

Filtered Data Export

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** 3West Developments Ltd

**Proposal:** 10. High Quality Design

**1. To which part of the High Quality Design chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** DS02

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed above?:** No

**1(c). If the comment is related to a site, please state the site reference here.:**  
Exmo\_20

**2. Do you consider that this part of the High Quality Design chapter is legally compliant?:** No

**3. Do you consider that this part of the High Quality Design chapter is sound?:** No

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the High Quality Design chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:**

2.60 3West support the principle of Policy DS02 and agree that residential development should optimise density in a manner that conserves or enhances the character of the area and makes efficient use of the land.

2.61 However, the policy as drafted lacks certainty and risks unnecessary duplication. In particular, the relationship between the requirement for design codes under Policy DS02 and the requirement for a comprehensive masterplan for St John's under Strategic Policy SD01 must be clearly defined. Both matters address overlapping issues.

2.62 To ensure the policy is effective and consistent with the tests of soundness, Policy DS02 should be amended to explicitly confirm that the comprehensive masterplan required under Strategic Policy SD01 will satisfy any design code expectations for the site, and that additional design code requirements will not be imposed where these matters have already been addressed. This certainty is essential to support deliverability and avoid delay.

**4. Do you consider that this part of the High Quality Design chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?:** No

**5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?:** Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

**6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary.:** Our attendance is necessary to effectively discuss the points raised in these representations.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** 3West Developments Ltd

**Proposal:** 10. High Quality Design

**1. To which part of the High Quality Design chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** DS01

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed above?:** No

**1(c). If the comment is related to a site, please state the site reference here.:**  
Exmo\_20

**3. Do you consider that this part of the High Quality Design chapter is sound?:** Yes

**3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the High Quality Design chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.:**

2.58 3West Developments support the requirements of the policy which ensure proposals respond to local policy and guidance, and to be of high quality and locally distinctive.

2.59 Land at St Johns, north-west of Exmouth, presents an opportunity to deliver up to 700 highquality homes. The development would respond positively to its surroundings, meeting local housing needs through a mix of private and affordable homes, alongside new social and community facilities.

**5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?:** Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

**6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary.:** Our attendance is necessary to effectively discuss the points raised in these representations.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** 3West Developments Ltd

**Proposal:** 13. Our Outstanding Biodiversity and Geodiversity

**1. To which part of the Our Outstanding Biodiversity and Geodiversity chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** PB05

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed above?:** Yes

**2. Do you consider that this part of the Our Outstanding Biodiversity and Geodiversity chapter is legally compliant?:** No

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Our Outstanding Biodiversity and Geodiversity chapter is sound?:** No

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Our Outstanding Biodiversity and Geodiversity chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:**

2.63 3West acknowledges the amendments made to Strategic Policy PB05 and supports the principle that impacts on biodiversity should be avoided wherever possible, mitigated where necessary, and fully compensated where residual impacts remain. The importance of delivering biodiversity enhancements as part of new development, including at Exmo\_20, is fully recognised.

2.64 However, notwithstanding the amendments, 3West Developments continue to consider the requirement for biodiversity net gain in excess of the statutory minimum is not sound. For the Local Plan to be considered sound, it must be consistent with national policy. The mandatory requirement for major development, as set out in the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by the Environment Act 2022), is a minimum of 10% biodiversity net gain. Any requirement to exceed this threshold must therefore be clearly justified, evidenced and shown to be deliverable.

2.65 This position is reinforced by emerging national policy, including the draft NPPF consultation (2025), which confirms that development plans should only set biodiversity net gain requirements above the statutory minimum in specific circumstances, where this is fully justified and demonstrably deliverable. Similarly, national Planning Practice Guidance is clear that higher BNG requirements should not be applied on an area-wide or allocation-specific basis unless supported by robust

evidence, including consideration of local need, opportunity and impacts on development viability.

2.66 In the absence of such justification, the application of a 20% biodiversity net gain requirement to major development would not be consistent with national policy and risks undermining the viability and deliverability of allocated sites, including Exmo\_20. Given the range of other sitespecific constraints and policy requirements already affecting the allocation, it is particularly important that biodiversity requirements are applied in a proportionate and flexible manner.

2.67 Accordingly, to ensure consistency with national policy and support the effective delivery of the St John's allocation, biodiversity net gain requirements should align with the statutory minimum of 10%, with any consideration of higher levels assessed on a site-specific and evidence-led basis through the development management process.

**4. Do you consider that this part of the Our Outstanding Biodiversity and Geodiversity chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?:** No

**5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?:** Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

**6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary.:** Our attendance is necessary to effectively discuss the points raised in these representations.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** 3West Developments Ltd

**Proposal:** 14. Open Space and Sports and Recreation

**1. To which part of the Open Space and Sports and Recreation chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** OS02

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed above?:** Yes

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Open Space and Sports and Recreation chapter is sound?:** No

**3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Open Space and Sports and Recreation chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.:**

We welcome the minor amendment to the policy wording, which provides different requirements for developments between 101 and 500 homes.

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Open Space and Sports and Recreation chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:**

This policy sets out the requirements for the provision of open space for new developments, with the level of required open space required varying by site size. The policy has been revised to state that developments are required to provide the following:

- Up to 20 homes – informal play provision
- Between 21 and 100 homes – LAPs and informal play provision
- Between 101 and 500 homes – LAPs, LEAPs and informal play space
- More than 500 homes - LAP, LEAP, NEAP, informal play, amenity green space, and additional green space types.

Additional requirements for developments over 200 homes include:

- Doorstep accessible Greenspace (0.5ha within 200m) or;
- Local accessible Greenspace (2ha within 300m). For sites over 300 homes, Neighbourhood Accessible Greenspace (10ha within 1km) is required.
- Open space will be calculated based on an average of 2.26 residents per household, with some exceptions or contributions to off-site spaces allowed.

We welcome the minor amendment to the policy wording, which provides different requirements for developments between 101 and 500 homes. It is also reiterated that the requirement for additional open space typologies for developments exceeding 200 homes is unnecessary. We maintain that the policy wording should allow for greater flexibility, recognising that certain development typologies may not be deliverable on some sites due to physical constraints, including topography and the surrounding site context.

**3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Open Space and Sports and Recreation chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Open Space and Sports and Recreation chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.:** reiterated that the requirement for additional open space typologies for developments exceeding 200 homes is unnecessary. We maintain that the policy wording should allow for greater flexibility, recognising that certain development typologies may not be deliverable on some sites due to physical constraints, including topography and the surrounding site context [see 3(b)].

**5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?:** Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

**6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary.:** Our attendance is necessary to effectively discuss the points raised in these representations.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** 3West Developments Ltd

**Proposal:** 14. Open Space and Sports and Recreation

**1. To which part of the Open Space and Sports and Recreation chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** OS01

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed above?:** No

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Open Space and Sports and Recreation chapter is sound?:** No

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Open Space and Sports and Recreation chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:**

Whilst \*\*\* Personal details have been removed \*\*\* support the principle of this policy and the need for new development to deliver new and enhanced high quality open space, it is disappointing that the concerns raised during the previous Regulation 19 Consultation have not been considered.

\*\*\* Personal details have been removed \*\*\* continues to raise concerns to the policy's suggestion that all development must consider the provision of formal sports provision including changing provision, pavilions and other supporting facilities it will generate. It should be recognised that the provision of formal sports facilities should be driven by the site's location and context and local need, and not all sites are suitable for formal sports provision. The Plan must acknowledge that certain sites (due to their context and topography) are not suitable locations for accommodating formal sports provision. Sporting facilities can be delivered in other, informal ways, including the provision of outside trim trail equipment, circular walking routes, which can deliver similar benefits and provide opportunities for health and well-being to all.

Land at Northcote Hill proposes to deliver areas of new public open space, which will be for the enjoyment of the existing and future residents of Honiton. This includes a large area of open space which will offer a variety of walking routes, informal recreation and biodiversity enhancements. The various areas of informal open space will contribute to the health and well-being of future residents. The proposals are landscape-led and informed by the site's context.

**3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Open Space and Sports and Recreation chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Open Space and Sports and Recreation chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.:** The policy must be reworded accordingly [see response to 3(b)] to recognise the need to consider formal sports provision on a case-by-case basis.

