

# EAST DEVON DISTRICT COUNCIL

## Notes of a Meeting of the Local Development Framework Panel held at the Knowle, Sidmouth on Tuesday 25 October 2011

Present: Councillors:  
Mike Allen (Chairman)  
David Atkins  
Ray Bloxham  
Peter Bowden  
Alan Dent  
David Key  
Douglas Hull  
Andrew Moulding  
Helen Parr  
Steve Wragg  
Claire Wright

Also Present: Councillors:  
Paul Diviani  
Vivien Duval – Steer  
Jill Elson  
Martin Gammell  
Roger Giles  
Graham Godbeer  
Tony Howard  
John Humphreys  
Geoff Pook  
Philip Skinner  
Phil Twiss  
Tim Wood  
Tom Wright

Honorary Alderman Vivienne Ash

Officers:  
Neil Blackmore, Landscape Architect  
Richard Cohen, Deputy Chief Executive  
Matt Dickins, Planning Policy Manager  
Ed Freeman, Interim Development Manager  
Nigel Harrison, Economic Development Manager  
Kate Little, Head of Economy  
Fliss Morey, Projects Director, Exeter & East Devon Growth Point  
Ross Sutherland, Planning Officer  
Hannah Whitfield, Assistant Democratic Services Officer  
Andrew Wood, Head of Infrastructure and Partnerships, Exeter  
and East Devon Growth Point  
Frank Woolston, Senior Planning Officer

Apologies: Councillors:  
Steve Gazzard  
Stephanie Jones  
Pauline Stott  
Mark Williamson  
Eileen Wragg

The meeting started at 2.00pm and finished at 5.50 pm.

## 81 Chairman's Welcome

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting and gave a presentation on the 'journey so far' in respect of EDDC's Local Plan production, which included:

- The stages of production and an overview of evidence gathering initiatives undertaken;
- Defining sustainability and sustainable development and how it's achieved;
- Being aware of global impact regarding food and energy security and of economic issues in the District - promotion of local goods and services;
- Outlining of EDDC's core priorities;
- The importance of producing a sound Local Plan;
- Being aware of the bigger picture with regards to the District – issues and strengths;
- Planning for all generations;
- Recognising what needed protection - environment;
- Responding to housing projections and providing low cost affordable housing near to employment opportunities;
- Allocating employment land – looking at viability, density and types of employment. Creating a better balance of workspace provision. Encouraging higher paid employment through technology, science and knowledge.
- Providing infrastructure appropriate to people and business needs;
- Developing key strategic policies within the Local Plan.

## 82 Notes of Previous Meeting

The notes of the Local Development Framework (LDF) Panel meeting held on 18 October 2011 were discussed and agreed as a true record, subject to the inclusion of:

- Cllr Thomas' comments regarding the Consultation Strategy (minute 77)
- Minute 76 – Renewable Energy and Climate Change Policy -

**RECOMMENDED:** that the Plain English Member Champion be asked to read through the draft Local Plan prior to it going out for review.

## 83 Declarations of Interest

The following declarations of interest were made by Members:

Councillor/Officer	Agenda Item	Type of Interest/ Action Taken	Nature of Interest
Councillor Claire Wright	General	Personal – Remained in Chamber to take part in discussion and voting	Councillor was a member of the Communities Before Developers (CBD) Campaign Group and had signed up to the CBD Candidate's Pledge
Councillors Ray Bloxham, Alan Dent and Douglas Hull	General	Personal – Remained in Chamber to take part in discussions and voting	Member of National Trust

## 83 Declarations of Interest continued...

<b>Councillor/Officer</b>	<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Type of Interest/ Action Taken</b>	<b>Nature of Interest</b>
Councillor Graham Godbeer	General	Personal – Remained in Chamber to take part in discussion	Vice Chairman of East Devon AONB
Councillor Mike Allen	General	Personal – Remained in Chamber to take part in discussion	Honiton Town Councillor
Councillor Douglas Hull	General	Personal – Remained in Chamber to take part in discussions and voting	Axminster Town Councillor
Councillor Douglas Hull	General	Personal – Remained in Chamber to take part in discussions and voting	Councillor was a member of the Communities Before Developers (CBD) Campaign Group
Councillor Graham Godbeer	Item 9 – West End – Sequencing of Proposals	Personal – Remained in Chamber to take part in discussion	Director on the Science Park Board
Councillor Philip Skinner	Item 10 – Littleham Valley Exmouth Capacity	Personal – Remained in the Chamber	Brother was tenant farmer of Maer/Green Farm, Littleham

## 84 LDF Panel Forward Plan

Members discussed the forward plan which scheduled items for the Panel's meeting on 1 November 2011.

A draft final report of the housing and employment study commissioned by EDDC had been published and was available on the Council's website. The Panel would consider an officer report on the implications of the study at their next meeting, along with outstanding chapters not yet considered by the Panel.

