

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 11 May 2021 12:34  
**To:** Planning Policy  
**Subject:** Colyton Neighbourhood Plan  
**Attachments:** 201212 NP Reg14-Comment-Form ajc.pdf

I write to confirm my objection to Colyton Neighbourhood plan as submitted.

Previously I made representations on the earlier draft, copy attached, have had no feedback apart from the initial acknowledgement and note that while very minor adjustments have been made, fundamentally it remains a Plan in name only. In my view the Plan does nothing for the sustainability of Colyton and Colyford or to meet the needs of **most** local people.

The document identifies many problems but has not addressed any of them adequately.

The Local Plan relies on Neighbourhood Plans to provide housing for Villages yet Colyton proposes a Green wedge to preclude any further allocations. At the most recent Parish Council meeting it was stated that the search for Affordable Homes sites has produced nothing apart from areas within the Green Wedge and it would seem the Council is content with this situation. Inevitably this will lead to building on Exception sites and history shows these are not socially inclusive and in many cases become a blot on the landscape.

I was slightly heartened from that same meeting in that the Council seems to be taking on board my suggestion of retaining the car park at Ceramtec for the benefit of the Primary School and perhaps others at the expense of open space, which fortunately, Colyton is not short of. However, from some of the comments made I fear it is not likely to be pursued with the vigour required.

Incidentally, while I now live in Beer, I was born and lived in Colyton for over 60 years, working there much of the time and still have property and family there.

Kind regards,

Jim Carthy

## NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN COMMENT FORM

All information is available online at:

[www.colytonparishcouncil.co.uk](http://www.colytonparishcouncil.co.uk)

### **Colyton Parish Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation**

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

DATE REC'D:

**9am Monday 5<sup>th</sup> October 2020 – 5:00pm Monday 14<sup>th</sup> December 2020**

*The information you provide will be held on a database and used to assist in the preparation of planning documents.*

*The information will be used in accordance with the Data Protection Act (2018) and the data privacy policies of Colyton Parish Council.*

We regret that we are unable to process any responses supplied without contact details.

Please tick as appropriate:

Responding as an Individual	<b>X</b>	
Responding on behalf of an Organisation		<i>Organisation:</i>
Agent Responsible on behalf of a Client		<i>Client:</i>

Please complete in BLOCK CAPITALS

		Agents details (if applicable)
NAME:	Jim Carthy	NAME:
JOB TITLE/DEPT:		JOB TITLE/DEPT:
ORGANISATION:		ORGANISATION:
ADDRESS:	[REDACTED]	ADDRESS:
POST CODE:		POST CODE:
EMAIL:		EMAIL:

Comments must be received no later than 5:00pm on Monday 14<sup>th</sup> December 2020  
*Comments received after this time may not be considered*

Please return to the Parish Clerk  
By email: [colytonpc@tiscali.co.uk](mailto:colytonpc@tiscali.co.uk)

By post or in person to:  
Colyton Parish Council  
Feoffees Town Hall  
Market Place, Colyton  
EX24 6JR

Please tick/complete as appropriate:

Do you wish to:

Comment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Support	<input type="checkbox"/>
Object	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Are your comments:

General	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Specific	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

If your comment is specific, to which Section/Policy does it refer;-  
Page/ Section **Pages 19, 20 and 42**  
Policy No. **Coly 4 Green Wedge**  
**Map 8**

Please make your comments here and indicate any changes you are seeking. Additional sheets may be attached to this form:

The document is very well presented but, with respect, I do not believe it can be considered a Plan in the real sense. The document identifies a number of serious issues but does not appear to propose any firm actions or proactive measures to deal with these.

In my view major problems for Colyton and Colyford that require urgent solutions include:

1. Lack of market housing that is affordable by local people many of which are disqualified from “affordable housing” as they are not classed as being “in need” by Devon Home Choice.
2. Shortage of equity share housing that will enable the occupants to get on the home owning ladder with the option to staircase out in the future.
3. A shortage of local trades people, artisans, retained fire crew, youth leaders and the like, resulting in part from the inability to purchase a house locally.
4. Severe shortage of parking and no safe drop off area for the Primary School.
5. Lack of off-street parking in many areas for residents including, but not exclusively, The Butts, Sidmouth Road, King Street, Church Street, Lower Church Street and Rosemary Lane and this creates severe traffic flow problems for all and potentially life threatening blockages creating delays for emergency vehicles.
6. There is no safe Coach and Bus parking for the Grammar School resulting in a serious danger to all road users of the A3052 between 15:20 and 15:50 on all school days.
7. Whether or not Colyton is Sustainable at the moment is questionable but there is no doubt that it is becoming less so by the day. Colyford, by the EDDC’s crude measure is not sustainable but in many ways it is. It certainly it has the potential to be highly sustainable and one aim of the Neighbourhood Plan should be to make it so and similarly improve Colyton’s sustainability.

The Green wedge as drawn is clearly designed to stifle development and I firmly believe it should be removed altogether. There are sufficient Local Plan Policies, the AONB being just one, to give Colyton and Colyford the protection that it needs.

