

## Question 9 - Sites for small scale housing developments

Paragraphs 5.5 to 5.7 of the Issues and Options report sets out Government policy that at least 10% of new homes should be built on smaller sites (below 1 hectare). This provides more opportunities for smaller, local businesses and is more likely to reflect local character than mass produced homes. We highlighted options, however, of providing more than 10%.

**Option 1** – Allocate or identify land for around 10% of homes to be on small sites

**Option 2** – Allocate or identify land for around 11% to 15% of homes to be on small sites

**Option 3** – Allocate or identify land for 26% to 50% of homes to be on small sites

**Option 4** – Allocate or identify land for 51% or more of homes to be on small sites

**Option 5** – None of the above

Those that made comment said.

Ref No	Respondent	Q 9	Question 9 Comment
FS-Case-297507653	Kate Duggan	option 5	I'm not sure how this would work in practice. My concern would be that it could lead to more building in villages that are already struggling to cope with increased traffic etc.
FS-Case-297785613	Kim Sankey Angel Architecture Ltd	option 1	See above - NP's already identify and account for small developments so is this quantified or are these the windfall sites?
FS-Case-297949549	Martin Thurgood	option 1	Major East Devon growth relates to Exeter city: to that end, Cranbrook new town is being established and this should be the focus of housing growth, including its acceleration if required. The need for further housing development, no matter the size of the project, is then the driver for finding sites of an appropriate size. The Central Government's 'one-size-fits-all' policy of 10% on smaller sites is not necessarily appropriate for East Devon. The most appropriate way forward that meets all policy commitments is to break-up the Cranbrook new town development into smaller zones so that the '10%' target can be fully met at the Cranbrook development.
FS-Case-299321852	William R Palmer	option 5	There are vast areas in EDDC that could be used for social housing. Examples include: in town centres over shops; in the spaces over single story supermarkets; in the space over bungalows. It is bordering on criminal to despoil greenfield sites whilst there are so many single storey buildings wasting space
FS-Case-299521339	mark readman Rockbeare Parish Council	option 1	Rockbeare Parish Neighbourhood agrees with is approach. While protecting countryside and Green wedge (Rock 06) we do advocate allowing developments in small plots within development limits under set conditions (Rock 07) and on land that will supports this - NOT FLOOD PLAINS
FS-Case-299861217	Heath Nickels Exmouth Wildlife Group	option 2	This, again goes back to the agreed spatial strategy: Distribution of development ( see Chapter 13) that the council adopts. This distribution analysis will inform the likely land supply and its location: 1. If the percentage of land analysed reflects smaller land areas ( below 1 hectare) then smaller builders/ developers would be a favoured option (aligned to the options above) 2. If the percentage of land analysed is larger than these 1 hectare areas, then larger developers would need to be involved.  Whichever one ( or mixture of ) is true then it is vital that EDDC sets out the design principles and STANDARDS that meet the aspirations for health and well-being; the climate and Biodiversity emergencies; sustainable transport etc.
FS-Case-300714787	Blank - No Name	option 3	There are many smaller sites that can be developed e.g. the famous brown field sites that developers do not like. Local village plans should include potential sites along with appropriate open spaces.
FS-Case-300872971	Ian Wasson	option 1	But within current BUAB's whenever possible.

Ref No	Respondent	Q 9	Question 9 Comment
FS-Case-3011794 21	Mark HUMPHRIES	option 1	only within curtilage of existing villages/towns. No expansion outside of existing footprints
FS-Case-3013453 04	JANICE ALEXANDER Devon Rural Housing Partnership	option 2	Option 2 is ambitious but attainable. I think that the parameters are too large - perhaps 15% - 20% would be better. Small sites are extremely important in rural areas as most of the developments there are fairly small scale. SME builders need to be encouraged and supported which not only brings smaller sites forward but provides employment in local areas. Any higher percentage as in options 3 and 4 would not deliver the numbers that are required to meet the government targets as there are not that many small sites available and not enough SME builders to undertake the work. Volume housebuilders will still be needed to build the high number of new homes required. There are also economies of scale so small sites are far more expensive to deliver than larger sites.
FS-Case-3023128 89	john aldrred	option 1	Protect villages from being overwhelmed by more and more development spreading from their outskirts
FS-Case-3025494 97	simon davidson	option 2	I think that Option 2 gives more opportunity for integrating new houses into existing communities without causing the huge disruption of developing major new sites with all of the infrastructure impact that results.
FS-Case-3026407 46	Hazel Jeffery	option 1	Yes but bear in mind that developers are trying to maximise their profit, and therefore will not be putting in homes that are actually needed in the area. For example, smaller bungalows for older people to move into, thus freeing up family homes for the market.
FS-Case-3029125 62	Paul Gamble	option 3	Whilst developments like Cranbrook in theory deliver large numbers of housing, in reality they raise many challenges. Just one example is the shortfall in the financing associated with delivering large new infrastructures and services. Cranbrook is already experiencing this. East Devon is too reliant on large developers/developments. When this limited number of large developments slow and don't deliver at the speed originally forecast, the impact can be rapid and considerable. East Devon has too many eggs in too few baskets. In addition, as stated earlier, Covid 19 has had a significant impact on where people wish to live with substantial numbers looking to move out of towns and cities to more rural locations and into properties with larger gardens. East Devon needs to encourage many more small builders/developers and self builders to spread the risk. This will also result in the raising of standards in regard to build quality and targets towards net zero carbon.
FS-Case-3029711 65	Richard Thurlow Sid Vale Association	option 5	All these targets are arbitrary: the approach should be to see how many suitable small sites can be identified.
FS-Case-3037342 12	Cassie Thornton	option 2	Houses should definitely be in keeping with the character of the local area and support local communities and businesses. However it shouldn't impact negatively to areas e.g if building more houses then proper infrastructure and public transport needs to be sufficient
FS-Case-3037912 82	Maureen Chandler	option 5	again - first must be housing for our young people - at affordable prices or for rent - the sale of our council housing stock has decimated this vital need - it should be stopped
FS-Case-3042105 44	David Beazley Sainthill Baptist Church	option 2	I'm not in a position to say what % would be appropriate, but in principle this is a right thing I believe, with areas of available (brown field?) land in established communities being used.
FS-Case-3061758 15	chistopher Burton	option 2	I understand the need for more housing and large builders can more easily supply the need, but we are in danger of these developments becoming too large and impersonal. I feel a balance in our rural areas should show more individuality which could be better supplied by local builders who are more sympathetic to the future effects of their developments on the environment.
FS-Case-3062377 29	Geoff Crawford	option 5	It is not for EDDC to "identify" development sites, it is for developers to do that and for EDDC to approve or otherwise depending on the views of those living in the area of proposed development.

Ref No	Respondent	Q 9	Question 9 Comment
FS-Case-306256851	Simon Rennie		no comment see objective 10 section 12 questions
FS-Case-306262278	Tamara Goldschmidt (None)	option 4	As long as this means that a smaller site doesn't mean very small homes in order for a developer to meet their housing quota
FS-Case-306308166	Sylvia Meller	option 5	This sounds like a great plan for developers to build shoebox -sized places for a premium sale. As said before, build vertical instead of horizontal, make sure places are really affordable without compromising on space. Stop building non-affordable houses (like 90% at the moment)
FS-Case-306915743	Catherine Kingham	option 5	Before building further homes, my comments in Question 8 should be addressed - i.e. that of empty properties, second homes etc.
FS-Case-307126895	Daren Richards	option 4	This should be a choice for local land owners
FS-Case-307127261	Julie Lewis	option 4	Let's avoid the likes of any more Bradley Stokes in South Gloucestershire. I have just moved from that barren landscape! Let's have smaller developments which provide jobs for local people, and build small communities which look out for each other, and have low crime rates, more variety of buildings etc.
FS-Case-307313176	Jonne Ceserani	option 5	Reference my previous comments, if second home ownership was tackled over time more local property would come on to the market. I recognise this is a very radical approach but I think this is necessary to get a mind shift in how we manage development in local tourist communities and there will be pain to make the change. In line with this I would prefer all small sites using local companies. COVID is showing us that local is better and possible.
FS-Case-307389332	Stephen Crook	option 5	No greenfield development, brownfield only.
FS-Case-307482014	G. Millard	option 1	Preferably, low cost housing, infilling and redevelopment of 'brown sites'. Especially if a 'New Town' is proposed.
FS-Case-307991316	Susan Cooper	option 1	These allocated sites to be provided in the West End, the 7 larger towns, small towns, larger villages (with over 1500 population) primarily outside the AONB. No allocations to villages in the AONB with a population of less than 1500.
FS-Case-307992623	Deirdre Jennings	option 3	How would this affect the % of affordable housing?
FS-Case-308043356	David Williamson	option 2	Must be hand in hand with infrastructure & public transport access.
FS-Case-308045888	roger staten	option 3	Expand farms
FS-Case-308046720	Jonathan Page	option 5	Small sites will encourage urban spread into our small villages and hamlets, destroying the very nature of the area. Keep them in large concentrated areas that have already been ruined by bad planning policy in the past
FS-Case-308046866	Simon Greenslade	option 5	Any developments need to be in existing available areas , and not using existing green spaces. We are losing far too much of our countryside to development.
FS-Case-308049835	Peter Duncan	option 5	Allocate and identify land that is not green belt, in AONB and minimise over development and maintain green space. Not just to hit targets.
FS-Case-308065272	robert hinks	option 4	Cementing /housing over large swathes of east Devon i( ie cranbrook )s ethically and enviromentaly abhorrent and detrimental to human and ecological quality of life , smaller but quality thought out projects are preferable and more sustainable