**RECOMMENDED:** that Roger Tym and Partners be invited to attend the LDF Panel meeting on 1 November to present their report.

85 West End – Sequencing of Proposals (Minute 59 & 66 refers)

At the LDF Panel meeting held on 11 October it was agreed that an up-to-date, enlarged map showing sequencing for proposals/allocations for the West End and Green Infrastructure be brought back to the Panel. Members considered an A3 plan of the major development sites committed/proposed in the West End and how they fitted into the Plan strategy and indicative phasing of the proposals. The proposed Strategy Chapter of the Local Plan aimed to phase development in 5 year time periods – there were four phases in total and the first phase had already passed.

Members noted that a preliminary assessment of development expansion options at Cranbrook had been undertaken. Based on the site of the current allocated/permitted land reasonably accommodating 3,500 dwellings, with design enhancements, it was considered acceptable to accommodate an extra 2,500 dwellings on expansion sites to the east and west to provide for development of 6,000 new dwellings in total.

The development proposal for new homes at Redhayes was phased in for/after 2021 - there was concern allowing development in this location prior would affect the delivery of Cranbrook. DCC Highways had stated in their presentation to the Panel that the Science Park access road would accommodate traffic generated from 4,000 houses, employment and other uses – after this scale of development a new parallel road would be required outside the Science Park site.

Members also considered an indicative map of the proposed extent of the Clyst Valley County Park - all of the strategic sites in the West End were set within the indicative location of the proposed park. Particular emphasis would be attached to establishing high quality landscapes and settings for development, people and wildlife in this area.

Matters raised and issues arising during subsequent discussion included:

- The density of housing for Cranbrook would be between 30-35 dwellings per hectare (dph) – development would be of a higher density in the centre of the town compared with housing adjacent to the country park.
- Expansion land to the east had two power lines across the land – if these could not be moved/put underground the expansion site would need to be reviewed.
- Restrictions regarding Bluehayes House and existing parkland had been taken into account when looking at sites for expanding Cranbrook.
- Phase 2 of Science Park could not commence until the new parallel road was in place. The issue was how the road was funded rather than when it would be bought forward – ultimately over time the road would be paid for by development.
- Funding for 30% affordable housing had been secured for the 1100 houses granted permission at Cranbrook.
- Identify green wedges and National Trust owned land on the plan.

**RECOMMENDED:** that the indicative phasing for major development proposals at the West End as set out in the report (and Plan) to the Panel be endorsed.

## 86 Littleham Valley (Exmouth) Capacity

At their meeting on 11 October 2011 (minute 64 refers) the Panel had given consideration to potential development land at Littleham, Exmouth. The Panel had recommended that the principle of 190 houses be accepted on the Maer Valley/Littleham site as an allocation site in the Local Plan, with the Planning Policy Manager to produce a map defining the area of the site for development. Members heard that Exmouth Town Council's submitted amended plan of the proposed allocation at Littleham (a smaller area of the original proposed allocation for 190 houses) included an existing employment site - it was not considered appropriate for the employment land to form part of the strategic housing allocation.

The Head of Economy advised that following the meeting on 11 October, Clinton Devon Estates had reconsidered its masterplan for Maer/Littleham Valley and put forward a revised proposal; the proposal promoted a total of 350 houses on an extended site to that recommended by the Panel and released 'Donkey Hill' as a public access area. The land identified was outside the landscape designation area. A capacity study for each of the options (190, 350 and 500 houses) had been undertaken and were presented in the submission – dwellings per hectare would be lower on the proposed site for 350 houses than on the site proposed for 190 houses. The revised proposal for 350 houses was considered a more appropriate/suitable allocation by Officers, particularly as the site was well related to the town centre, a range of services and employment opportunities.

## Speakers' comments:

- Due to the lateness of the submission for 350 houses it had not been possible for Exmouth Town Council to be consulted;
- Concern regarding loss of farms/farmland;
- Over burden on infrastructure from 350 of greater concern than the higher density;
- Littleham Valley residents and town councillors not been consulted regarding development of the site;
- Recommendation made by the Panel for 190 houses should stand;
- Shouldn't look at sites in isolation – consider the wider picture in Exmouth and affects development/non-development of sites might have;
- Need more time to consider the revised proposal.