Map 8 incorrectly shows the extent of the Peace Memorial Playing Fields and has omitted the Football Field and Play Area at Road Green and the Play Area off Whitwell Lane.

**Should the Steering Group decide to include possible solutions in the Plan I would welcome the opportunity to make constructive proposals. I set out below some further comments and recommendations.**

## **Colyton Neighbourhood Plan Recommendations by A J Carthy.**

### **Background**

There is little doubt that after Covid both Climate Change and Housing will feature at or near the top of the Government's agenda. There are already moves in place to increase housing and East Devon is likely to have to provide for much more than it is at present.

In both the 1995 - 2011 and the 2013 -2031 Local Plans, development was focused on the West End of East Devon and mainly in Cranbrook. For a number of years leading up to 2016 the Council could not demonstrate a 5 year land supply and that gave rise to consents for over 3000 dwellings been granted, Contrary to Policy, in East Devon, many on very unsuitable sites.

There is little doubt that almost half the dwellings at Cranbrook are meeting Exeter's need and for which no allowance had been made, so in reality the provision for East Devon is very much less than set out in the Plan and only a fraction of what is required.

Because of an anomaly in the figures, East Devon is able to demonstrate that it is currently has a 5 year land supply, however, it is doing that while only achieving 73% of housing numbers in the Plan despite being able to include those meeting Exeter's need and the large number built that were unplanned. If objectively measured, the Council would not have a 5 Year Land Supply.

When the current Local Plan was drafted, land for some 740 houses was to be allocated to Villages, however, the Inspector, Mr Thickett, decided that the 5% measure used was too crude and allocation should be more objective. As a result the Council withdrew all allocations for Villages and while an increased allocation was made to the West End, suggested that the numbers would be produced through the Neighbourhood Plan process. **Colyton was classed as a Village in this regard.**

The Villages Plan was subsequently produced without the benefit of any objective needs assessments and in my view, crazily, the Inspector Beverley Doward raised no query on that when examining the soundness.

It is clear from the Neighbourhood Plans produced to date, apart from Beer which has made one allocation, there has been no serious attempt to provide allocated sites for housing, so the Villages will not have the housing promised in the original plan and young local people are the ones that are suffering and will continue to do so as a result of that.

From 1971 to 1994 Colyton benefitted from an average of 17 new houses per year as well as a number of industrial units, had that not happened then the place would be much less sustainable than it is today, with fewer services and there is a good chance that the Library and much else would have been lost.

Current policies have restricted development and since that time the average has dropped to perhaps 2 per year and 20 of those was on an Exception site on the western skyline.

If Colyton is to be sustainable into the future and avoid having development imposed upon it, then I would recommend that a fresh look is given to the Plan and allocations for parking, employment and housing are recommended, based upon an objective needs survey.

We know already that there is a move to build more affordable housing on an Exception site and that means that the plan makers have abdicated their responsibility by ignoring a need that has been established and not proposing an appropriate allocation.

There is a hidden agenda for relocating the Primary School. While the Local Education Authority has no plans for this, Parish Councillors have been heard to state that residential development should not be considered on the land adjacent to the Peace Memorial Playing Fields because it is the Council's preferred site for relocating the Primary School. If it is the wish of the Parish and the LEA indicates it is feasible, then it should be included in the plan with that site or other suitable land identified for it and the present school reallocated for other use.

On 16<sup>th</sup> November Christopher Pincher, housing minister, spoke at an online housing conference and below is an extract from the report which I believe underlines my thoughts that if Colyton does not make the allocations to fulfill its needs then those allocations will be imposed; local people want to live in Colyton and Colyford and not Cranbrook being the **anywhersville** that he refers to.

***The housing industry is “at the forefront of a seismic shift” in the way people are now viewing their homes and communities, the housing minister Christopher Pincher said today (November 16).***

***Speaking at today’s online Housing Market Intelligence Conference, Pincher said the government had placed housing at the centre of its recovery ambitions.***

***He reiterated the government’s intention to reach its homes target, including through changes to planning and moves toward design-led, green homes. Pincher also noted the robustness of the housing market.***

***“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 “anywhersville but where people want to live”.***

***Pincher said the pandemic had given many people “a new and profound appreciation of their homes and communities”.***

***“We hope with government support that this will be an opportunity not just to build, build, build, but build better and more beautiful and build communities that not only recover but are stronger and brighter.”***

**In the light of above I believe the Way forward for Colyton should be to:**

- 1.1. Adjust the Built-up Area Boundary to fairly reflect the physical Built-up Area.**
- 1.2. Carry out an objective Needs Assessment for all types of Housing, Employment, Education, Health and Parking.**
- 1.3. Make proposals for sustainable allocations to cover as much as possible of the Assessed Needs.**
- 1.4. Propose new Defined Development Boundaries that reflects the existing scale and core built form of the settlements and seek expansion to facilitate additional development in sustainable locations to meet the identified needs, respecting the distinctive character of the settlements and sensitivity to landscape setting.**
- 1.5. Ensure that all options are on the table.**