Ref No	Respondent	Q 9	Question 9 Comment
FS-Case-3080718 16	Gillian Cameron- Webb n/r	option 4	We definitely need to radically change the nature of house building in East Devon, the big developers and landowners don't seem to care about East Devon at all, they only care about their profits. I include local big developers Cavanna & Clinton Devon Estates in this, their focus on profits can be seen in their cramped estates (e.g. in Budleigh/Knowle) their unimaginative design (e.g. the new housing estate at Clyst St Mary) and their failure to deliver promised infrastructure (the doctor's surgery in Newton Poppleford). For all the reasons given in paragraph 5.7 I definitely agree with building the absolute maximum of small sites, including self builds, using small local builders.
FS-Case-3080722 38	Robert Cooper	option 5	Affordable housing should only be for local people. Not used to draw in undesirable tenants in from deprived areas.
FS-Case-3080741 83	Benedict McGuigan	option 4	the large scale developments generally lack character and smaller ones could be better designed to be part of the community
FS-Case-3081053 98	Jane Ashton Please choose	option 4	In truth I'd need explanation of exactly how this option 4 would change the nature of house building in East Devon. Sprawling estates can be such lonesome places and can lack character. We want to build new small communities within existing communities near facilities. A pipe-dream perhaps.
FS-Case-3081058 11	Timothy Bell	option 2	Aim for a level higher than government standards, however too high a number would result in greater impact to the natural landscape that we live in. The locality is dependent on rural tourism, and assigning too high a value to this type of development would dramatically impact the face of local villages which are a draw to tourists.
FS-Case-3081115 47	janice watkins	option 4	Large estates are not appropriate in east devon as they can change the balance of communities, and all new homes should be on small developments.
FS-Case-3081559 66	Vivien Rands	option 1	As we are already meeting housing needs with Cranbrook, it is important not to swamp smaller communities, more importantly without the necessary infrastructure.
FS-Case-3081584 61	sally mumford george woods (sw)ltd	option 4	east devon is a big place , the population is growing , things need to change
FS-Case-3081680 70	Norman Reeder	option 2	as mentioned above, self-build is important as are small (5 to 10) property developments as these develop communities far more than new towns like Cranbrook.
FS-Case-3081777 03	Judith Ferrier	option 5	See reply to question 8
FS-Case-3081998 82	Bernadette Steadman	option 3	I almost went for option 4. Places such as Honiton have been disfigured by huge swathes of estates, whereas even the smallest villages can take a small development (See Chardstock). Estates are for the benefit of builders, not users. Fit houses where possible into the community - don't build whole new communities if you don't have to. It's much more effective for social cohesion to integrate 20 families into an existing community, rather than expect 800 families to find their feet at one go. Also, because the huge developers would not be interested in smaller sites, the way is open for the small to medium size builder, who can better accommodate the area's needs.
FS-Case-3082101 21	Cariad Eccleston	option 4	I feel like being open-minded to smaller sites will increase our options for builds, and give more opportunities to local builders.
FS-Case-3082312 55	Martin Seymour	option 4	The objective should be to build self sustaining communities for a diverse range of people.
FS-Case-3082566 53	Della Cannings	option 2	Should be a minimum of 25% .. so better designed, less impact on areas, and encourage local builders.
FS-Case-3082683 15	Tracy Simmons Cranbrook	option 1	The development of small sites leads to unsustainable development and more car journeys to work, shops and leisure. Option 1 is preferred although, whilst that is the best of the options, it may not go far enough.

Ref No	Respondent	Q 9	Question 9 Comment
	Town Council		
FS-Case-308288718	Emily Davis	option 4	It would have to be strictly controlled, but yes. Large-scale building has to go. Smaller, better-built, eco-friendly homes built on old industrial or repurposed brown land is the way to go.
FS-Case-308324058	Jack Slim	option 2	A  I think the idea of smaller developments is what is needed. For example, Ottery St Mary has two huge edge of town developments with minimum local facilities. This means people have to get in a car to get basic provisions or a newspaper. Better to concentrate large new developments in new towns such as Cranbrook. Also I detect very little affordable dwellings in those developments.
FS-Case-308326362	Peter Eastwood N/A	option 4	The need for Council rented property is 'absolute' if the young are to remain in East Devon.
FS-Case-308410804	David Forward Domestic	option 2	Identify room for expansion of main towns and avoid flood plains and low lying coastal areas
FS-Case-308433805	Kerry Carr	option 4	I think all the large housing estates that are built do not reflect the character of the town's in which they are built & are so generic they could be placed on any town, city or village anywhere in this country. Smaller developments would be much more likely to have more character & individuality and fit in better with the town or village they are in.
FS-Case-308520714	Peter Brain	option 3	2 or 3 The dilemma here is that affordable housing is difficult for small builders to achieve. Building for rent by housing associations and by the council itself seems to be outside the scope of this survey, but should be encouraged.
FS-Case-308527556	Kevin Staddon	option 5	None, small becomes medium and then large.
FS-Case-308546698	Noel Allan	option 5	Allowing smaller sites is just encouraging greater inappropriate development in rural areas; would result in far more building creeping in unnoticed until too late.
FS-Case-308588780	Patricia Boyd	option 2	In addition, identify small/infill/redevelopment sites that could be used for self-build projects. Sometimes these could be very tiny for 1 to 2 as well as larger areas that could be dedicated to say 20-30 self-builds. Self-builds should produce high quality, more energy-efficient housing than from commercial developers and will also contribute to housing targets
FS-Case-308594020	Michael Harris	option 2	Building on smaller sites should encourage local builders and support the local economy.
FS-Case-308618646	Christopher Eccles	option 3	there are plenty of small scale brownfield development opportunities around - it just needs a more practical and flexible approach to make these simpler to deliver.
FS-Case-308638086	Robin Barker	option 5	As in 8 - look also at far better use of existing underutilised properties. In parallel with using land where it does not impact on the nature of existing housing (eg housing at the end of current villages with rural outlooks)
FS-Case-308655667	Jan Gannaway Exmouth Wildlife Group + Active Travel Exmouth	option 2	Easier to integrate smaller developments into local communities. Spreads the impact of extra traffic rather than having huge estates
FS-Case-308685349	Carol Wheeler Company Name (optional)	option 5	Can't find relevant paragraphs, link stopped working. Stop building on gardens, towns need these green spaces