**5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?:** Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

**6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary.:** Our attendance is necessary to effectively discuss the points raised in these representations.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** 3West Developments Ltd

**Proposal:** 14. Open Space and Sports and Recreation

**1. To which part of the Open Space and Sports and Recreation chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** OS02

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed above?:** Yes

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Open Space and Sports and Recreation chapter is sound?:** Yes

**3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Open Space and Sports and Recreation chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.:**

2.68 3West Developments support Policy OS02 and welcomes the updated wording which recognises that site topography and other planning constraints may limit the extent to which open space and recreational provision can be delivered on-site. This flexibility is appropriate and ensures that the policy can be applied in a pragmatic manner without undermining the viability or deliverability of allocated sites, including Exmo\_20.

2.69 The development of land at St John's, Exmouth will provide significant opportunities for sport, recreation and public open space in accordance with Policy OS02. As set out within the Vision Statement and Addendum, the scheme will deliver a substantial quantum of publicly accessible open space, including landscaped green infrastructure, woodland retention and enhancement, informal recreation areas, and opportunities for children's play.

**4. Do you consider that this part of the Open Space and Sports and Recreation chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?:** No

**5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?:** Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

**6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary.:** Our attendance is necessary to effectively discuss the points raised in these representations.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** 3West Developments Ltd

**Proposal:**

3. The Spatial Strategy

**1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?:**

Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** SP07

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed in the table above?:** Yes

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?:** Yes

**3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.:** \*\*\* Personal details have been removed \*\*\* acknowledge the removal of the need for new development proposals to support the 'wider community' in terms of the delivery of infrastructure, ensuring that the draft policy wording is in accordance with National Policy is Guidance.

**5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?:** Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

**6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary.:** Our attendance is necessary to effectively discuss the points raised in these representations.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** 3West Developments Ltd

**Proposal:**

3. The Spatial Strategy

**1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?:**

Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** SP03

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed in the table above?:** Yes

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:** Strategic Policy SP03 – Housing Requirement by Designated Neighbourhood Plan:

We do not object in principle to Policy SP03, however have observed some discrepancies between the figures in this policy and those set out in Policy SD03 within the Second Regulation 19 Draft Local Plan.

Notably, the Honiton DNA housing requirement in Strategic Policy SP03 specifies 888 homes, while the Honiton allocations identified within Strategic Policy SD03 (Honiton and its development allocations) amount to 877 homes. It is unclear where the remaining 11 homes are proposed to be allocated given that Honiton Town are not actively progressing a Neighbourhood Development Plan.

**5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?:** Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

**6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary.:** Our attendance is necessary to effectively discuss the points raised in these representations.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** 3West Developments Ltd

**Proposal:**

3. The Spatial Strategy

**1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?:**

Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** SP02

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed in the table above?:** No

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?:** No

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:** Strategic Policy SP02 – Levels of future housing development:

Affordable Housing Need: Supporting text for Strategic Policy SP02 has been amended to provide an update affordable housing need figure for East Devon between 2020-2040. Paragraph 3.10 confirms that the affordable housing need has increased from 4,070 affordable dwellings to 4,108 dwellings and an additional '1,170 homes for those in private rent but who aspire to home ownership and can afford discounted market housing products'. The affordable needs for the District should be accounted for as well as the Council justifying its approach to an affordable housing contingency.

Housing Need and Stepped Trajectory: "The Local Plan is being examined under the September 2023 NPPF, but benefits from the transitional arrangements introduced in the December 2024 NPPF, which allow plans that had reached Regulation 19 to proceed on the basis that they meet at least 80% of the Standard Method housing need. On this basis, the Council is entitled to set its minimum housing requirement at 80% of the 2023 Standard Method figure, and the housing requirement in Strategic Policy SP02 meets this minimum threshold. However, the 80% figure represents a policy minimum and starting point, not a ceiling. There is no policy harm in planning for a higher level of housing provision where this can be sustainably accommodated. The latest Standard Method (May 2025) indicates an annual housing need of approximately 1,147 dwellings per annum, which better reflects current demographic and affordability pressures. As such, while the Plan satisfies the transitional minimum, the objectively assessed

housing need is materially higher. To ensure the Plan is justified by the latest housing need, it must be genuinely positively prepared and responsive to the housing needs of the district."

**5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?:** Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

**6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary.:** Our attendance is necessary to effectively discuss the points raised in these representations.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** 3West Developments Ltd

**Proposal:**

3. The Spatial Strategy

**1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?:**

Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** SP06

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:**

2.21 Strategic Policy SP06 states that in locations outside of the defined settlement boundaries, development will not be permitted unless it is in accordance with a specific Local or Neighbourhood Plan policy that explicitly permits such development.

2.22 While 3West Developments support this policy, 3West Developments consider that there is an inconsistency with Strategic Policy SP05, which appears to discourage Neighbourhood Plans from allocating sites outside of the Draft LP settlement boundaries. It should be acknowledged that Neighbourhood Plans can make alterations to the settlement boundaries to allow for additional housing growth where this is justified and accords with the Council's overarching spatial strategy, therefore meeting the NDP Basic Conditions Tests.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** 3West Developments Ltd

**Proposal:**

3. The Spatial Strategy

**1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?:**

Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** SP05

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed in the table above?:** No

**2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?:** No

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?:** No

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:**

2.17 Whilst 3West Developments agree with the principle of this policy, 3West Developments object to the current policy wording, which appears to restrict and discourage Neighbourhood Plans from allocating sites beyond settlement boundaries.

2.18 The housing numbers within the Council's strategic policies and housing distribution should not represent a ceiling for growth. Neighbourhood Plans must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan in force (in order to meet the basic conditions).

2.19 Should updated evidence be prepared in support of a future Neighbourhood Plan that suggests that there is a local unmet need for additional housing (beyond that identified within the adopted LP), the Council should not prevent additional sites from being allocated within the Neighbourhood Plan.

2.20 As currently worded, therefore, it is considered that this Strategic Policy is not sound as it does not align with National Policy and the Government's overarching objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes (NPPF; Paragraph 61).

**4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?:** No

**5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?:** Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

**6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary.:** Our attendance is necessary to effectively discuss the points raised in these representations.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** 3West Developments Ltd

**Proposal:**

3. The Spatial Strategy

**1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?:**

Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** SP04

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed in the table above?:** No

**2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?:** No

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?:** No

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:** We note that Policy SP04 has been amended since previous consultation stages to provide further explanation as to why the proposed employment land provision exceeds the requirements identified within the Employment Development Needs Assessment (EDNA). In particular, the Council now seeks to justify this approach on the basis of addressing historic under-provision, and 3West Developments acknowledge that this amendment appears intended to respond to concerns raised in earlier representations.

2.15 We also reiterate our previous concern in relation to the proposed approach of meeting a proportion of Use Class E(g)(iii) light industrial needs through allocations associated with larger housing developments. The Plan has still failed to demonstrate that such locations are suitable for accommodating light industrial uses, nor has it been shown that this approach would be effective in meeting the operational requirements of such businesses. There is therefore a lack of proportionate evidence to justify this approach. In the absence of evidence on market demand, deliverability, compatibility with residential uses, and long-term viability, it has not been demonstrated that this strategy will deliver employment land and premises in the right locations over the plan period. For these reasons, whilst the amendments to Policy SP04 are noted, they do not adequately address the concerns raised in previous representations. The policy remains insufficiently justified and it has not been demonstrated that it represents an effective or evidence-led approach to meeting employment needs. As currently drafted, Strategic Policy SP04 is therefore not considered sound, particularly in respect of the tests of being justified and effective.

**4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?:** No

**5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?:** Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

**6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary.:** Our attendance is necessary to effectively discuss the points raised in these representations.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** 3West Developments Ltd

**Proposal:**

3. The Spatial Strategy

**1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?:**

Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** SP03

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed in the table above?:** No

**2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?:** No

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?:** No

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:**

2.12 3West raise no objection in principle to Policy SP03 and welcome the increase in the Exmouth DNA housing requirement from 2,311 to 2,331 dwellings. However, 3West Developments consider that further clarity is required regarding how this requirement is expected to be met over the plan period, having regard to existing commitments and the role of any future Neighbourhood Development Plan.

2.13 In particular, whilst Policy SP03 identifies a housing requirement of 2,331 dwellings for the Exmouth DNA, the allocations listed under Policy SD01 provide for 1,455 dwellings. It is therefore unclear whether this figure includes extant commitments and/or whether the Council anticipates an uplift to accommodate additional growth through the emerging Exmouth Neighbourhood Development Plan. The relationship between these figures, and the reliance upon them for meeting the Draft LP housing requirement, must be clarified to ensure consistency and certainty across the Draft Local Plan.

**4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?:** No

**5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?:** Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

**6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary.:** Our attendance is necessary to effectively discuss the points raised in these representations.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** 3West Developments Ltd

**Proposal:**

3. The Spatial Strategy

**1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?:**

Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** SP02

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed in the table above?:** No

**2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?:** No

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?:** No

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:**

2.8 3West reiterate comments made in previous representations in respect of Strategic Policy SP02 and remain disappointed that the concerns raised at the earlier Regulation 19 stage have not been substantively addressed.

