have no trust in government estimates of number of new homes required, and think that local authorities should be more proactive in investing in schemes using smaller local builders to provide genuinely affordable housing to buy and RENT for local people.
FS-Case-316019433	Jennifer Morgan	option 4	Each community needs to be looked at for its own needs, not working on national Government requirements. If a tax was put on second home ownership, it could be used to help those communities buy existing houses and/or build homes for the first time buyers who are finding it increasingly difficult to stay within that community.
FS-Case-316023654	lauren allan	option 4	East Devon has 2/3 of its land under AONB status. If we work on a Government quota basis it places an unfair burden on the rest of the area. Really the housing need should be assessed locally and the evidence submitted. Better use of the existing housing stock, special Council taxes on second homes etc
FS-Case-316036693	Philip Wragg none	option 4	None of the above housing targets are appropriate as they do no more than follow central Government direction without consultation with the local population. We are currently in a pandemic, with increasing unemployment and reduced incomes. Also there is de-population post Brexit with East Europeans returning home. Thus the demand for housing is much reduced so the actual demand has to be proved rather than blindly building houses - East Devon residents do not want new houses.
FS-Case-316053199	Ben Evans	option 4	I do not agree with the government targets and how these have been calculated. I think the figures require a refresh post COVID and BREXIT. There are too many rich people with second homes or holiday rentals that could be used to meet our housing needs. You are also not building upwards you are focussed on building outwards! The footprint of a house built upwards is less than one built outwards.
FS-Case-316056741	Helene Jessop RSPB		As a nature conservation charity, RSPB does not have a view on the number of new homes that should be planned for each year but in meeting housing targets, East Devon District Council should ensure all new housing development adheres to the mitigation hierarchy for nature and provides biodiversity net gain.
FS-Case-316121149	Sam Piper	option 4	I still find the numbers of houses 'required' quite eye watering though I appreciate these numbers are somewhat out of EDDC's control. I don't see any evidence to suggest there is a huge demand for any more homes than 928 a year. Sure if you build them then people might relocate to the area but the argument not enough homes are being built doesn't wash with me personally when you see the vast developments at Cranbrook, Plumb Park at Exmouth etc. The population of East Devon has grown by circa 20,000 in the past 20 years. Staggeringly 18,560 homes (928 homes a year x 20 years) will equate to a population increase of nearly 44,544 (using ONS figures of 2.4 average persons to a home) which seems enough to me already without building more than requirements set by Whitehall. The term 'affordable housing' is often bounded around by larger developers in order to gain support for developments but so often it fails to materialise once planning is given the green light.

Ref No	Respondent	Q 8	Question 8 Comment
FS-Case-316125851	Diana jennings	option 4	CPRE considers that housing needs specified by the government are considerably higher than what is actually required so we would urge a reconsideration of the government's figures in consultation with organisations such as CPRE. Affordable housing - truly affordable for people on very low incomes - together with social housing for those who cannot afford their own houses, should be a priority.
FS-Case-316127402	Eleanor Rylance	option 1	I think we should plan for our government mandated number, but make a much larger proportion of them council-owned and social housing and genuinely affordable rents, with local connection criteria. We need to radically rethink how we are delivering social housing. The current methods are not working at delivering houses that local people can afford without wraparound benefits. Delivering social housing at passiv house standards would mean people could spend a whole lot less on energy. We need to do this not just to enable people to live dignified lives, but also to tackle climate change.
FS-Case-316129116	Dawn Chamberlain Payhembury Parish Council	option 4	The figure should be negative if truly want sustainability. Not politically acceptable as an answer and the government will force you to build them anyway.
FS-Case-316135438	George Williams Greensalde Taylor Hunt	option 3	Our client wholly supports option 3. At both a national and local level there is an undersupply of housing, and Local Authorities often seek to deliver their targets as a maximum, and many fall short of that figure. This has a knock on effect onto the affordability and suitability of housing, which in-turn has an effect on people's standards of living, as well as inequality in wider society. East Devon should set itself ambitious targets based on the figure of 1,614 dwellings which formed part of a sound plan by the Government of delivering in those areas that were capable. Increasing housing supply across the district not only helps to address housing shortages, but will also act a catalyst for further economic, social and environmental growth, helping East Devon District Council to achieve more of their objectives previously mentioned. Through the construction of new housing, comes the creation of more jobs, through construction as well as increased patronage of local services.