Ref No	Respondent	Q 9	Question 9 Comment
FS-Case-308690532	Martin Weller	option 5	Case by case analysis.
FS-Case-308724025	Damian Coombes	option 2	Large developments in rural locations such as East Devon stand out in the landscape, and also the supporting infrastructure is not there for large numbers of housing. The two current large developments prove this, the limited access is already a visible issue.
FS-Case-308801635	L Martin	option 2	At the same time, I don't want to lose all our green spaces. However, without communities we are lost!
FS-Case-308930499	Lisa Bowman Exmouth Town Council	option 2	Option 2 improves communities. Also, we need to outlaw situations where developers can abuse planning legislation thresholds to avoid delivery of affordable housing through phased planning applications on larger sites.
FS-Case-308948443	Karin Goodfellow	option 2	A higher proportion of small sites could encourage further infilling, i.e. an escalation of the current garden grabbing development.
FS-Case-309114723	Robert Anthony	option 3	Plans for " Garden Villages" inevitably encounter major local resistance and therefore delays, small scale developments are more likely to be completed quickll
FS-Case-309131539	Daniel Bristowe	option 2	Would help to improve the use of local tradesmen and encourage the younger generation with apprenticeships where viable.
FS-Case-309139032	David Lord	option 3	Redevelopment of old retail or brown field sites suits smaller builders.
FS-Case-309293778	Paul Smith	option 2	<p>Primary house building should be concentrated towards localised affordable and social needs which are best met within the towns, villages and small communities where they exist. This will require a revisit of the Villages Plan, in respect of limited development beyond build up boundaries.</p> <p>If a quality of life is to be maintained for all EDDC residents, with the prerequisite of access to open green space, it is untenable to preclude some development within 66% of AONB, especially where there is an established localised need for affordable/social housing. Such minimalised development is totally within the remit and spirit of the NPPF.</p> <p>The only proviso for all development proposed above, would be that a % of such provision must remain social/affordable into PERPETUITY.</p>
FS-Case-309383731	Val Ranger	option 5	This is a difficult one. In the previous draft villages local plan, it was stated that villages might grow at 5%. The inspector felt this was a high percentage for villages such as Newton Popleford and stated so in his review so the draft plan had to be amended. It now turns out NP had many more houses than that forced upon it in just a few years since the existing local plan was adopted in 2016. NP had 53 new houses built just in 2019. Some villages formerly considered unsuitable for development had local demand. I support a whole village survey being done for exception sites with a 66% minimum of affordable housing on, no matter what the size of the site overall. eg if there were 3 houses built, 2 should be affordable.
FS-Case-309385676	Roger Pell	option 4	More Social Housing
FS-Case-309401093	Philip Jordan	option 3	Smaller developments will lead to a better environment for old and new residences and also would, with careful pre-planning, allow development of existing medical, transport and education amenities to cope with the growth.
FS-Case-309425268	Pamela Dean	option 5	Identify land for affordable homes on small scale
FS-Case-309456508	Ian Birch	option 2	Sadly I doubt we could meet the number of houses required by going for such small-scale developments - attractive though that prospect is. Insistence on reflecting local character should apply whatever the size of development - the big developers would grumble, but if so, then exclude them. Get innovative in forming consortia of local builders and trades, and support their supply chains to provide high design variety.



Ref No	Respondent	Q 9	Question 9 Comment
			Which are the most attractive townscapes? Those where each building is different to its neighbours!
FS-Case-309465143	Daisy mclauchlan	option 4	The nature of housebuilding has to change in East Devon. How can it not? The West End can not longer take the fallout of government policy. Young people live in the AONB's as well, how will they ever be able to stay in these areas unless we provide accommodation that they can afford. East Devon need to build in every town and village and start soon
FS-Case-309478869	Rosemary Birch	option 2	Giving smaller, local buiders the opportunity to build smaller developments would be a good thing. They would be more likely to be in tune with local requirements in terms of design, size and construction materials and would be providing employment to local people. But, forcing small villages to 'find' spaces for small developments just to satisfy a pre set % would be undesirable.
FS-Case-309561897	Maria Malinowska	option 3	Small developments are in keeping with traditional Devon villages.
FS-Case-309583339	Andy Bourne	option 5	If a smaller site is appropriate, then fine, allocate it to housing. But do not set an arbitrary target!
FS-Case-309588076	Carol Jay Transition Exmouth	option 1	Any new build should be to the highest environmental standards . A demonstration property should be included in each newbuild area to showcase techniques which can be retrofitted to existing property
FS-Case-309614514	DAVE LEWIS	option 5	New homes should be built on all available land already marked for housing or urbanisation before building on agricultural land or other green field areas. There is lots of such land in small developments in many urban areas already. This would ensure the infrastructure for such development is already in place.
FS-Case-309879551	David Goodfellow	option 2	Option 1 could encourage infills and "garden grabbing" which must be should be discouraged
FS-Case-310067578	Terry Redgers N/A	option 5	It shouldn't be about %'s it should be about actual local needs and practicalities of achieving developments that meet all the best building standards along with energy efficiency.
FS-Case-310194190	WAYNE SUMMERS	option 4	Small local developments FOR LOCALS ONLY
FS-Case-310202766	Anthony Derrick	option 5	Curb the demand for new homes by not allowing 2nd homes and reducing demand for holiday let homes
FS-Case-310214396	Karan Bennett Bishops Clyst Parish Council	option 3	In an area such as East Devon, with a large number of smaller communities, the opportunity to provide limited growth across a range of sites would help with local sustainability This would also lower the impact of development on existing communities.
FS-Case-310327426	Amy Roberts Bell Cornwell LLP		Please see attached sheet.
FS-Case-310456969	Penny Kurowski	option 2	The rural nature of East Devon is, in my opinion, being put at risk from some of the huge developments that are already being built.
FS-Case-310579594	Richard Lawrence	option 1	Again concentrating on the infrastructure for support
FS-Case-310604804	Sarah Alana Sayers Farringdon Parish Council	option 5	Farringdon Neighbourhood Plan 8. Built Environment, Heritage and Housing Overview 8.8  Farringdon Neighbourhood Plan Housing Needs Survey 2019 and consultations on the Neighbourhood Plan has established that the community is not opposed to a "small number" of dwellings being built for local people, but any future housing development needs to be small in scale and should be aimed at satisfying a discernible local need that cannot be met within the neighbourhood area or a reasonable distance from it.

Ref No	Respondent	Q 9	Question 9 Comment
FS-Case-310728087	Josephine Ash		I would like to see small sites near towns and villages used in preference to vast, new greenfield sites. Better for town centre rejuvenation, less car use, end of unsightly unused brownfield sites.
FS-Case-310810698	Janice Owen	option 3	Having smaller sites would help communities retain their character.
FS-Case-310963665	Wendy Rowing	option 5	Just build new big housing villages where the infrastructure can be built as needed, leaving just a house here or there to be built in smaller communities.
FS-Case-310965690	Victoria Serag-El-Din	option 3	Greater positive environmental impact, shopping locally etc.  Allow smaller developers, builders and self builders to compete in the market and promote a more diverse built environment as a result.
FS-Case-310974350	Ian Smith	option 2	Important to enhance not detract from the physical nature of and quality of life in communities large and small to which small scale developments are added.
FS-Case-310982347	Peter WRIGHT	option 2	My answer in part to the previous question covers the need for small scale local development
FS-Case-311523569	Kevin Clarke	option 3	I would like to see smaller projects close to existing villages increasing sustainability and community for villages of a reasonable size (school and some community facilities) not always just fixated on car travel
FS-Case-311530475	Jon Brown	option 3	I strongly favour small sites rather than large estates, however that does not mean that we cannot create new villages or even small towns.
FS-Case-311637333	David Lloyd	option 1	Small scale development is sometimes necessary to keep communities alive with, especially, younger parents with families. Most development should be within the larger towns and / or near major road networks.
FS-Case-311663864	Jim Moon	option 5	Again, EDDC is far to developed as it is. The loss of habitat and our environment are a travesty.
FS-Case-311693209	Jeremy Woodward Vision Group for Sidmouth	option 1	The only limit to the new LP policy is that each site should be no more than 1 hectare, which could allow for several small-scale sites being developed in the Sid Valley - and this could amount to more than 10% of new homes.  These criteria would match Sid Valley NP Policy 10 which allows for small-scale housing development, with a maximum of 15 dwellings as 'exception site' residential development of land bordering the BUAB – almost all of which lies in protected AONB. Nevertheless, NP Policy 9 specifies that “outside of the BUAB there will be a general presumption against new residential development.”  “In the replies to the Second Household Survey as to where any building outside the BUAB should take place, only a very small proportion of respondents identified any such sites. In fact, the most popular response to this question was that any new housing should be in “brownfield sites’, within the BUAB.”
FS-Case-311868155	Martin Dowse	option 3	Look at brownfield potential and infill around local communities. Plan social housing developments as in the 1930,50,s?
FS-Case-312142504	David Broom	option 3	Many larger towns do not have the infrastructure to support additional homes, with provision for schools, health care and sports facilities are already stretched. Smaller scale developments add to communities, ensuring the sustainability of local facilities. Smaller developments assist local economy through retaining investment in local companies /developers, rather than large national companies benefiting.
FS-Case-312184112	Linda Lowes N/A	option 1	I would like most of the housing to be built on brownfield sites - including unsightly holiday parks.
FS-Case-312251067	Neal Jillings Place Land Ltd	option 3	Housebuilding is monopolised by the larger concerns. Requiring more development on smaller sites will allow smaller housebuilders to provide housing, where there is currently less supply of these type of sites. I don't accept that this will be more likely to reflect local character at all, but it will help smaller developers and businesses and deliver homes more quickly once the industry catches up. Infrastructure planning must