2.9 In particular, the approach taken continues to rely on constrained housing provision, which reflects a housing requirement of 80% of the actual local housing need for the District, despite East Devon experiencing an acute housing crisis and worsening housing affordability.

2.10 3West also object to the Council's intention to proceed with a stepped trajectory approach, which is wholly unjustified, noting the District's significant overreliance on housing delivery within the new settlement, despite the acknowledged uncertainty surrounding future housing need and delivery on such strategic sites, highlighted through the historic issues associated with Cranbrook. This risks undermining the Plan's ability to respond positively and flexibly to changing circumstances, contrary to national policy. EDDC are also experiencing a housing crisis and an acute affordable housing need rendering the need to address their housing requirement as soon as possible, rather than delaying delivery by adopting a stepped trajectory approach.

2.11 Given Exmouth's position within the settlement hierarchy, a more ambitious approach to housing provision within the town would assist in ensuring the Plan is positively prepared and effective over the plan period.

**4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?:** No

**5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?:** Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

**6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary.:** Our attendance is necessary to effectively discuss the points raised in these representations.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** 3West Developments Ltd

**Proposal:**

3. The Spatial Strategy

**1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?:**

Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** SP01

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed in the table above?:** No

**2. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is legally compliant?:** No

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?:** No

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:** These representations have been prepared by Boyer on behalf of 3West Developments, in response to the East Devon District Council (EDDC) Local Plan (Regulation 19, stage 2) Consultation Document (hereafter referred to as the “Draft LP”).

1.2 3West Developments have positively engaged in past Local Plan consultations, with representations for Land at St Johns (‘the Site’) previously been submitted by Collier Planning as part of the first stage of the Regulation 19 Consultation undertaken in March 2025.

1.3 This second stage of the Regulation 19 consultation uses a 'tracked changes' document, highlighting differences from the first version; these representations focus on the changes and thus should be read alongside the Phase 1 submissions made in March 2025. Land at St Johns (Exmo\_20)

1.4 Land at St Johns is located north-west of Exmouth, which extends to approximately 85.46 hectares. The Site is sustainably located and has capacity for up to 700 high quality homes, offering a Site that can significantly benefit the Council in terms of housing land supply.

1.5 The site is identified as a draft allocation within East Devon’s Regulation 19 Consultation Document (Exmo\_20), to accommodate:

- Social and community facilities;

- Around 700 new homes; and
- At least 2 hectares of employment land.

1.6 3West Developments wholly supports the allocation of Land at St Johns (Exmo\_20) as set out in the Regulation 19 Publication Draft and can confirm that the site is suitable, available and deliverable.

1.7 The Site represents a highly sustainable, landscape-led opportunity on the edge of Exmouth to create a distinctive contemporary 'woodland village'. The proposals are founded on a masterplan that works with existing topography, woodlands and hedgerows to deliver a wellconnected, walkable neighbourhood focused on a strong community core, generous green infrastructure and excellent active travel links. The development will provide a well-integrated, self-contained extension to the town that promotes healthy lifestyles, a sense of belonging and a positive transition between the urban area and the surrounding landscape. A Site Location Plan is included within Appendix 1 of these representations. Test of Soundness

1.8 These representations respond to the relevant Draft Local Plan policies, having regard to the tests of soundness set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, December 2023). For the avoidance of doubt, these tests apply in the context of the Draft Local Plan benefitting from the NPPF transitional arrangements. In this regard, the Plan must be: a. Positively prepared; b. Justified; c. Effective; and d. Consistent with national policy.

#### Policy SP01: Spatial Strategy

2.2 Strategic Policy SP01 confirms that new development will be directed towards the most sustainable locations in East Devon, with the most sustainable location identified as the West End of the District, followed by the Principal Centre of Exmouth and the Main Centres of Axminster, Honiton, Ottery St Mary, Seaton and Sidmouth.

2.3 3West support the identification of Exmouth as a Principal Centre. This appropriately recognises that Exmouth is the largest town in East Devon and provides the greatest concentration and range of services, facilities and employment opportunities within the district. It is appropriate and entirely justified therefore that the plan identifies Exmouth as a higher tier settlement than the other towns.

2.4 We also support the overall settlement hierarchy set out within Strategic Policy SP01 and agree that it accords with a fundamental principle of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023), namely directing housing growth towards the most sustainable locations.

2.5 However, 3West are disappointed to see a continued lack of any meaningful uplift in housing provision directed towards Exmouth. At only approximately 11% of the overall housing requirement, the level of growth apportioned to Exmouth is lower than might reasonably be expected for the district's largest and most sustainable settlement. This is particularly the case when Exmouth's role, accessibility and service provision are considered in the context of the spatial strategy as a whole.

2.6 We note the addition of the following text to the policy justification: 'In the event of housing not being delivered in accordance with the plan and/or the identified need for new homes changing in the future, including taking account of possible unmet needs in neighbouring areas, the requirements of national policy and legislation for a review/update of the plan will be followed.'

2.7 Whilst acknowledgement of the need for future review is supported, this recognition would have been more meaningful if accompanied by a greater uplift in housing provision directed to a settlement which is already identified as highly sustainable and well suited to accommodating additional growth.

**4. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?:** No

**5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?:** Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

**6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary.:** Our attendance is necessary to effectively discuss the points raised in these representations.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** 3West Developments Ltd

**Proposal:**

8. Meeting Housing Needs

**1. To which part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** HN03

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed above?:** No

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter is sound?:**  
No

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:** \*\*\* Personal details have been removed \*\*\* continues to support the principle of Policy HN03, and the importance of providing housing that meets the needs of older people is recognised, given the evidence that there is a requirement for an increased number of units for older persons as a result of an ageing population across the District. However, \*\*\* Personal details have been removed \*\*\* continue to have concerns regarding viability and the lack of consideration afforded to this in the consideration of this policy, as well as the specific locational requirements associated with specialist older persons housing.

It is acknowledged that, subject to commercial viability, housing proposals are required such that “schemes for 200 or more dwellings should include at least 10% as on-site as specialist older persons dwellings as either C3 dwellings and/or C2 equivalents”.

It is considered that the current policy wording is neither effective nor justified, as it does not adequately address the specific locational requirements of specialist housing (including, for example, proximity to town centres, or access to established public transport corridors). The policy, as currently worded, may result in such dwelling types not being suitable on certain major development sites. As drafted, the policy is therefore considered unsound.

**3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have**

**identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.:** \*\*\* Personal details have been removed \*\*\* continues to reiterate that the policy wording should be revised to make clear that older person's units will only be required where there is an up to date evidence base, a demonstratable market demand (including the location being a suitable and desirable one for such a use), and where the provision of such units is viable.

**5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?:** Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

**6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary.:** Our attendance is necessary to effectively discuss the points raised in these representations.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** 3West Developments Ltd

**Proposal:**

8. Meeting Housing Needs

**1. To which part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** HN02

**3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.:** This policy prescribes the affordable housing requirements required on all developments across East Devon. For site allocations within Honiton, affordable housing is set at 30%. \*\*\* Personal details have been removed \*\*\* notes that the affordable housing mix included is an aspiration and it welcomes this flexibility.

**3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.:** \*\*\* Personal details have been removed \*\*\* notes that the affordable housing mix included is an aspiration and it welcomes this flexibility. Further clarity could be provided to confirm that any alternative mix proposed would be subject to evidence including local market information.

**5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?:** Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

**6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary.:** Our attendance is necessary to effectively discuss the points raised in these representations.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** 3West Developments Ltd

**Proposal:**

8. Meeting Housing Needs

**1. To which part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** HN01

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed above?:** No

**3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.:** \*\*\*

Personal details have been removed \*\*\* continues to support the principle of Strategic Policy HN01 and the need for new developments and housing to meet existing needs. We welcome the recognition that up-to-date local housing need evidence assessments can be relied upon when assessing both existing and future housing needs.

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:** \*\*\* Personal details have been removed \*\*\* reiterate, however, that the Plan should seek to provide housing allocations sufficient to meet the full objectively assessed housing need for East Devon, rather than treating the minimum 80% Standard Method figure permitted under the NPPF transitional arrangements as a ceiling. While the housing requirement in Strategic Policy SP02 satisfies the transitional minimum, it represents only a starting point. The latest Standard Method indicates an annual housing need of approximately 1,147 dwellings per annum, which better reflects current demographic and affordability pressures. There is no policy harm in planning positively for a higher level of housing provision above the minimum, and doing so would reduce reliance on a small number of strategic sites and better ensure the Plan is genuinely positively prepared.