Matters raised and issues arising during subsequent discussion regarding Maer/Littleham Valley included:

- Residents would have the opportunity to comment on allocations when the draft Local Plan went out for review – Members were advised that the housing allocation figure could not be increased after the review, only decreased without the need to go out for further consultation/review;
- A number of units at Pankhurst Industrial Estate were unoccupied and should be considered for housing;
- 190 houses had been supported by Exmouth Town Council and was recommended by the Panel;
- Developing (part-of) Pankhurst Industrial Estate for housing should be explored;
- Disappointment that there had been no consultation with the community regarding the proposal for 500 or 350 houses. Question some of the statements in the submission regarding the revised proposal;

## 86 Littleham Valley (Exmouth) Capacity continued...

- Members were advised that the Pankhurst Industrial Estate had not been put forward for development and had not been included within the SHLAA. There were also potential contamination issues with the site;
- 350 houses would deliver more affordable housing and advise was that there were no issues from a highways perspective with a development of this scale on the proposed site;
- Need to consider community benefits;
- Limited weight would be given to the draft Local Plan when it went out for review – weight would increase as the Local Plan went through examination/adoption stages;
- Disagree with DCC highways as traffic issues in and around Littleham. Increased traffic would add to the congestion problems on A376.

**RECOMMENDED:** that a strategic allocation of 190 houses at Maer/Littleham Valley be included within the draft Local Plan and that the possibility of developing 60 houses on the Pankhurst Industrial Estate be explored.

## 87 Draft Chapter of the Proposed New Local Plan

Members considered the Budleigh Salterton Chapter which had not yet been seen/considered by the Panel and highlighted a few refinements regarding the Vision for East Devon to 2031 Chapter. The outstanding Chapters circulated would be considered at the Panel's meeting on 1 November 2011.

- RECOMMENDED:**
1. that the Vision for East Devon to 2031 Chapter be revised and refined to include the following:
    - 3.1 – add Budleigh Salterton to the towns listed under balanced communities;
    - Amend the map to include Budleigh Salterton as a town;
    - 4.1 - Reinstate titles 'Thriving Communities' and 'Outstanding Environment'. Clarification to be sought on whether titles should be in line with the Corporate Plan;
  2. that the Budleigh Salterton Chapter be revised and refined to include the following:
    - 9.2 – Site of Specific Interest was in Otterton not Budleigh Salterton;
    - 9.3 – remove 'along High Street and Fore Street (and some in side streets)';
    - 9.4, second bullet point – add 'which is appropriate to location and surroundings'.

- 88 Proposed Development Management Policies of the Local Plan
- Members were advised that part two of the new Local Plan would comprise development management policies (part one comprised strategy policies). Existing Local Plan policies would be used as a starting point to define new policies, however these would be augmented by some additional new Development Management Policies. Members considered a schedule setting out each of the policies, proposed new Local Plan text, justification for the policy and officer commentary giving explanation for the recommendations.

Members heard that a second phase of work regarding the Local Plan, ideally to be subject to separate examination from the strategy and development management policies, would be to consider/amend boundary changes for those settlements with Built-up Area Boundaries that did not want/intend to produce Neighbourhood Plans. This phase of work was not intended to form part of the upcoming review on the new Local Plan; however comments/feedback received regarding boundaries during the review would inform this work.

Speakers' comments included:

- Support many of the policies in the schedule, such as retention on environmental policies;
- Policy S4 – would like it to include a comprehensive list of types development that might be permitted outside BUABs, however ideally there would be no exceptions;
- Policy EN18 – include the word 'sewerage' after foul;
- Policy EN21 – surface water run-off policy should be retained;
- Affordable housing policy – disagree with the proposed policy. Provision on affordable housing should respond to local need and reflect the suitability of the area and the site for housing;
- Policy E4 should be retained – prevention of bad neighbour development should be at the heart of the policies.

Members had a lengthy discussion regarding the Development Management policies set out in the schedule up to Policy H1.

88 Proposed Development Management Policies of the Local Plan continued...

**RECOMMENDED:**

that the proposed Development Management policies be incorporated/amended in accordance with the schedule up Policy H1, into the new Local Plan subject to:

- it being made clear that strategic policies were detailed within the strategy part of the Local Plan;
- all references to 'protect' or 'protection' of the countryside be changed to 'conserve' or 'conservation';
- Policy S5 – being changed to 'Development in the Countryside';
- Policy S7 – being retained until 1 November Panel meeting when strategic policy would be considered;
- Policy D1 – 3. v) – being separated into two elements:
  - amenity of occupants – a reference for what amenity (such as waste, storage and drying space) was required to sit alongside the policy;
  - amenity of occupiers of adjoining residential properties.
- Policy D4 – remove text above the criteria as dealt with through the validation process;
- Policy CS 34, Nature Conservation and Geology (strategic policy) – being redrafted to bring in line with retained policies EN4/5;
- Policy EN18 – policy name being amended to 'Adequacy of Sewage Treatment Works';
- Policy EN20 – being amended to reflect the sequential test and exceptions tests currently set out in PPS 25 (PPS 25 was likely to be superseded by National Planning Policy Framework)

89 Local Plan Vision Statement

**RECOMMENDED:**

that the redrafted Local Plan Vision Statement be considered at the Local Development Framework Panel meeting to be held on 1 November 2011.