Ref No	Respondent	Q 9	Question 9 Comment
			take lots of small sites coming forward into account rather than relying on huge strategic sites to provide the necessary infrastructure.
FS-Case-312255566	Stephen sadler	option 5	None of the options 1-4 take into consideration the reality of the Devon development so far undertaken. I practice it sounds good, but in the reality all we will see is the planning process flooded with these small site developments. Therefore what would the benefit be to the local towns in which they build? how will they add to the community, and what will they provide to the community in way of improved services
FS-Case-312317917	Steven Walton	option 5	As previously stated allocating targets for housing causes more disruption to rural communities. We should be looking to use brownfield sites, such as shop closures in the towns to meet the housing requirements.
FS-Case-312431413	Bruce Thomson	option 2	This would help local builders who cannot purchase large development sites
FS-Case-312449388	George Williams Greenslade Taylor Hunt	option 5	<p>Smaller sites are often delivered more quickly than larger sites. They also offer small and medium developers to compete, strengthening the local and national economy. Smaller schemes within and on the edge of sustainable villages allows those communities to grow in a commensurate way whilst contributing to the district's wider housing ambitions.</p> <p>As such, there should be an ambition to deliver at least 26% of the required housing through smaller sites but there does not need to be such a restrictive figure of one hectare used to identify a 'small site'. Rather, there should be general support of the benefits of smaller sites around but not explicitly at the one hectare mark.</p> <p>The Globe Hill site at Woodbury would assist the Council in meeting the above mentioned benefits.</p>
FS-Case-312482944	Peter Bowler NA	option 1	Villages should remain as villages, needing only small infill building to cater for the local population. As mentioned above, estates should only be contemplated near large towns with employment prospects.
FS-Case-312655834	Theresa Sanders	option 3	<p>Smaller site development on brownfield sites where possible, is preferable to .... reduce impact on local communities, infrastructure and environment and aid integration</p> <p>deter 'big profit making' corporations /developers</p> <p>provide local and smaller business opportunities</p>
FS-Case-312726461	Anthony Bevan N/A	option 5	The suggestion that small scale housing developments is a good idea, and is consistent with the need to utilise brown field sites as a first option. It is not however for the EDDC to arbitrarily identify sites to a set target, especially where this would be in conflict with neighbourhood plans.
FS-Case-312744056	Christina Skinner	option 5	Need to look at this on a case by case basis. If only small developments were in villages this would be better but there could be more built on brownfield or urban areas looking at land where buildings were previously. Always being mindful not to 'swamp' areas with housing. Look carefully at infrastructure such as roads, schools, doctors and other resources to make sure they will cope with any additional housing
FS-Case-312781179	Carine Silver	option 5	Prove there is a need for these new homes first. If there is, then infill building (small sites WITHIN EXISTING BUILT-UP BOUNDARIES) should be prioritised, including brown-field development. Small sites situated at some way from facilities means more roads, more cars less opportunity for joined up public transport. Small sites MUST be within or adjacent to existing built-up areas IF THEY ARE ACTUALLY NEEDED.
FS-Case-312788353	Rosemary Walker	option 2	The main disadvantage of small sites is that developers try and build as many houses as possible which overlook each other and deny privacy. Unfortunately the planning dept. approve these schemes.
FS-Case-312793696	Margaret Hall West Hill Parish Council	option 2	<p>The need for smaller sites may vary with the settlement – it would certainly be appropriate for a village such as West Hill, where individuality of style is important. In general we consider that smaller sites improve design quality and support the local building industry. Smaller sites are more likely to maintain the character of the area. It is important to maintain the distinctiveness of existing areas – e.g. we wouldn't want West Hill to become a suburb of Ottery St Mary.</p> <p>Larger sites could be split amongst developers.</p> <p>The capability of infrastructure must be considered alongside site allocations.</p>
FS-Case-312802318	Alan Dent	option 1	Maintaining the character of our local communities and villages is really important

Ref No	Respondent	Q 9	Question 9 Comment
FS-Case-312869806	PHILIP LOAT	option 3	There are many small brownfield sites that could be used for affordable housing. It has been too easy for local councils to give in to big developers to build on large sites with poor transport access and who in the end provide very little affordable housing.
FS-Case-312949492	Janet Caudwell	option 2	Small sites are particularly appropriate for development attached to small villages. They are less likely to overwhelm the existing householders and change the character of the village. This may also mean they are less likely to attract strong opposition. Perhaps there is a desirable ratio for new versus existing dwellings?
FS-Case-313155665	Catherine Dandridge	option 1	Smaller developments are often more in keeping & sensitive to local area however these might impact more on AONB & wildlife, neither should these be isolated developments without connection with other towns/villages and/or with easy access to public transport.
FS-Case-313233811	Phil Golder	option 5	All homes should be built by local housebuilders where possible, regardless of the size of site (I assume large sites could be split up, if necessary?). However, all housebuilders must ensure that new houses are zero carbon, create minimal waste and are, as far as possible, energy self sufficient.
FS-Case-313343575	Joanna Burkey	option 4	If we have to build houses, there are plenty of small brown field sites that could be used or using smaller green field sites would have less impact and likely be of a higher quality.
FS-Case-313459444	Mike Allen EDDC	option 2	Small amounts of growth in selected rural areas should be allowed along with careful additions to our towns. No growth greater than 25-30 houses per site should be allowed in AONB areas
FS-Case-313468624	Caroline Dartnall	option 4	smaller developments better for people and communities and less of a look of big housing estates
FS-Case-313523282	Gary Barlow	option 2	There are countless pockets of land around the county that would easily build 10 or so homes that due to planners don't get passed, but the big developers get whatever they want whenever they want. And there will 100% be some form of corruption happening here with kick backs.
FS-Case-313529843	Simon Spencer Simon Spencer MCIAT	option 2	small housing developers feel penalised by CIL, whereas the large developers can absorb the cost by penalising the land owner on the purchase price for the land which is correct, but small developers struggle with this in their purchase negotiations.
FS-Case-313533757	Patrick Sinnott	option 2	It is important to encourage local contractors to build these new housing developments.
FS-Case-313542858	Judith Heathcock	option 1	Only if this is absolutely necessary! As I have previously said, there is plenty of space already available.
FS-Case-313603740	Eileen Beech	option 5	I think houses should be built where there is suitable land, large or small areas. The design of the development must meet local needs of transport, schools, employment and health service accessibility.
FS-Case-313608804	Susan Child	option 4	I am not an expert in this field, but a lot of the mass building that has been going on around Devon seems crammed, anonymous & lacking green spaces, trees & infrastructure
FS-Case-313613307	Madeleine Blu	option 5	It should be 100%. I think that this is the factor which will make our housing beautiful and unique, like before the bombings of 2nd WW. It will also provide for local employment. If we employ local people and train them we will no longer have an unemployment problem. I refer to previously mentioned Bill Dunstan and Agamemnon Otero.
FS-Case-313643991	Douglas Smith	option 2	But right homes in right place
FS-Case-313678330	june glennie	option 1	it must be doable
FS-Case-313682721	Heike Hollerung	option 1	Option 1 or 2 depending on the small sites being identified.