**5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?:** Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

**6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary.:** Our attendance is necessary to effectively discuss the points raised in these representations.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** 3West Developments Ltd

**Proposal:**

8. Meeting Housing Needs

**1. To which part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** HN05

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed above?:** No

**2. Do you consider that this part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter is legally compliant?:** No

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter is sound?:**  
No

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:**

2.55 3West supports the overarching principle of Strategic Policy HN05, however, considers that allocating specific sites for self-build and custom-build housing would be more effective than applying blanket requirements to all allocated sites. A more flexible, criteria-led approach would be better suited to facilitating delivery.

2.56 We question whether the requirement for self-build and custom-build housing on all developments of more than 20 dwellings is sufficiently justified. Where there is no demonstrable demand, developers should not be disadvantaged by being required to deliver specialist housing products.

2.57 To ensure the policy is justified and therefore sound, the wording should be amended to clarify that self-build and custom-build housing will only be sought on developments where there is clear evidence of market demand. In the absence of such demand, it should be recognised that these units should revert to conventional market housing to meet local needs.

**4. Do you consider that this part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?:** No

**5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?:** Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

**6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary.:** Our attendance is necessary to effectively discuss the points raised in these representations.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** 3West Developments Ltd

**Proposal:**

8. Meeting Housing Needs

**1. To which part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** HN04

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed above?:** Yes

**2. Do you consider that this part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter is legally compliant?:** No

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter is sound?:**  
No

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:**

2.51 3West Developments recognises the increasing demand for accessible and adaptable homes and supports the overall objectives of Strategic Policy HN04. The reduction in the proportion of new dwellings required to meet Building Regulations M4(2) or higher from 100% to 50% is welcomed, as it provides a more balanced and deliverable approach. It should be noted by the LPA that this will place increased cost and issue on development layouts and viability.

2.52 However, the Draft Local Plan also proposes to increase the proportion of new affordable homes required to meet Building Regulations M4(3) (2)(a) or (b) from 5% to 15%. 3West Developments has significant concerns shares the concerns raised by the Home Builders Federation, and considers that, when combined with the continued requirement for 50% of all dwellings to meet M4(2) standards, the policy would have a substantial impact on development viability.

2.53 National policy is clear that Local Plan policies must be realistic, proportionate and deliverable when considered cumulatively. Evidence published by the Home Builders Federation demonstrates that M4(3) requirements can result in significant cost increases, reduced layout efficiency and greater design constraints, particularly on sites with level changes, complex topography or higher infrastructure demands. These impacts are exacerbated when combined with a requirement for 50% of all dwellings to meet M4(2) standards.

2.54 Accordingly, 3West Developments considers that the proposed uplift to 15% M4(3) affordable housing is not sufficiently justified and risks undermining the effective delivery of strategic allocations.

**4. Do you consider that this part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?:** No

**5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?:** Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

**6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary.:** Our attendance is necessary to effectively discuss the points raised in these representations.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** 3West Developments Ltd

**Proposal:**

8. Meeting Housing Needs

**1. To which part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** HN03

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed above?:** No

**2. Do you consider that this part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter is legally compliant?:** No

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter is sound?:**  
No

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:**

2.47 3West recognise that there is an increased demand for adaptable dwellings due to the ageing population. Notwithstanding this, viability and site location must be factored into policy requirements , given that not all sites would be appropriate to accommodate such provision.

2.48 The current policy wording states that “schemes for 200 or more dwellings should include at least 10% as on-site as specialist older persons dwellings as either C3 dwellings and/or C2 equivalents”.

2.49 It is considered that the policy, as currently worded, is neither effective nor justified, as it fails to recognise the specific locational requirements of specialist housing, such as proximity to town centres and access to public transport. As currently drafted, it risks requiring such accommodation on sites where it would be unsuitable, thus meaning the policy is unsound. The wording should be amended to clarify that older persons’ housing will only be required where supported by an up-to-date evidence base, demonstrable market demand, and where delivery is viable.

2.50 The policy should also explicitly address market demand for older persons’ housing and confirm that, where no such demand exists, the units should revert to general market housing.

**4. Do you consider that this part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?:** No

**5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?:** Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

**6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary.:** Our attendance is necessary to effectively discuss the points raised in these representations.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** 3West Developments Ltd

**Proposal:**

8. Meeting Housing Needs

**1. To which part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** HN01

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed above?:** No

**2. Do you consider that this part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter is legally compliant?:** No

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter is sound?:**  
No

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:**

2.42 3West Developments support the principle of Strategic Policy HN02 and the provision of affordable housing to assist the Council in meeting and addressing housing need and worsening the affordability gap within EDDC.

2.43 Policy HN02 states that sites within Exmouth, must provide 30% affordable housing. In accordance with this, Land at St Johns is proposed to deliver 30% affordable housing which will assist the Council in meeting their affordable housing needs.

2.44 It is maintained that ensuring a balance between the delivery of affordable housing as well as other objectives such as design, sustainability and infrastructure requirements is crucial. 3West Developments therefore reiterate our previous concerns regarding the evidence base underpinning affordable housing requirements and the need to ensure that policy expectations remain realistic, deliverable and flexible, when considered alongside other policy burdens.

2.45 Furthermore, whilst 3West Developments recognise amendments to the wording, there remains a concern that the policy does not allow for sufficient flexibility nor recognise market variance within the breakdown of affordable housing tenures and mix. Paragraph 86(d) of the NPPF (2023) which states that planning policies should “be flexible enough to accommodate needs not anticipated in the plan, allow for new and

flexible working practices (such as livework accommodation), and to enable a rapid response to changes in economic circumstances.”

2.46 To be considered effective and sound, 3West suggest the policy wording be amended to:

- Include additional flexibility, with the use of local market information to inform the appropriate tenure breakdown, beyond what is set out within the District wide housing needs assessment.
- Ensure the policy considers affordable housing mix on a case-by-case basis.
- Allow alternative housing mixes where necessary.
- Allow developers to depart from the proposed affordable housing mix should sufficient market evidence be provided, particularly if the proposed development provides the required affordable housing percentage required.

**4. Do you consider that this part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?:** No

**5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?:** Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

**6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary.:** Our attendance is necessary to effectively discuss the points raised in these representations.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** 3West Developments Ltd

**Proposal:**

8. Meeting Housing Needs

**1. To which part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** HN01

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed above?:** No

**2. Do you consider that this part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter is legally compliant?:** No

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter is sound?:**  
No

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:**

2.39 We support the overall intent of Strategic Policy HN01 and acknowledge the importance of ensuring that new housing development responds to identified local needs. We also welcome the policy's recognition that the most up-to-date local housing needs evidence can be taken into account when assessing both current and future requirements.

2.40 In this context, we consider that the Plan should make provision for housing allocations that meet 100% of East Devon's identified housing needs, rather than limiting delivery to 80%.

2.41 Furthermore, we consider that locally derived market evidence and sales data, which form an important component of housing needs evidence, should be recognised within the broader assessment framework. Such information can provide valuable, site-specific insight and supplement district-wide evidence when determining appropriate levels of housing provision.

**4. Do you consider that this part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?:** No

**5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?:** Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

**6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary.:** Our attendance is necessary to effectively discuss the points raised in these representations.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** 3West Developments Ltd

**Proposal:** Sustainability Appraisal

**If you would like to make representations on the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) please provide your comments here, stating to which part of the SA your comments relate.:**

3.3 Alongside the revised draft Local Plan, the Council has also published a revised Sustainability Appraisal (SA), in which Land at St John's, Exmouth (EXMO\_20) has been assessed against the SA Objectives. The current SA identifies the site as a suitable strategic allocation and supports its role in meeting Exmouth's housing and sustainability needs within the plan period.

3.4 3West Developments broadly agrees with the majority of the SA scoring against the SA objectives and considers that the appraisal appropriately recognises the strategic merits of the St John's allocation. Where minor points of clarification or additional evidence are relevant, these are addressed below.

3.5 An assessment of the Council's SA findings is set out below, which is accompanied by a revised site suitability assessment undertaken by Boyer. This reassessment provides further evidence that the St John's site is capable of accommodating the scale of development proposed in the Draft Local Plan and supports the conclusion that the allocation represents an appropriate, sustainable and deliverable option for growth in Exmouth.