FS-Case-316136353	Bill Horner Historic Environment Team, Devon County Council		No comments
FS-Case-316147775	Mathieu Holladay	option 4	The government formula for the number of homes required has been shown to be flawed and because I'm aware of this I'm left being uncertain of how many homes East Devon actually needs. What is clear is that we need more small scale, locally built and self build properties because most large scale housing developers are building homes that are of a poor quality with many (sometimes serious) defects. Once properties are sold on by these big development companies the homeowners buying them are left footing the repair bills and grappling with the consequences because the developers simply abandon their obligations and escape being held to account.
FS-Case-316153559	Jacqueline Green	option 4	Please refer to CPRE report 'Devon Housing Needs Evidence, September 2018'
FS-Case-316158325	Paul Hayward Personal View only	option 1	We already have policies for affordability ratios. It's just that developers ignore them and seek to abrogate their responsibilities with viability claims. Simply upping the numbers won't change that mindset. We'll just end up with more MV houses than we needed and can reasonably sustain and cater for. I take exception to the loaded nature of Option 2 and 3 which create false narratives with ambiguous words such as "may" and "potentially" ... it's all about the question wording!
FS-Case-316158385	Sarah Jackson	option 1	I feel this is a VERY leading question designed to incite a specific reply through fear of not meeting affordability targets where this is clearly not the only consideration. inappropriate.
FS-Case-316159794	George Williams	option 3	Our client wholly supports option 3. At both a national and local level there is an undersupply of housing, and Local Authorities often seek to deliver their targets as a maximum, and many fall short of that figure. This has a knock on effect onto the

Ref No	Respondent	Q 8	Question 8 Comment
	Greenslade Taylor Hunt		<p>affordability and suitability of housing, which in-turn has an effect on people's standards of living, as well as inequality in wider society.</p> <p>East Devon should set itself ambitious targets based on the figure of 1,614 dwellings which formed part of a sound plan by the Government of delivering in those areas that were capable.</p> <p>Increasing housing supply across the district not only helps to address housing shortages, but will also act a catalyst for further economic, social and environmental growth, helping East Devon District Council to achieve more of their objectives previously mentioned. Through the construction of new housing, comes the creation of more jobs, ... (please refer to submitted Consultation Response document).</p>
FS-Case-316160103	Julie Moore	option 3	<p>In my experience it is nigh on impossible to make large developers deliver at faster rates unless it suits their business model (They know that if they over deliver ultimately they reduce demand and reduce the value of their houses. They are in it for a much longer timescale than any Local Plan) . If you identify more sites then you are at risk of under delivery of sites and increased claims at appeal with less control over well planned delivery.</p>
FS-Case-316176196	Adrian Toole	option 4	Build only 'affordable' homes.