Ref No	Respondent	Q 9	Question 9 Comment
FS-Case-313693362	Gary Tubb	option 1	Agree
FS-Case-313694058	Joseph Williams	option 5	Local residents often object to housing developments, despite it having been shown that such developments are net contributors to the local economy. This is likely partly because developments are visually unattractive, of low quality and often have insufficient facilities, putting extra pressure on existing ones. Smaller developments are less likely to suffer from this, especially with good planning, and so may prove a more popular way to provide more housing.
FS-Case-313698487	Craig Daley	option 5	Again, a waste of time question. You do not control who builds what and where, so stop wasting my time thinking you do.
FS-Case-313710620	Jacqueline Cox	option 4	Smaller sites are less disruptive and frequently provide a more individual style of housing. The architecture is less "standard" from site to site as opposed to a large scale site with many houses looking the same. If the style of house and materials used were different throughout a large housing development this may achieve the same effect.
FS-Case-313718525	Robert Maynard	option 1	Option 1 should be backed up by evidence to demonstrate that local builders are capable of delivering around 10% of homes needed each year,
FS-Case-313736922	Simon Cox S Cox and Co Ltd	option 1	smaller building sites are usually developed by small local builders employing local people and supporting local businesses
FS-Case-313771026	John Connolly	option 2	The definition of "smaller sites" is too generalised for practical application. eg in Exmouth a site for 20-50 houses might be considered small, but in (say) Ven Ottery 20-50 houses would have a massive impact. So while I support the smaller development proposition it must be scaled to suit the existing habitation.
FS-Case-313780058	Megan Lowe	option 3	I think I prefer the idea of smaller developments as it allows for communities to be built. These homes still need access to good quality greenspace though and should be developed with sustainability in mind.
FS-Case-313812606	Richard Bates	option 5	see above
FS-Case-313846023	Paul Garnham	option 5	Small scale house building is the preferred way forward, but it should be dealt with on a planning application by planning application basis by EDDC rather than land being "allocated" or "identified". Priority should also be given to small scale local builders to help support their businesses, rather than the huge mass development companies like Persimmon, Taylor Wimpey etc.
FS-Case-313848718	Julia Bove	option 1	Keep the design of new homes 'traditional' and in line with existing nearby historic developments. It is so sad to see new build developments which are so uninspiring, dull and not in keeping with nearby villages.
FS-Case-313849237	Kathleen Ellett		I am keen to provide opportunities for local builders and to have smaller sites but would this be more expensive and would they include affordable housing? If no affordable housing you would end up by providing homes for elderly who are only ones who can afford it and pockets of separate, young and old communities
FS-Case-313857211	Linda Johnson	option 3	25 to 35% homes on small sites would help ensure the continued life and vibrancy of rural communities and help maintain the remaining services and facilities of smaller towns, villages and rural areas. I don't favour large developments especially new towns on large greenfield sites, a massive loss of countryside when smaller developments could have less environmental impact.
FS-Case-313997024	Richard Holman	option 5	The EDDC should use whichever land fits into the development needed in an area. It should take into account historical brownfield sites and re-purposing of commercial land as a priority land and try to improve the local infrastructure around each site individually. This would be immensely suitable to the EDDC area due to the nature of the land and infrastructure. EDDC is not Exeter and it does not work to just do massive developments. they need to engage with local land owners and follow through on developments, not try to prevent them
FS-Case-314113114	Caroline Wilson Chardstock	option 1	The stipulations as laid down in Neighbourhood Plans and the protection of the AONB should take precedence. Brownfield development should be given priority over greenfield development.

Ref No	Respondent	Q 9	Question 9 Comment
	Parish Council		
FS-Case-314133727	Ian Jewson Walsingham Planning Ltd	option 1	Whilst it is appropriate to identify a source of new homes from small sites in order to achieve flexibility and choice in the market the majority of housebuilding will need to be delivered on larger strategic sites as these are most likely to be able to deliver necessary infrastructure improvements in a comprehensive and coordinated manner.
FS-Case-314181450	Iain Ure	option 3	I question the quality of houses built by the larger builders. We need variety that fit in with the surroundings
FS-Case-314278250	Keith Bungay		Seems unnecessarily complicated - see previous note on Question 9
FS-Case-314282919	Norah Jaggers Beer Village Heritage, AONB Ambassador, JCT Ambassador	option 4	Small scale developments can be accommodated in both town and village settings without upsetting the balance of the community which is what can happen when large estates are created.
FS-Case-314437283	Jacqui Baldwin	option 4	Smaller developments are much more likely to fit into the local landscape and have far less impact on the existing population
FS-Case-314500910	Graham Kingham	option 5	Consider building more new towns/villages
FS-Case-314585169	Peter Faithfull	option 3	There is a real need to support rural communities. This is in conflict with the major developers.
FS-Case-314606312	RICHARD GETLIFFE	option 3	small sites but no in the middle of current housing
FS-Case-314731257	Fiona Lawson	option 5	Don't keep building large homes
FS-Case-314758581	Peter Ball Kilminster Parish Council	option 1	Identify smaller sites in carefully selected locations that do not destroy existing local communities through fast growth, which can also then results in insufficient local community facilities. Look at Neighbourhood Plans for guidance on what is considered acceptable growth and existing facilities.
FS-Case-314760502	christopher Heal Private	option 4	The allocation of more smaller sites would distribute the work to smaller building companies who at present are not able to compete with the larger developers who have the finance to purchase larger acreages of land and restrict the availability of future sites becoming available, this will also enhance smaller villages to become more sustainable.
FS-Case-314762361	ZOE H BETTERTON Cornerstone Design and Build	option 2	Smaller sites would promote more diversity of design and stop the large scale homogenous approach of large poorly built developments done by the large house builders which are soulless.
FS-Case-314771914	Ian Cherry	option 1	Once high density housing is allowed the potential damage to the environment and inevitable loss of community spirit which is more easily achieved in smaller sites cannot be remedied. Once a small community is established expansion is still an option but once a large community is established the clock cannot be turned back if it is found to be problematic.
FS-Case-314782794	Nicola Daniel	option 4	East Devon has had the majority of housing numbers provided in major developments. With this policy large amorphous estates are alien to the east devon countryside. Towns and villages have lost their identity and large areas of Grade 1 agricultural land lost. Smaller sites would be a progressive enlargement of communities, give local builders employment and produce housing with the characteristics of the vicinity.

Ref No	Respondent	Q 9	Question 9 Comment
FS-Case-314806759	Stuart Yerrell	option 4	No development on green-field sites
FS-Case-314832307	Anthony Carthy James Carthy and Company Limited	option 3	We do need to provide houses for local people and to quote Christopher Pincher the Housing Minister from a speech on 16th November: “We’ve lost ground due to the pandemic. But the market has proved itself to be more resilient than people expected,” he said. “There is no question we need to go further and faster to deliver the commitment of 1 million homes by the end of this parliamentary term.” But these new homes could not be “anywheresville but where people want to live”.  In my view Cranbrook and the West end is the "anywheresville" that he quotes.
FS-Case-314852216	Jenny Ashmore	option 4	Add to this the need to investigate why there are empty properties in the area and also to completely stop new housing going to second homes or holiday lets. Don't have that luxury any more and gets into the 'haves' and 'have-nots', so morally questionable in current climate.
FS-Case-314894688	John Colby	option 1	However in a built-up town like Exmouth small sites could be difficult to find, but there should be no encroachment into protected environmental areas eg as designated in NPs. Adaptability of internal house design is important
FS-Case-314910549	James Barnes-Phillips	option 2	Allow small sites to be developed, but NOT at the existing environment. In The Avenues in Exmouth we have lost far too many 1900s Villas to developers who then want to cram in 10 homes onto a 1 acre site this spoiling the street scene. There are many places where these small scale developments can take place without spoiling the attractive environments we all love in East Devon.
FS-Case-314921504	robert wiltshire	option 3	Smaller developments are less intrusive than larger ones.
FS-Case-314926201	Richard Crabtree	option 2	New homes need to have decent sized rooms and gardens. This doesn't seem to be the case now with Developers squeezing as many houses on their land as possible.
FS-Case-314926952	Kathy Hackman	option 1	Minimum housing around this area. Locals can't afford it. Those moving in from other areas will add to the pollution and 'unaffordability', not to mention flooding potential from run-off.
FS-Case-314937410	Eleonore Pang	option 4	Utilise Cranbrook - but otherwise think local! Always ensure transport and schools and healthcare provision is adequate - bus services.
FS-Case-314951782	Daniel Mumby N/A	option 2	Small sites are good but don't cram tok many in one place
FS-Case-314963509	Trudi Franklin	option 4	Can use more surrounding land without ruining area and overcrowding towns with high rise or squishing second homes into gardens
FS-Case-315062740	Ann UPCHURCH	option 2	This would be better than having sprawling housing areas with no heart, such as cranbrook
FS-Case-315100989	Elaine Wade	option 1	Whilst I appose new building as Exmouth is big enough and other towns are becoming too large in ED, I may support this approach. I would want to see this in operation and then consider whether a larger percentage is a good option.
FS-Case-315126013	George Williams Greenslade Taylor Hunt	option 3	Smaller sites are often delivered more quickly than larger sites. They also offer small and medium developers to compete, strengthening the local and national economy. Smaller schemes within and on the edge of sustainable villages allows those communities to grow in a commensurate way whilst contributing to the district’s wider housing ambitions. As such, there should be an ambition to deliver at least 26% of the required housing through smaller sites but there does not need to be such a restrictive figure of one hectare used to identify a ‘small site’. Rather, there should be general support of the benefits of smaller sites around but not explicitly at the one hectare mark. The site off Oak Road, West Hill would assist the Council in meeting the above mentioned benefits.