3.6 The above revised site suitability assessment for Land at St John's, Exmouth (EXMO\_20), which has been informed by the site's specific technical surveys and assessments prepared by relevant technical consultants, demonstrates that the site is capable of accommodating the scale of development proposed for St John's Woodland Village (up to circa 700), while continuing to positively contribute towards EDDC's Sustainability Objectives. Technical Reports

3.7 These representations are supported by a full suite of Technical Reports, which have informed the St John's Woodland Village concept masterplan for Land at St John's, Exmouth (EXMO\_20). These reports demonstrate that the site is suitable for the scale of development proposed in the Draft Local Plan and can be delivered in a manner consistent with the Vision Statement.

3.8 The technical reports demonstrate that the St John's site is capable of accommodating the level of development proposed in the Draft Local Plan in a sustainable and well-designed manner. The technical reports are summarised below.

#### Landscape

3.9 A Landscape and Visual Appraisal was prepared by LDA Design which outlines the key landscape constraints of the site. The appraisal confirms that the site lies outside any formal landscape designation. The site is situated close to East Devon National Landscape and the Pebblebed Heaths SPA/SAC/SSSI to the north. Although not directly within these protected areas, the site's visibility from higher ground, such as the B3179, and its proximity to the designated landscapes introduce important visual and environmental sensitivities. A 400m buffer from the SPA/SAC has been integrated into the masterplan, limiting development on the more prominent northern ridgeline.

3.10 The site's landscape character is defined by rolling farmland, mature woodland, hedgerows, and the presence of St John's in the Wilderness Church, a heritage feature. The emerging masterplan responds to these constraints by focusing development in the lower, less sensitive areas of the site, incorporating substantial green infrastructure, and preserving key views and natural features to ensure a respectful transition between the town and surrounding countryside.

3.11 The proposed development will not result in a significant effect on landscape.

#### Transport and Highways

3.12 A technical note has been prepared by SLR Consulting to assess the potential traffic impact of the development, particularly on key routes. To assess the traffic impact, the study examined how vehicle trips generated by the development are distributed and assigned across key access routes. Traffic data was gathered using Automatic Traffic Counters (ATCs) over a seven-day period, allowing comparison of projected increases against typical daily fluctuations to determine if mitigation measures are necessary.

3.13 The technical note concluded that suitable vehicular access can be achieved into the site, with proximity to the local highway network and existing infrastructure. Traffic modelling indicates that most surrounding routes will experience negligible increases in traffic flow, Dinan Way is projected to see traffic increases exceeding the typical 10% threshold during peak hours, however, this is not likely to be in excess of 30%, and therefore the overall impact is not considered to be significant. Ecology and Arboriculture

3.14 A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) has been undertaken by GE consulting to identify potential ecological constraints associated with the site. The assessment comprised both a desk study and a walkover habitat survey in accordance with UKHab (2023) guidance. The desk study included a review of available ecological records,

supported by data from the Devon Biodiversity Records Centre (DBRC), to determine the proximity of designated sites and the potential presence of protected or notable species. The walkover survey recorded habitats on site, including any features of ecological interest, invasive species, or signs of protected fauna.

3.15 No overriding ecological barriers to development have been identified. The site's ecological assets can be addressed through further survey work, appropriate mitigation, and habitat enhancement. The findings of these assessments will inform the site's design evolution and ensure compliance with planning policy, biodiversity legislation, and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The Proposed Development will not result in a significant adverse effect on ecology. Heritage and Archaeology

3.16 A technical note regarding the heritage impact of a proposed development has been prepared by Alan Baxter Ltd, which included a review of historic mapping, and understanding of the development of nearby designated assets and a site visit to assess topography and intervisibility.

3.17 The Technical Note concluded that the proposed development would have a limited impact on designated heritage assets within and surrounding the site. The Grade II listed buildings along St John's Road would be well screened and physically separated from the development, resulting in a neutral effect on their setting and significance. The Grade II\* listed church would experience a degree of change to its wider rural setting due to the introduction of built form to the north, east, and south, although its immediate setting remains largely unaffected.

3.18 This change is assessed as resulting in a low level of less than substantial harm, at the minor end of the spectrum, in line with national policy. The impact is confined to the contribution made by the church's wider setting, and not its core heritage value. With further design refinements and landscape mitigation, it is likely that this impact could be reduced further.

3.19 The proposed development is not considered to result in a significant effect on heritage assets. Flood Risk and Drainage

3.20 The majority of the site lies within Flood Zone 1 (i.e the lowest Flood Risk Zone), with small areas located within Flood Zones 2 and 3 to the west of the site associated with an existing watercourse running from the north to the south, which would be kept free from development.

3.21 The existing surface water flooding can be addressed through the creation of a new Sustainable Drainage System to manage surface water runoff across the site effectively. The proposed development will be delivered outside of areas at risk of flooding (from all sources).

3.22 The proposed development will not result in a significant effect on flood risk.



**Full name:** Danielle Halford

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** Persimmon Homes South West Limited

**Proposal:**

1. Introduction

**1. To which part of the Introduction chapter does your representation relate?:**

Paragraph

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:**

1.1

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed above?:** No

**2(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Introduction chapter is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible.:**

-

**3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Introduction chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.:** Transitional Arrangements

1.5 For the second stage of EDDC's Regulation 19 Consultation, it is understood that EDDC are still seeking to benefit from the NPPF Transitional Arrangement as set out within Annex 1 of the NPPF. As such, it is still therefore expected that this Draft LP will be examined under the

provisions of the 2023 NPPF. On this basis, these representations reference the soundness of this Draft LP against the requirements set out within the NPPF (2023).

1.6 It is noted that the NPPF states those local plans that reach Regulation 19 (pre-submission stage) on or before 12 March 2025 and whose draft housing requirement meets less than 80% of local housing need should proceed to examination within a maximum of 18 months from 12 December 2024, or 24 months of that date if the plan has to return to the Regulation 18 stage.

**Full name:** Danielle Halford

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** Persimmon Homes South West Limited

**Proposal:** 11. Sustainable Transport and Communications

**1. To which part of the Sustainable Transport and Communications chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** TR06

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Sustainable Transport and Communications chapter is sound?:** No

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Sustainable Transport and Communications chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:** Policy TR06: Digital Connectivity

2.39 Policy TR06 requires that all major developments provide access to terrestrial or satellite superfast broadband and high-quality communications.

2.40 However, this policy may be unduly restrictive, particularly for sites located in smaller or isolated communities where issues of practicality and viability are significant.

2.41 We consider that it is essential to reiterate that local planning authorities should engage with developers to assess the feasibility of delivering superfast broadband connections in proximity to the Site. Such considerations should be proportionate, taking into account the scale of the development and the associated costs of any additional infrastructure required.

**3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Sustainable Transport and Communications chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Sustainable Transport and Communications chapter sound. It**

**will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.:**

2.41 We consider that it is essential to reiterate that local planning authorities should engage with developers to assess the feasibility of delivering superfast broadband connections in proximity to the Site. Such considerations should be proportionate, taking into account the scale of the development and the associated costs of any additional infrastructure required.

**5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?:** Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

**6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary.:** Our attendance is necessary to effectively discuss the points raised in these representations.

**Full name:** Danielle Halford

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** Persimmon Homes South West Limited

**Proposal:** 11. Sustainable Transport and Communications

**1. To which part of the Sustainable Transport and Communications chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** TR04

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed above?:** Yes

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Sustainable Transport and Communications chapter is sound?:** No

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Sustainable Transport and Communications chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:** Policy TR04 has been amended to include that:

- Where possible, off-street and on-street parking spaces for residential development that are served by EV charging should aim to exceed Building Regulation standards and they should be designed for ease of use and have immediate availability for property occupiers at the point at which they take up occupancy.
- Developers promoting major development will be expected to work with energy companies, distribution network operators and the planning authority to ensure the development of relevant and appropriate smart energy infrastructure is planned and installed to provide current and future EV capacity.
- Developers should fully consider options to promote and secure uptake of high levels of use of electric vehicles by residents of new dwellings being built.

2.34 Developers are expected to engage with energy companies, DNOs, and the planning authority at an early stage to ensure that smart energy infrastructure is appropriately planned and installed. However, aligning the objectives, timelines, and technical requirements of multiple stakeholders can be complex and time-consuming. The need for early and detailed consideration of options to meet and exceed policy standards adds further complexity.

2.35 The installation of smart energy infrastructure for EV charging often requires upgrades to existing grid infrastructure. Developers may encounter technical limitations in the local electricity network, such as insufficient capacity to support high levels of EV charging, necessitating costly and time-consuming network reinforcements. These upgrades must be coordinated with Distribution Network Operators, who may have competing priorities and limited resources to deliver timely solutions.