FS-Case-316181550	Deborah Griffiths Devon Archaeologic al Society		No comments
FS-Case-316188495	George Williams Greenslade Taylor Hunt		<p>Our clients wholly support option 3. At both a national and local level there is an undersupply of housing, and Local Authorities often seek to deliver their targets as a maximum, and many fall short of that figure. This has a knock on effect onto the affordability and suitability of housing, which in-turn has an effect on people's standards of living, as well as inequality in wider society.</p> <p>East Devon should set itself ambitious targets based on the figure of 1,614 dwellings which formed part of a sound plan by the Government of delivering in those areas that were capable.</p> <p>Increasing housing supply across the district not only helps to address housing shortages, but will also act a catalyst for further economic, social and environmental growth, helping East Devon District Council to achieve more of their objectives previously mentioned. Through the construction of new housing, comes the creation of more jobs, through construction as well as increased patronage of local services.</p>
FS-Case-316222313	Kimberley Waterfall	option 4	<p>The government formula for the number of homes required has been shown to be flawed and because I'm aware of this I'm left being uncertain of how many homes East Devon actually needs. What is clear is that we need more small scale, locally built and self build properties because most large scale housing developers are building homes that are of a poor quality with many (sometimes serious) defects. Once properties are sold on by these big development companies the homeowners buying them are left footing the repair bills and grappling with the consequences because the developers simply abandon their obligations and escape being held to account.</p>
FS-Case-316240170	George Williams Greenslade Taylor Hunt	option 3	<p>Our clients wholly support option 3. At both a national and local level there is an undersupply of housing, and Local Authorities often seek to deliver their targets as a maximum, and many fall short of that figure. This has a knock on effect onto the affordability and suitability of housing, which in-turn has an effect on people's standards of living, as well as inequality in wider society. East Devon should set itself ambitious targets based on the figure of 1,614 dwellings which formed part of a sound plan by the Government of delivering in those areas that were capable. Increasing housing supply across the district not only helps to address housing shortages, but will also act a catalyst for further economic, social and environmental growth, helping East Devon District Council to achieve more of their objectives previously mentioned. Through the construction of new housing, comes the creation of more jobs, through construction as well as increased patronage of local services.</p>
FS-Case-316255332	Matthew Sherwood	option 1	Building houses just for the sake of it, makes no real sense. Local needs should be informed by a proper housing needs assessment.

Ref No	Respondent	Q 8	Question 8 Comment
FS-Case-316257871	robert pearcey	option 1	Planning for 'at least' the minimum allows adjustment to be made in future plans. Without full knowledge of how these new homes would impact local populations and their effect on roads and local facilities it doesn't seem appropriate to build without limits.
FS-Case-316333576	Rosalind Leveridge	option 1	I feel we have accepted so much new housing in Devon in the last decade. I understand government requirements need to be met, but I see no reason to exceed them.
FS-Case-316334732	K A Pearcey	option 1	928 to be a maximum with careful consideraion of site position and amenity details
FS-Case-316371196	Josie Denning	option 1	Building houses just for the sake of it, makes no real sense. Local needs should be informed by a proper housing needs assessment.
FS-Case-316377163	John Sherwood	option 1	We have to meet the government target whether we like it or not. There is an acknowledged need for more affordable housing and housing suitable for elderly residents which it would be desirable to set in mixed residential developments.
FS-Case-316444654	Eva Ingleson		Build less With the persistent development takng place in East Devon the area is losing the very thing it is renowned for - beautiful countryside. If restrictions were put on second home ownership in the area, more existing property would be freed up for people to live in reducing the need for so many houses to be built. Empty properties also need to be addressed and actioned
FS-Case-316474209	Janine Corkery	option 4	Too many green spaces are being built on and nature is being destroyed.
FS-Case-317286080	Stephen Canham	option 1	Option 1 supported by a totally new approach to providing social housing. (as outlined above) Simply increasing the number of houses built without addressing this fundamental flaw will simply result in the current situation being repeated. If private development has historically only delivered 10-15% Social Housing then building in total 3700-4600 new houses to meet the 461 p.a. social housing target and a total demand of 928 is patently absurd.
FS-Case-319425252	Peter Simmons	option 1	Renovate run down areas when increasing the supply of housing, don't just concrete over East Devon with low quality housing estates that won't last 50 years
FS-Case-323661989	Michael Gooch Boyer	option 3	<p>According to the latest ONS statistics, the ratio of median house price to median gross annual income in East Devon stood at 10.57 in 2019. This has increased from 6.00 in the year 2000. This indicates that East Devon District has one of the lowest affordability ratios of any Local Authority in England and Wales. This is despite the result of the Government's 2020 Housing Delivery Test showing that East Devon delivered has 122% of the required number of homes. It is therefore clear that, historically, insufficient numbers of new housing required have been below that required to help address local affordability.</p> <p>It is therefore considered that the Local Authority should plan for a significant uplift in planning housing provision n order to ensure the future housing need can be suitably met, including affordable housing need. This would also provide additional flexibility in the supply of land help avoid</p> <p>In this regard, residential sites such as Land at Langaton Lane and Mosshayne La</p>
FS-Case-324952647	Lawrence Turner Boyer Planning	option 2	Please refer to submitted representations.