Ref No	Respondent	Q 9	Question 9 Comment
FS-Case-315135756	Philip Jordan Woodbury Parish Council	option 2	To alter small villages as being 'unsustainable'. In our case Exton and Woodbury Salterton. Exton has excellent communication for example, but has been prevented from any appropriate growth since 2016.
FS-Case-315168747	Liz Shortland	option 1	Preferably infill and derelict and brown field sites.
FS-Case-315184341	Richard Pratt	option 1	Hard to see how allocating more land for small scale development will achieve the quantity of homes required per annum. Would there be enough local builders out there to achieve this?
FS-Case-315186818	Mervyn H Clapp	option 5	Right to build.
FS-Case-315216760	Elizabeth Campbell	option 5	Again I do not believe it is practical to define such targets. What needs to be addressed is the vast acres of land being covered over instead of taking an alternative approach to encourage developers to use small unused tracts of land which may often be more centrally located, may have been an old industrial site, offices or similar.
FS-Case-315224273	ROY OSBORN	option 3	SMALLER DEVELOPMENTS WOULD INVOLVE SMALLER LOCAL BUILDERS AND TEND ON THE WHOLE TO ENCOURAGE A GREATER SENSE OF RESPONSIBILITY AND COMMUNITY SPIRIT WITH HOME OWNERS.
FS-Case-315275424	Rob Phillips Broadhembury Neighbourhood Community Land Trust (BNCLT)	option 5	We have approached our answer to this question from two perspectives. Firstly, please see our response to Q8 where we challenge the basis and the method upon which the number of homes (characterised as both affordable and non-affordable) that are stated to be needed. Secondly, please refer to our response to Q12 where we highlight that infrastructure is needed to support development. Merely responding to this question (Q9) with a percentage does not fully account for the complex interactions at play between need and infrastructure. The percentage depends greatly upon the whereabouts within the East Devon district. Much lower proportions being appropriate in the more rural areas – zero in some.
FS-Case-315287680	Jennifer Hiley-Payne N/A	option 1	I think Woodbury is a good example of extension of an old village, with good sporting facilities and play grounds, free carpark and public transport routes.
FS-Case-315320410	Richard Power Diocese of Exeter	option 1	Policy must be developed in consideration of the other policies pertaining to infrastructure, transport and affordable housing - small sites often are more difficult to develop profitably when these issues are factored in.
FS-Case-315449037	Darren Roberts East Devon District Council, Central Planning	option 2	Given the number of settlements within East Devon, in order to allow new housing in smaller villages it is necessary for these to be on small sites
FS-Case-315455012	Rachel Hughes	option 3	Please refer to my previous answer.
FS-Case-315490875	Alan Sydenham Herridge Property Consulting	option 3	Requiring more development on smaller sites will allow smaller housebuilders to provide more housing of local character more quickly.
FS-Case-315516791	Mary Truell None	option 1	See Qu 8 for use of land in towns saving open natural land for reconnecting with the natural world and mindful refreshment and exercise without either light or air pollution. Restoration of habitats. Garden oases in towns and allotments. Parks are also remarkably pleasant for morning runs, children to play, elderly to sit. Plenty of trees, no tarmac lanes except paths only for cyclists to keep pedestrians safe. Keep urbanisation OUT of countryside. NO MORE HOUSEBUILDING ON GREENFIELD COUNTRYSIDE. A little in rural villages for farmworkers. Villages in East Devon within easy commuting to Exeter airport, London train service etc are very vulnerable to excessive numbers of extremely expensive single houses built on green fields. This MUST STOP as must



Ref No	Respondent	Q 9	Question 9 Comment
			housing estates permitted on vital Green Wedges especially round Exmouth. This reduces access for exercise for all the people already cramped into extant housing estates.
FS-Case-315539551	Gary Parsons Sport England		no comment
FS-Case-315583497	Ann Kelf	option 2	Again I am opting for something that might be achievable.
FS-Case-315591470	Brian Carpenter	option 4	The case for a policy of favouring smaller developments is well made in 5.7, and I think it's worth setting an ambitious target in this area. In general there's likely to be less local resistance to smaller developments, and the increased use of local labour and materials, along with potential for greater adherence to local character and traditions, and the opportunity for local consultation are all admirable objectives.
FS-Case-315622017	Robert Martin Clyst Honiton Parish Council	option 4	<p>To continue to build strategic sites like at Cranbrook and the West End has already fundamentally changed the nature of house building in East Devon.</p> <p>The focus needs to return to smaller sites provision to stop such fundamental land change in the district.</p> <p>The fundamental land impact of smaller sites is less, and the argument of non-sustainability because of car use will less of an issue with advancing electric vehicle development and use.</p> <p>Development in villages will enable sustainability. Small sites develop out quicker, need less onerous infrastructure and are models for sustainability and vibrant communities. It is recognised that it is easier on the face of it to provide large numbers of housing on one or two major developments, but the danger is that the developers on those sites can hold you to ransom over the provision of Section 106/CIL infrastructure finance, which means that the houses are built, but not the necessary facilities – an example is Cranbrook!</p>
FS-Case-315666051	Olly Davey	option 2	I think allowing planned growth in villages could encourage more facilities to be viable, such as local shops, transport links or community buildings.
FS-Case-315672889	James Dorey Plainview Planning	option 3	<p>Whilst larger allocations can help resolve a gap in housing requirements, they often take significantly longer to come forward than smaller allocated sites. Consequently, the revised NPPF stresses that small/medium sites provide an important contribution to local housing delivery (paragraph 68 of the NPPF). In the interest of securing deliverable sites in East Devon, it is therefore important that the allocation of small/medium sites is primarily supported.</p> <p>Small sites which tend to have less landowners and can be built out in one phase by one team and can be brought forward quickly, therefore providing a fast provision of homes for the district.</p> <p>Small sites also allow small local house builders the opportunity to buy and build sites. This helps to provide work for local people rather than larger sites which tend to only be suitable for larger house builders.</p> <p>It is for these reasons that small sites should account for a significant proportion of emerging housing sites.</p>
FS-Case-315678300	George Williams Greenslade Taylor Hunt	option 3	<p>There are benefits of encouraging small scale development as such sites are often delivered in a more timely fashion. However, it is suggested that the overall size of the site is not necessarily the most significant issue but rather the scale of housing growth to be permitted within a certain time period. An arbitrary assessment, where sites of one hectare are acceptable but a site of 1.5 hectares for example would not be policy compliant, is not sound.</p> <p>In many cases, employment development is unviable and can be neglected. The Council therefore needs to consider whether a quantum of housing development should be encouraged as part of any employment allocation to incentivise the delivery of the</p>

Ref No	Respondent	Q 9	Question 9 Comment
			employment development and create jobs in a timely fashion. By doing so, the costly infrastructural requirements can be mitigated to some degree and a proper balance of housing and employment units can be provided.
FS-Case-315678845	Paul Hayward Newton Poppleford and Harpford Parish Council	option 5	The Parish Council has no predetermined views in this regard. But, 20/40 properties per hectare is far too dense in a rural district and contradicts the aspirations contained within 3.6 earlier re: health and wellbeing through design / build standards. Policy should set a maximum density level.
FS-Case-315681467	Jacqui Best	option 3	Encourage smaller builders to provide a mix of housing types, towards meeting different levels of affordability. More homes to build and competition between smaller builders may help to keep new home sale prices down.
FS-Case-315685113	Lauren James MMO	option 4	It's always great to keep the local character, even if this is just a goal, it seems like a good one to aim for. To contribute to local businesses as well as this can only be a positive.
FS-Case-315690761	Naome Glanville	option 5	We should minimise development altogether - the huge rise in housing in the period of the last plan has led to a pressure on infrastructure, busy roads, noise and light pollution and a detriment to nature and the amount of agricultural land. If development does have to happen, then EDDC should take action to ensure it is of a higher quality than some of what has recently been built. EDDC should also strive to ensure that any development is in keeping, as East Devon is fast losing any local character.
FS-Case-315694995	John Labrum	option 2	Small sites are better, potentially providing a better built environment and supporting the local economy. But we need to ensure that the houses are not too expensive, with a good proportion of affordable homes
FS-Case-315697980	Terrence Blackler	option 4	Anything which keeps the volume builders away with their high density, low quality building for maximum profit would enhance East Devon
FS-Case-315804855	Sophie Minter		see above
FS-Case-315843780	James Holman	option 2	Small Or medium size plots for up to 100 homes are a key to breaking a log jam in east Devon . The current mindset to Block all Development must be removed and east Devon must be drawn into the 21st century . It has a moral as well as legal obligation to provide homes . Compared to exeter city council east Devon council is not grasping the gravity of this housing need Devon is facing as a whole . Donald trump built a wall I think east Devon would like to do the same to keep people out .
FS-Case-315852527	Cindy Collier	option 4	Please see comments to question 8
FS-Case-315873808	Stephen Harris Emery Planning	option 1	This would accord with Government policy.
FS-Case-315884481	stephen moore Mr	option 2	Small communities need to avoid stagnation. The process of accomodating new development invigorates villages and it's ageing inhabitants.
FS-Case-315892586	Carolyn Bowles	option 5	If you must build new houses perhaps their impact would be lessened if you built them on many small sites in more towns and villages as opposed to less sites with very large scale development
FS-Case-315937332	Fiona Anderson	option 2	Its a much more efficient use of land
FS-Case-315939416	linda aucott	option 2	Small sites would be good for smaller builders, encourage diversity and creative thinking if combined with good overarching objectives. This is more likely to protect the character of existing communities and provide longer term sustainable development.