2.36 The expectation to exceed minimum standards, particularly in sensitive areas where higher levels of EV uptake are required for environmental mitigation, can result in significant additional costs for developers. Securing funding and agreeing on cost-sharing arrangements with energy companies and DNOs can be a further barrier.

2.37 It is also noted that Policy TR04 now requires fossil fuel emissions adversely impacting on the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA to be reduced in addition for wider environmental benefits. PHSW consider that the requirement for residential

development to exceed Building Regulation standards is not justified. It should be noted that Future Homes Standard 2025 or successor standards should be achieved on site, and as a result Policy TR04 should not be a duplicate.

2.38 The proposed policy wording for Policy TR04 should be updated to reflect the above, with additional flexibility included to ensure that residential development that is not in proximity to the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA are not affected.

**5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?:** Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

**6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary.:** Our attendance is necessary to effectively discuss the points raised in these representations.

**Full name:** Danielle Halford

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** Persimmon Homes South West Limited

**Proposal:** 11. Sustainable Transport and Communications

**1. To which part of the Sustainable Transport and Communications chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** TR02

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed above?:** Yes

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Sustainable Transport and Communications chapter is sound?:** No

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Sustainable Transport and Communications chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:**

2.30 Since the submission of written representations to the Draft LP first consultation, PHSW have undertaken a review of evidence base documents and make the following observations in respect of the relief road:

1. There is only one reference within the updated Sustainability Report, November 2025 which identifies Axminster relief road as an outstanding project (page 117 of 686).

2. The Local Plan Viability Assessment Addendum, November 2025 includes reference to including a section of relief road under proposed allocation for land east of Lyme Road (Axmi\_22). As detailed at paragraph 2.5 the previous version of the Local Plan Viability Assessment Addendum (CSD-004) commented that it was understood from the Council that the relief road is unlikely to proceed in the foreseeable future and that the requirement will require a suitable layout instead.

3. The Promoting Sustainable Transport Background Evidence, January 2025 has not been updated. Resultantly, PHSW maintain their position that whilst Devon County Council has requested the route of the potential relief road to be protected , EDDC have acknowledged within their own Local Plan evidence base that the relief road is unlikely to proceed within the foreseeable future and there is no evidence of funding being available to deliver the link road.

4. The updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan, November 2025 does not make any reference to the Axminster relief road.

5. There has been an updated Site Selection Report addendum – Historic Environment Site Assessment for Axminster, November 2025. This is not relevant to Axmi\_22 and does not reference the Axminster relief road.

6. The Settlement Boundaries Topic Paper, Second Regulation 19 consultation version does not reference the Axminster relief road.

2.31 In light of the above and previous submitted representations, PHSW must strongly reiterate that it does not consider it appropriate to continue to safeguard a possible relief road route which has no funding or evidence of its ability of it being

delivered. Its inclusion is simply not justified within the requirements of the site allocation particularly given the Site is identified to include up to 100 homes.

2.32 To ensure the Draft LP is robust, PHSW maintains that any reference to the route of Axminster relief road is removed from Strategic Policy TR02: Protecting transport sites and routes as there is no evidence available to demonstrate it is deliverable or indeed viable and therefore its retention is unjustified.

**5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?:** Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

**6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary.:** Our attendance is necessary to effectively discuss the points raised in these representations.

**Full name:** Danielle Halford

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** Persimmon Homes South West Limited

**Proposal:** 13. Our Outstanding Biodiversity and Geodiversity

**1. To which part of the Our Outstanding Biodiversity and Geodiversity chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** PB05

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed above?:** Yes

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Our Outstanding Biodiversity and Geodiversity chapter is sound?:** No

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Our Outstanding Biodiversity and Geodiversity chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:**

2.42 The requirement in the East Devon emerging Draft LP for a 20% Biodiversity Net Gain exceeds the statutory expectation and is inconsistent with the approach set out in the adopted and emerging National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

2.43 Whilst out for consultation, the draft NPPF proposes that local plans should not seek BNG contributions above the statutory requirement except in limited circumstances, specifically where higher levels of gain can be robustly justified for particular allocated sites, and not as a blanket policy. The intention is to ensure that BNG is applied in a proportionate and consistent manner across local planning authorities, supporting nature recovery while maintaining viability and deliverability.

2.44 PHSW maintain that the BNG requirement within the emerging Local Plan should be aligned with the national policy position, and the imposition of a 20% BNG standard is not justified under the emerging NPPF framework and will negatively affect the deliverability of housing

**5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?:** Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

**6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary.:** Our attendance is necessary to effectively discuss the points raised in these representations.

**Full name:** Danielle Halford

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** Persimmon Homes South West Limited

**Proposal:**

5. Development in the Towns and Villages

**3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.:**

-

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:**

Strategic Policy SD02: Axminster and its development allocations

2.2 PHSW support Strategic Policy SD02: Axminster and its development allocations, with particular regard to the retention of land east of Lyme Road (Axmi\_22) as an allocation for 100 homes.

2.3 It is noted that the following amendments to the Draft LP text for the allocation of the Site shown in red and underlined are proposed:

“Land east of Lyme Road (Axmi\_22)

This site is allocated for 100 dwellings. The site layout should make provision for a suitable access road to facilitate the development of site GH/ED/80 to the north and also be designed and built to a standard suitable for use as part of a possible future relief road to link to the A358, Chard Road, south of the Weycroft Bridge.

Pedestrian/cycle access should be off Loup Court, with Public Rights of Way enhancements. In order to ensure no adverse effect on the integrity of the Beer Quarry and Caves SAC and bat activities, suitable avoidance or mitigation measures will need to be identified and implemented.”

2.4 Whilst PHSW continue to support the continued allocation of land east of Lyme Road (Axmi\_22), as detailed within previous written representations to ensure the policy is sound at examination, the requirement to safeguard land for the relief road should be removed. The suggested amendment to the draft wording for Axmi\_22 is as follows:

“Land east of Lyme Road (Axmi\_22)

This site is allocated for up to 100 dwellings. The site layout should make provision for a suitable access road to facilitate the development of site GH/ED/80 to the north and also be designed and built to (Delete wording - a standard suitable for use as part of a possible future relief road to) link to the A358, Chard Road, south of the Weycroft Bridge.

Pedestrian/cycle access should be off Loup Court, with Public Rights of Way enhancements. In order to ensure no adverse effect on the integrity of the Beer Quarry and Caves SAC and bat activities, suitable avoidance or mitigation measures will need to be identified and implemented.”

2.5 Paragraph 6.9 of the January 2025 Local Plan Viability Assessment Addendum (CSD-004) notes that:

“Some of the allocation policy requirements reference a possible future relief road although it is understood from the Council that this is unlikely to proceed in the foreseeable future and that the requirement will require a suitable layout instead”.  
[Boyer emphasis]

2.6 The November 2025 Local Plan Viability Assessment Addendum (CSD-004a) provides no further commentary regarding the delivery of the relief road. As a result, the retention of the relief road within the Draft LP is unjustified as there continues to be a lack of feasibility and viability for the ‘possible future relief road’ and is acknowledged by EDDC to be unlikely to proceed.

2.7 The Local Plan Viability Assessment Addendum (CSD-004a) notes the following detailed regarding the allocation of Axmi\_22:

Table 2.1 Extract of Table 3.4 Allocations, value area and typology (CSD-004a)

Proposed Allocation	Value Area	Greenfield / Brownfield	Dwellings	Typology
In planning Land east of Lyme Road (Axmi_22) – 100 dwellings including section of relief road	VA 5	GF	100	Res5a No

2.8 PHSW are dedicated to delivering the scheme at east Axminster and the planning submission for the Site is anticipated in early 2026. Further details regarding the deliverability of land east of Axminster is provided within Section 3 of this report.

2.9 In terms of the proposed development at the Site, a pedestrian access point will be provided at the northwestern site boundary where the existing Public Right of Way

(PRoW) meets Sector Lane. The application proposal also encompasses community infrastructure such as publicly accessible amenity open space, enhanced linkages, cycleways and footpaths, thereby creating a sustainable and integrated new community. This requirement for a connection to Loup Court is therefore supported by PHSW.

2.10 PHSW acknowledge the importance of ensuring there are no adverse effects on the integrity of the Beer Quarry and Caves SAC and bat activities and understand that suitable avoidance or mitigation measures will need to be identified and implemented. The East Devon Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) of the East Devon Local Plan 2020 to 2042 (Second Regulation 19 Publication Draft Plan – Autumn 2025) (CSD-006(rev)b) provides the following extracted screening of the Plan for likely significant effects, which highlights that some allocations within the landscape connectivity zone for Lesser Horseshoe Bats have been screened in on a precautionary basis for bats and supporting habitat.