FS-Case-324964822	Sarah Jackson	option 1	I feel this is a VERY leading question designed to incite a specific reply through fear of not meeting affordability targets where this is clearly not the only consideration. Inappropriate!
FS-Case-324977684	Simon Collier Collier Planning	option 3	Please refer to submitted representations.

Ref No	Respondent	Q 8	Question 8 Comment
FS-Case-324988465	Simon Collier Collier Planning	option 3	Please refer to submitted representations.
FS-Case-324999075	David Morgan Not Applicable	option 1	Please refer to submitted representations.
FS-Case-325010263	Nick Freer David Lock Associates		Please refer to submitted representations.
FS-Case-325030287	John Withrington N/A	option 1	Local needs for housing should be driven by local input (e.g. NPs), and a critical eye when it comes to Government estimates of required [sic] build. Most importantly, one of the lessons of the covid pandemic in the last year has been the increase in home working. This practice is likely to continue to be popular, and housing estimates will surely need to be revised downwards as a result.
FS-Case-325037488	Ed Salter LDA Design		Please see attached letter
FS-Case-325041454	East Devon and Tiverton & Honiton CLPs	option 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · To build with a higher quota for affordable housing of 33%, with a 5-10% social housing quota. · Priority to build council houses rather than housing association houses. · Affordable housing prices should be linked to average income rather than property prices. · Very few (if any) of these homes should be second-homes. Second home owners drive property prices up and price local people out. A council tax strategy could aid this.
FS-Case-325053097	Ed Persse EJJ Planning Ltd	option 3	See attached submission.
FS-Case-325070883	Emma Russell	option 4	I don't accept the premise that we keep needing to build more executive and luxury homes, nor more retirement homes (given the restrictive nature of these premises and the rip-off tendencies of the management companies that run them). The plan should concentrate purely on affordable quality homes. How one calculates the requirement in an area I don't know, but I wouldn't trust any politician to come up with an appropriate number, Until we understand how the region will change in employment opportunities how can we possibly know how many houses are required?
FS-Case-325077531	I.G. Cann Exmouth Civic Society	option 1	Please see attached submission.
FS-Case-325085151	Matthew Kendrick Grass Roots Planning	option 3	See Separate Representations Document
FS-Case-325107229	George Williams Greenslade Taylor Hunt	option 3	Please refer to submitted representations.
FS-Case-325124589	Glynnis Poole LiveWest	option 3	Please refer to submitted representations.
FS-Case-325131855	Michelle Dobrota-Gibbs N/A	option 2	Please refer to submitted representations.
FS-Case-325156112	Peter Dobbs	option 1	Please refer to submitted representations.
FS-Case-325170882	Dorothy Taylor Exmouth Mental Health St John's Court	option 4	Please refer to submitted representations.

Ref No	Respondent	Q 8	Question 8 Comment
	Carers' Group		
FS-Case-325549089	Ken Pearson Stockland Parish Council	option 4	During publication of the NPPF 2018 the target number of homes required was quoted by the Government as 300,000, yet using the 2016 Housing growth projections the Government target was then cut from 269,000 to 213,000! So what figure should be used when dealing with historic under-delivery, the main cause found by ONS? Local Plans are stuck with an express requirement to have a 5 year supply of deliverable sites, produce a buffer and an annual position statement, when it is developers with Planning Approval who decide when and whether to build, not the LPA!
FS-Case-325726521	Simon Coles Tetra Tech Planning	option 3	Policies relating to the delivery of new homes should be aspirational and incorporate flexibility so as to maintain an appropriate supply of housing in the right places. This will give the best opportunity to meet identified need for market and affordable housing, as well as for other delivery models and tenures.
FS-Case-325731054	Andrew Ardley South Western Railway	option 2	Provides more certainty about the delivery and funding of infrastructure with the ability to also focus development in larger sites.
FS-Case-325812938	Nick Matthews Savills	option 3	See attached.
FS-Case-325829612	Dan Yeates Savills	option 2	Please refer to submitted representation.
FS-Case-325831870	Cem Kosaner Lichfields	option 3	Please see attached comments.
FS-Case-325838141	Dan Yeates Savills	option 2	Please refer to submitted representations.