Ref No	Respondent	Q 9	Question 9 Comment
FS-Case-315947650	Rosalind Rapley	option 5	Stop identifying land and start identifying brown sites; disused buildings, old factory sites, rough ground, large houses suitable for conversion to flats/maisonettes etc.
FS-Case-315959715	Paul Warren		Small sites should be available for individuals who wish to self build and for small groups to build co-operatively. Plots on these sites should be at realistic prices and not available for businesses to purchase.
FS-Case-315961800	David & Mrs Wendy Lewis	option 3	We would imagine some of the smaller sites would be suitable for more rural locations, less overwhelming, more assimilable and sustainable in relation to existing infrastructure.
FS-Case-315963133	George Koopman	option 3	Helps with integration into local communities and gives more opportunities to local builders who generally work to higher standards and have less overheads
FS-Case-315967632	David Daniel	option 4	Smaller site would help to maintain the identity of Towns and villages and give smaller builders a chance. We have had too many "anonymous" and soulless major developments
FS-Case-315968014	Eleanor Cozens	option 3	Important to support smaller local firms and avoid large-scale national developers.
FS-Case-315972159	Monica Bell	option 1	Always use brown field sites.
FS-Case-315984133	Daphne CURRIER	option 3	We need to get on with this- small sites will inevitably include some mistakes but if small, they could be learnt from and possibly remedied. Large mistakes could end up with vacant homes in the middle of nowhere with no transport link to jobs or services. Smaller developments are more likely to involve local workers.
FS-Case-316012231	Terry Sweeney	option 2	This approach would fit with my choice of strategic option. The 25% or so would be for existing town/ large village growth ( most in the big 3 ) , support local builders, achieve distinctiveness and affordability. Growth here responds better to small site development for many reasons.
FS-Case-316019373	Anthony Green	option 3	Many current housing developments are too large for the local infrastructure, destroy the character of local communities, and give little sense of belonging to new residents
FS-Case-316023654	lauren allan	option 5	The situation in East Devon lends itself to small scale development which is likely to be more acceptable to existing residents e.g.: small farms with edge of established settlement location are ideal, especially if existing buildings can be repurposed and upgraded. Trying to apply a percentage is inappropriate until we establish the need for housing in our area.
FS-Case-316035390	Daniel Lazar Membury Parish Council	option 2	Option 2 will help smaller settlements survive and remain sustainable.
FS-Case-316036693	Philip Wragg none	option 5	You are just consulting on arbitrary figures provided by central Government - what does East Devon Council think? This has to be a research based exercise on what has happened in the past, what is required for the future rather than just relying on central Government instructions.
FS-Case-316047097	Richard Pryor	option 1	This would allow small builders to be involved in providing new homes of a diverse nature. (My grandfather was a builder in South Essex and he build a street of mixed houses in Totnes some time in the 1930 as work in Southend-on-Sea had stopped)
FS-Case-316053199	Ben Evans	option 4	All developers want to maximise profits by building as cheaply and quickly as possible and get away with not spending any money on expensive extras such as space for a community to thrive and infrastructure. I think we need to move towards encouraging genuine local developers but that communities need to then be more involved in the interactions with the developers so that they are held to account for their actions by the community within which they live.
FS-Case-316056741	Helene Jessop RSPB		New homes should avoid adverse impacts on nature and provide biodiversity net gain. Allocated sites must exclude any that would damage statutorily designated nature conservation sites. Policy should ensure appropriate consideration and protection of habitats, including sites supporting species of principal importance. For example, East

Ref No	Respondent	Q 9	Question 9 Comment
			Devon supports a small but growing population of ciril buntings, a farmland bird that is found on suitable habitats close to existing settlements, locations that are often prioritised for new development. We recommend East Devon District Council adopts the approach to ciril buntings and development set out in Wildlife and development guidance note: ciril bunting (Devon County Council, Teignbridge District Council and Torbay Council, October 2017) so that, where development does impact on this species, if development proposals progress, appropriate measures, including provision of compensatory habitat, can avoid net loss to the population.
FS-Case-3160579-37	irene Wyndham	option 2	Because I would prefer to see a well-structured new town for the majority of new housing and development
FS-Case-3161211-49	Sam Piper	option 3	I'm not totally sure how this would in effect work but I would much prefer homes were built by smaller local companies who know and live in the local area and have some empathy with regards to design rather than someone sitting in Barrat Homes Office in London.
FS-Case-3161258-51	Diana jennings	option 1	Generally we think that option 1 is best however, whichever option is selected, all new building should be on brown field sites until these are completely exhausted. This is despite the objections of builders who traditionally enhance their profit margins by building on greenfield sites.
FS-Case-3161274-02	Eleanor Rylance	option 3	At present, EDDC is socially engineering village communities that are higher in average income and have virtually no young people. If we want to produce demographically balanced village communities that can support each other, we need to address the lack of housing for young people and for people who need adapted living in our villages. Many people rely on local support networks- for informal childcare, for shopping for vulnerable relatives etc- we should be enabling that. Our current strategic housing policy runs against that. Let's encourage communities to plan for their own profile, but giving them the support and information they need. Also, we need to identify a whole lot more self-build and live/work sites, to foster both affordability and less need to get in the car.
FS-Case-3161354-38	George Williams Greensalde Taylor Hunt	option 3	Smaller sites are often delivered more quickly than larger sites. They also offer small and medium developers to compete, strengthening the local and national economy. Smaller schemes within and on the edge of sustainable villages allow those communities to grow in a commensurate way whilst contributing to the district's wider housing ambitions.  As such, there should be an ambition to deliver at least 26% of the required housing through smaller sites but there does not need to be such a restrictive figure of one hectare used to identify a 'small site'. Rather, there should be general support of the benefits of smaller sites around but not explicitly at the one hectare mark.  The site off Down Close, Newton Poppleford would assist the Council in meeting the above mentioned benefits.
FS-Case-3161363-53	Bill Horner Historic Environment Team, Devon County Council		No comments
FS-Case-3161477-75	Mathieu Holladay	option 4	EDDC should take much greater control over home building on small sites. I would support 51% or more homes being built on small scale sites because there are so many potential benefits of taking this strategy.
FS-Case-3161535-59	Jacqueline Green	option 3	Need to avoid loss of agricultural land (including Grade 1) which has been happening with spread of large scale development.  Cloned house style, with no regional characteristics, does not create wellbeing. "We shape our buildings; thereafter they shape us" , Winston Churchill
FS-Case-3161583-25	Paul Hayward Personal View only	option 2	Chapter 5.6 refers to a density figure of 20-40 dwellings per hectare (again, with an ambiguous phrase "typically")  We live in East Devon where aside from towns (where such density is conceivable) the density per hectare is far less as you move into the villages and countryside. Smaller developments would allow for stepped changes in character rather than significant blocks of inappropriate housing as has been the case previously.