Table 2.2 Extract of Table 4 of the East Devon HRA (CSD-006(rev)b)

Plan Section / Policy Description	Initial LSE Screening	Potential Risks
Comments SD02: Axminster impacts Policy allocates a number of locations all in close proximity to the River Axe. Land at Chard Road and the and development alone (River Axe combination	Strategic policy, LSE.	Recreation Screened SAC), in
	allocation of 12 locations	in.
	and development sites for development in	

or around Axminster. (Sidmouth to West Bay SAC); Loss of supporting habitat alone (Beer Quarry & Caves SAC); water quality alone (River Axe SAC) Axminster Carpet site are both very close (well within 100m) of the SAC boundary, bringing particular risks. Some allocations just within landscape connectivity zone for Lesser Horseshoe Bat (a feature of the Beer Quarry & Caves SAC), see (Jennings & Youngman, 2022) and therefore screened in on a precautionary basis for bats and supporting habitat.

2.11 It should be noted that PHSW have undertaken Ecological Reports prepared by GE Consulting who have identified that impacts on bats on Site would be negligible, and that a Habitat Management and Maintenance Plan will be produced and followed to mitigate any long-term impacts.

Local Plan 2020 to 2042 Policies Map (Second Reg 19 Consultation)

2.12 With regards to the revised Local Plan Policies Map in relation to the Site and Axminster, it is noted that land at East Axminster (Axmi\_22) is designated as follows:

- Housing (100 homes under Policy SD02);
- Within settlement boundaries (Policy SP05);

- Designated Neighbourhood Area of Axminster (Policy SP03);
- River Axe Catchment Area (Policy PB04); and
- Axminster CP Parish Council Area.

Figure 2.1 Extract of the Local Plan 2020 to 2042 Policies Map (Second Reg 19 Consultation)

2.13 Whilst the Local Plan Policies Map notes the Site is designated as a Flood Zone, PHSW can confirm that following updates to the Environment Agency (EA) Flood Maps for planning in March 2025, the site continues to be wholly located within Flood Zone 1 and is therefore at low risk. In addition, the EA flood maps indicate that there are some areas of potential surface water flood risk. However, all areas of development at land east of Axminster are located in Flood Zone 1 outside of areas at risk of surface water

flooding. PHSW therefore request that the Local Plan Policy Map be updated accordingly to ensure that 'Flood Zones' are not a designation for Axmi\_22.

2.14 On further review of the updated evidence base, there has been no additional evidence provided to demonstrate that the Axminster relief road is essential to mitigate the impacts of development within Axminster. In addition to confirmation from EDDC that it is unlikely that the relief road will come forward within the next plan period, the necessity for a relief road at this stage should be removed from site specific allocation.

**5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?:** Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

**6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary.:** Our attendance is necessary to effectively discuss the points raised in these representations.

**Full name:** Danielle Halford

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** Persimmon Homes South West Limited

**Proposal:**

6. Mitigating Climate Change

**1. To which part of the Mitigating Climate Change chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** CC05

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed above?:** No

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Mitigating Climate Change chapter is sound?:** No

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Mitigating Climate Change chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:** Strategic Policy  
CC05: Heat Networks

2.17 Strategic Policy CC05 now requires applications within 1km of an existing heat network to provide justification in line with national guidance published by the Department for Energy Security and Net Zero as to when the connection is deemed undeliverable. In addition, all major developments within 1km of an existing heat network must be connected to it, or, for proposals exceeding 1,200 homes where no heat network exists, a new heat network must be provided.

2.18 Strategic Policy CC05 is unjustified and unsound as the Draft LP text continues to fail to consider whether achieving a connection is feasible on a case-by-case basis, and in addition, clarity has not been provided regarding the locations of existing heat networks within EDDC.

2.19 It is also reiterated that the ability to access heat networks is outside the control of the developer or landowner, and additional work is needed to demonstrate that a heat network can be secured at an affordable price with the same safeguarding as a domestic supply. As

such, the policy is considered unjustified and unsound, and it is recommended that this Draft LP policy be removed.

2.20 If retained, the EDDC Local Plan Policy Map should be updated to indicate the location of heat networks to inform site assessments accordingly. In addition, the Draft LP policy should be updated to consider sites on a case-by-case basis and acknowledge that access to heat networks is outside of the control of the developer or landowner.

2.21 The Cranbrook development has been designed since its inception to be powered by a District Heating Network. An EDDC led project to bring forward a DHN solution to serve the Cranbrook Expansion Area has recently failed and be restarted under different parameters. This serves to indicate firstly, that huge difficulties exist with trying to bring forward projects of the type and scale. Secondly, the Cranbrook DHN project was led by EDDC and its consultants and thus benefitted from funding streams and CPO powers not available to developers or landowners. The requirement upon a single developer or landowner (or a collection of the above) to deliver standalone DHNs is almost certainly unachievable.

2.22 It is noted that Axminster does not currently benefit from a heat network, and the allocations proposed at Axminster, including East of Axminster (site reference Axmi\_22), fall below the 1,200-home threshold. Therefore, it is not anticipated that a heat network would be required for these allocations.

**3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Mitigating Climate Change chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Mitigating Climate Change chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.:** recommended that this Draft LP policy be removed.

**5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?:** Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

**6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary.:** Our attendance is necessary to effectively discuss the points raised in these representations.

**Full name:** Danielle Halford

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** Persimmon Homes South West Limited

**Proposal:**

6. Mitigating Climate Change

**1. To which part of the Mitigating Climate Change chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** CC02

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed above?:** No

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Mitigating Climate Change chapter is sound?:** No

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Mitigating Climate Change chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:** Chapter 6.  
Mitigating Climate Change

Strategic Policy CC02: Net-Zero Carbon Development

2.15 Whilst PHSW support the principle of Strategic Policy CC02, it is reiterated that the implementation of the Future Homes Standard (FHS) will support East Devon in becoming carbon neutral by 2040 and that any policy which goes beyond the requirements set out in building regulations (now or in the future) should be justified and supported by relevant viability assumptions and assessment. Strategic Policy CC02 is therefore not required as this will duplicate national standards.

2.16 If Strategic Policy CC02 is retained, PHSW are disappointed to note that the Draft LP text has not been amended and still requires new development to demonstrate at the application stage that the relevant standards can be achieved. It should be

recognised that such information, which relates to detailed interior and exterior design will only be available at detailed design stage. The policy text should be revised accordingly to enable appropriately worded conditions to be added to consents.

**3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Mitigating Climate Change chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Mitigating Climate Change chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.:** Strategic Policy CC02 is therefore not required as this will duplicate national standards.

**5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?:** Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

**6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary.:** Our attendance is necessary to effectively discuss the points raised in these representations.

**Full name:** Danielle Halford

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** Persimmon Homes South West Limited

**Proposal:**

8. Meeting Housing Needs

**1. To which part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** HN05

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed above?:** Yes

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter is sound?:**  
No

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:** Strategic Policy HN05 now confirms that proposals for custom and self-build housing, to be occupied by those persons commissioning or undertaking the construction, will be generally supported within settlement boundaries and as part of any housing permitted in other areas. This policy does not apply to areas that fall within Built-up Area Boundaries defined in the Cranbrook Plan, where Policy CB11 of the Cranbrook Plan will apply.

2.29 PHSW continue to support policy HN05 in principle. However, PHSW consider that the requirement for sites over 250 dwellings to make a proportion of plots available for affordable housing should be removed from the policy text. This is not justified for the following reasons:

- The requirement for affordable housing is likely to introduce delivery constraints for developers and thus lead to viability challenges presenting themselves.

- Effective implementation would necessitate joint working with Housing Associations and third sector organisations, increasing complexity and extending development timescales.

- It should be recognised that Housing Associations and third sector organisations may be unable to acquire self-build and custom build plots, and that there may be no demonstratable local need for such provision.

- This requirement is likely to operate as an unnecessary impediment to the timely delivery of homes. This would set this policy at odds with some of the main objectives of the NPPF, thus making the policy wholly unsound.

**5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?:** Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

**6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary.:** Our attendance is necessary to effectively discuss the points raised in these representations.

**Full name:** Danielle Halford

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** Persimmon Homes South West Limited

**Proposal:**

8. Meeting Housing Needs

**1. To which part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** HN03

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed above?:** Yes

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter is sound?:**  
No

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:** Strategic Policy  
HN03: Housing to Meet the Needs of Older People

2.25 It is noted that minor amendments have been made to Policy HN03. Whilst PHSW support the principles of Strategic Policy HN03, we are disappointed to see that our previous comments have not been noted within the Draft LP text. The current policy wording is therefore still not effective nor justified as it does not address the specific locational requirements of specialist housing.