Ref No	Respondent	Q 9	Question 9 Comment
FS-Case-3161583 85	Sarah Jackson	option 2	I think we should be more ambitious than governments minimum standards, however I am deeply concerned about the density suggested on these small sites as these would simply fall short of any other targets we have for health and wellbeing, the environment, and carbon neutrality.
			a key overriding issue throughout this whole section of the consultation is OUR definition of "affordable" which also needs to be more ambitious than the definition set out by central government, which, in east Devon is not affordable in many cases when compared to local wages.
FS-Case-3161597 94	George Williams Greenslade Taylor Hunt	option 1	Given the under supply of homes through the district and nationally, the Council must ensure that sites are bought forward in a timely manner. The Council should individually assess each site for its merits, policy compliance, alongside deliverability. Smaller sites should be allowed to come forward as they allow settlements to evolve and assist the Council in maintaining a five-year housing land supply. However, even larger sites in edge of village locations should be supported within the mix based on their specific sustainability credentials, such as proximity to a train station. Such sites can also be delivered in part or in full in a timely fashion when compared with sites in more constrained urban environs. Achieving a mix of sites is key to de-risking the Council's approach to housing delivery. As mentioned, the smaller sites have their benefits ... (please refer to submitted Consultation Response document).
FS-Case-3161601 03	Julie Moore	option 2	I think it is important to allocate a wide range of sites in as wider a range of ownerships as possible. Including smaller housing companies. I don't think the size of the site is as important as having a range of developers in charge of the land, especially including sites under the control of smaller developers.
FS-Case-3161761 96	Adrian Toole	option 1	First identify and protect green space in law.
FS-Case-3161815 50	Deborah Griffiths Devon Archaeological Society		No comments
FS-Case-3161884 95	George Williams Greenslade Taylor Hunt	option 3	Smaller sites are often delivered more quickly than larger sites. They also offer small and medium developers to compete, strengthening the local and national economy. Smaller schemes within and on the edge of sustainable villages allows those communities to grow in a commensurate way whilst contributing to the district's wider housing ambitions. As such, there should be an ambition to deliver at least 26% of the required housing through smaller sites but there does not need to be such a restrictive figure of one hectare used to identify a 'small site'. Rather, there should be general support of the benefits of smaller sites around but not explicitly at the one hectare mark.
FS-Case-3162223 13	Kimberley Waterfall	option 4	EDDC should take much greater control over home building on small sites. I would support 51% or more homes being built on small scale sites because there are so many potential benefits of taking this strategy.
FS-Case-3162401 70	George Williams Greenslade Taylor Hunt	option 3	There are benefits of encouraging small scale development as such sites are often delivered in a more timely fashion. Such sites should be allocated within a mix of small, medium and large sites. However, an arbitrary assessment, where sites of one hectare are acceptable but a site of 1.5 hectares for example would not be policy compliant, is not sound. Rather, each site should be considered on its merits. The Council should individually assess each site on its merits, policy compliance, alongside deliverability. Sites, such as the land mentioned at Chardstock, could deliver housing quickly given its limited number of delivery limitations. Schemes within and on the edge of sustainable villages allow those communities to grow in a commensurate way whilst contributing to the district's wider housing ambitions.
FS-Case-3162471 67	Marcus Hartnell	option 2	In my experience smaller developers and local builders tend to provide better quality homes, albeit national volume builders are needed to provide the volume of homes required.

Ref No	Respondent	Q 9	Question 9 Comment
FS-Case-316333576	Rosalind Leveridge	option 4	Recently here in Devon we have seen volume builders change fundamentally the character of areas such as the approaches to Exeter and the spread of mass-produced homes without corresponding improvement to and extension of amenities, infrastructure, green spaces, health services, and schools. Moreover, these vast developments do not attempt to fit the character of the county and are often dense and unsightly. More, smaller sites, using local builders should deliver the correct numbers of homes, blending in better with the local environment and using existing infrastructures without overwhelming them. A much greater sensitivity to the local environment is required. Benefits such as local employment would also be a positive.
FS-Case-316377163	John Sherwood	option 1	Smaller sites are more likely to maintain the character of the area and enable a focus on localities near local infrastructure and transport and therefore reduce developments on greenfield sites on the periphery of settlements.
FS-Case-316444654	Eva Ingleson		Make better use of the current housing stock - restrictions on second homes, don't allow homes to stand empty, and renovate derelict buildings
FS-Case-316464599	Conrad Libischer	option 3	The experience of the local population in Axminster of large developments by large house-builders does not seem to have been positive. There have been a lot of complaints about build quality and they do not seem to have served the community particularly well.
FS-Case-316577757	Ron Metcalfe	option 4	East Devon could do with a change in the nature of house building
FS-Case-319425252	Peter Simmons	option 4	Encourage local builders and small business who can fill in the gaps with a range of quality housing. Mass produced houses by the national companies are characterless and require vast areas of land.
FS-Case-323231602	Gordon Hodgson	option 3	Generally there is insufficient discussion regarding more homes to rent. In other countries there is a private rental sector which, in a properly worked through system, may provide another viable solution to the housing problem. Institutions such as pension schemes may, given the various safeguards required for both tenants and owners/landlords, may be interested in investing. Other social housing schemes may also be suitable. Many people want to own their own home but there may too be
FS-Case-323661989	Michael Gooch Boyer	option 1	It is considered that the proposed approach would meet Government politically-derived requirements for the provision of new homes on smaller sites, thereby providing opportunities for smaller developers, whilst retaining sufficient provision of strategic-scale development sites that could support the delivery of larger scale housing schemes will remain important to meet the identified housing need for East Devon.
FS-Case-324952647	Lawrence Turner Boyer Planning	option 1	Please refer to submitted representations.
FS-Case-324964822	Sarah Jackson	option 2	I think we should be more ambitious than Government's minimum standards. However, I am deeply concerned about the density suggested on these small sites as these would simply fall short of any other targets we have for health and wellbeing, the environment, and carbon neutrality. A key overriding issue throughout this whole section of the consultation is OUR definition of "affordable" which also needs to be more ambitious than the definition set out by Central Government, which - in East Devon - is not affordable in many cases when compared to local wages.
FS-Case-324977684	Simon Collier Collier Planning	option 1	Please refer to submitted representations.
FS-Case-324988465	Simon Collier Collier Planning	option 1	Please refer to submitted representations.
FS-Case-324999075	David Morgan Not Applicable	option 1	Please refer to submitted representations.



Ref No	Respondent	Q 9	Question 9 Comment
FS-Case-325022897	DLP Planning DLP Planning DLP Planning	option 5	See attached letter
FS-Case-325041454	East Devon and Tiverton & Honiton CLPs	option 2	Option 2 · Small villages struggle to expand where they want to, due to the current development plan being too restrictive. · Local people would rather see smaller developments, in large part because they put less pressure on already stressed infrastructure. · Smaller sites should aim to be built on brownfield sites, in town and village centres. · Community land trusts and small scale developments can be too onerous on unpaid parish and town councillors. There must be a named officer of EDDC to help these authorities set up community land trusts and remove some of the harder work. · A better discourse between Parish councils and District councils.
FS-Case-325053097	Ed Persse EJP Planning Ltd	option 2	It is considered that the proposed approach would meet Government politically-derived requirements for the provision of new homes on smaller sites, thereby providing opportunities for smaller developers, and support local communities, Such as Awliscombe. This approach would still give East Devon the ability to allocate strategic sites.
FS-Case-325070883	Emma Russell	option 3	Part of healthy and happy living is being part of a community. Large housing estates don't really plug such a need and invariably become large towns or large suburbs on the edge of large towns or cities, Villages need an uplift of youth and local employment opportunities. More small developments around villages will aid the survival of village life, preserve village identities and done well could contribute to an injection of vibrancy over all of East Devon rather than just around the existing larger urban areas. It is interesting to note the absence of second-homes in the thinking. How can we keep our communities vibrant all year round if properties remain stubbornly empty throughout much of the year? Policies should be developed to discourage second-home ownership, but possibly encourage more holiday homes which are used for a minimum number of days per year - in turn providing local employment for their management.
FS-Case-325077531	I.G. Cann Exmouth Civic Society	option 2	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		Please refer to submitted representations.
FS-Case-325131855	Michelle Dobrota-Gibbs N/A	option 4	Please refer to submitted representations.
FS-Case-325156112	Peter Dobbs	option 2	Please refer to submitted representations.
FS-Case-325170882	Dorothy Taylor Exmouth Mental Health St John's Court Carers' Group	option 5	Please refer to submitted representations.
FS-Case-325549089	Ken Pearson Stockland Parish Council	option 2	Certainly in rural areas, there is a need to over-deliver on provision of social need housing for rent, to retain young, working people/families to remain in the community. There is also a need to provide housing for elderly people who may then release 2-3 bed homes in the community. There seems to be a trend for larger developers to argue that even though they have identified a provision for small sites that would deliver

Ref No	Respondent	Q 9	Question 9 Comment
			social need or affordable, ends up with more market housing because of the price they had to pay for the land. Allocating smaller sites across the Plan area could bring more relevant local designs to the fore rather than have urban solutions in rural areas. In fact this could be the area that could be provided by the Local Authority as part of their commitment and re-generate the loss of social need for rent.
FS-Case-325731054	Andrew Ardley South Western Railway	option 1	Small sites are more difficult to plan and secure infrastructure funding for. May be appropriate for smaller rural locations.
FS-Case-325812938	Nick Matthews Savills	option 1	See attached.
FS-Case-325829612	Dan Yeates Savilles	option 1	Please refer to submitted representation.
FS-Case-325831870	Cem Kosaner Lichfields	option 1	Please see attached comments.
FS-Case-325838141	Dan Yeates Savills	option 1	Please refer to submitted representations.