2.26 PHSW acknowledge that there is a need to address the growing need for diverse housing options within East Devon. However, sites should be considered on a case-by-case basis. PHSW support the requirement of specialist older persons dwellings at 10%, however, this

does not consider the need for specialist housing within specific areas of East Devon, where there may not be a 10% need.

2.27 The policy wording should be revised to make clear that older persons units will only be required where there is an up to date evidence base and a demonstratable market demand, and where the provision of such units is viable.

**3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.:** The policy wording should be revised to make clear that older persons units will only be required where there is an up to date evidence base and a demonstratable market demand, and where the provision of such units is viable.

**5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?:** Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

**6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary.:** Our attendance is necessary to effectively discuss the points raised in these representations.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd

**Proposal:** 10. High Quality Design

**1. To which part of the High Quality Design chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** DS02

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed above?:** Yes

**1(c). If the comment is related to a site, please state the site reference here.:**  
GH/ED/39a, GH/ED/39b

**3. Do you consider that this part of the High Quality Design chapter is sound?:** No

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the High Quality Design chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:** The policy has been amended to include that developments of 50 or more dwellings, especially in or adjacent to a National Landscape, will be required to supported by a design code agreed with, or produced, by the Council as planning authority. It is considered that requiring a design code for all major residential developments is disproportionate, and that such a requirement should be limited to larger schemes of at least 500 dwellings plus. It is also noted that there is no guidance on the expected content of a design code, which gives rise to concern that officers may seek an unreasonable level of detail as part of any such submission.

**3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the High Quality Design chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the High Quality Design chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.:** [see 3(b)] It is considered that requiring a design code for all major residential developments is disproportionate, and that such a requirement should be limited to larger schemes of at least 500 dwellings plus. It is also noted that there is no guidance on the expected content of a design code

**5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?:** Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

**6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary.:** Our attendance is necessary to effectively discuss the points raised in these representations.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd

**Proposal:** 11. Sustainable Transport and Communications

**1. To which part of the Sustainable Transport and Communications chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** TR06

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed above?:** No

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Sustainable Transport and Communications chapter is sound?:** No

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Sustainable Transport and Communications chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:** It is disappointing that the previous concerns raised by Taylor Wimpey during the previous Regulation 19 Consultation have not been considered during this consultation. The Policy remains unchanged and remains to be unsound for the reasons outlined below.

Policy TR06 requires that all major developments provide access to terrestrial or satellite superfast broadband and high-quality communications. However, this policy is overly restrictive, particularly for sites located in smaller or isolated communities where issues of practicality and viability are significant.

We consider that it is essential to reiterate that local planning authorities should engage with developers to assess the feasibility of delivering superfast broadband connections in proximity to the site. Such considerations should be proportionate, taking into account the scale of the development and the associated costs of any additional infrastructure required.

**5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?:** Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

**6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary.:** Our attendance is necessary to effectively discuss the points raised in these representations.



**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd

**Proposal:** 11. Sustainable Transport and Communications

**1. To which part of the Sustainable Transport and Communications chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** TR04

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed above?:** Yes

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Sustainable Transport and Communications chapter is sound?:** No

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Sustainable Transport and Communications chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:** The policy, which sets the parking standards for new development within the district, has been amended as part of the second Regulation 19 Consultation to include further reference to the provision of electric vehicle charging points. Part a) of the policy now states “For residential developments... off-street and on-street parking spaces that are served by EV charging should aim to exceed Building Regulation standards”. This is said to be in place to recognise the air quality concerns relating to the Pebbled Heaths SPA/SAC.

Taylor Wimpey, however, consider that this policy requirement is not justified for the remainder of the County, in particular for areas that are not within proximity of the Pebbled Heaths SPA/SAC.

The policy goes on to state that “To address potential concerns in respect of Habitat Regulation compliance (and therefore to secure planning permission) developers should fully consider options to promote and secure uptake of high levels of use of electric vehicles by residents of new dwellings being built”. This is not justified given that it is not the onus of the developer to secure that future residents own an electric vehicle. For the policy to state that these concerns should be addressed ‘to secure planning permission’ is not justified and the policy should be reworded in order to reflect this consideration and be in accordance with Building Regulations.

**3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Sustainable Transport and Communications chapter sound, in respect of any**

**matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Sustainable Transport and Communications chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.:** the policy should be reworded in order to reflect this consideration [see 3(b)] and be in accordance with Building Regulations.

**5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?:** Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

**6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary.:** Our attendance is necessary to effectively discuss the points raised in these representations.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd

**Proposal:** 12. Our Outstanding Landscape

**1. To which part of the Our Outstanding Landscape chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** OL01

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed above?:** No

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Our Outstanding Landscape chapter is sound?:** No

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Our Outstanding Landscape chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:** Strategic Policy OL01 states that development will only be permitted where the applicant is able to demonstrate that it will protect and enhance features and qualities that contribute to the character of East Devon's landscapes.

The policy then identifies a number of landscape qualities, including land and water forms and pattern of settlement; important natural and man-made features (including topography, field boundaries, trees and woodlands, areas of importance for nature conservation, and rural buildings); adverse disruption of a view; and aesthetic and perceptual factors such as tranquillity, wildness, and dark skies. As the latter are characteristics rather than physical features of the landscape, the policy should be renamed to "Landscape Features and Character" to reflect its full scope.

\*\*\* Personal details have been removed \*\*\* reiterates that, whilst the importance of several of the identified features and qualities is accepted, it is not considered that a failure to protect or enhance every existing feature, such as a single existing tree, should in itself be sufficient grounds to refuse permission for development. Development can, in many cases, deliver substantial new green and blue infrastructure (including a range of new planting), and can enhance positive landscape characteristics, both of which can secure a notable overall betterment to the existing landscape. The policy must be reworded accordingly.

**3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Our Outstanding Landscape chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have**

**identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Our Outstanding Landscape chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph.**

**Please be as precise as possible.:** the policy must be reworded and should be renamed to “Landscape Features and Character” to reflect its full scope [see explanation in response to 3(b)].

**5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?:** Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

**6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary.:** Our attendance is necessary to effectively discuss the points raised in these representations.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd

**Proposal:** 13. Our Outstanding Biodiversity and Geodiversity

**1. To which part of the Our Outstanding Biodiversity and Geodiversity chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** PB09

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed above?:** No

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Our Outstanding Biodiversity and Geodiversity chapter is sound?:** No

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Our Outstanding Biodiversity and Geodiversity chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:** Whilst the amendments to Policy PB09, which remove the obligation for the developer to contribute a financial bond equal to 25% of the calculated planning costs prior to the commencement of construction are welcomed, Taylor Wimpey continue to object to this policy, which is not justified and therefore not sound.

The draft policy requires annual inspection reports to be prepared and submitted to the Local Planning Authority for a period of 5 years following completion of the planting works. It should be recognised that developers will frequently transfer the ownership of a scheme's public open space to a management company, which would then assume responsibility for the ongoing maintenance of the planting. It is not justified for the developer, who will no longer hold any interest in the land, to be made responsible for submitting annual inspection reports to the LPA, as implied by Part B of the draft Local Plan policy.

**3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Our Outstanding Biodiversity and Geodiversity chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Our Outstanding Biodiversity and Geodiversity chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.:** We strongly encourage this element [regarding annual inspection reports] of the policy is omitted [see 3(b)].

**5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?:** Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

**6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary.:** Our attendance is necessary to effectively discuss the points raised in these representations.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd

**Proposal:** 13. Our Outstanding Biodiversity and Geodiversity

**1. To which part of the Our Outstanding Biodiversity and Geodiversity chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** PB07

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed above?:** No

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Our Outstanding Biodiversity and Geodiversity chapter is sound?:** No

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Our Outstanding Biodiversity and Geodiversity chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:** Whilst Taylor Wimpey supports the overall principle of this policy, and the importance for new development to deliver ecological enhancements, it is disappointing that the policy has not been amended to reflect the comments made during the previous Regulation 19 Consultation

We have significant concerns, however, regarding the lack of flexibility within the policy wording, which states the following requirements:

- One integrated bird box per dwelling;
- Provision of integrated bat boxes;
- An integrated bat loft within all major developments;
- Gaps in fences to facilitate the movement of hedgehogs; and
- Provision of overhanging eaves for nesting house martins in all major developments.

**3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Our Outstanding Biodiversity and Geodiversity chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Our Outstanding Biodiversity and Geodiversity chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.:** It is reiterated that additional flexibility should be provided within the policy wording to allow ecological enhancement features to be determined on a case-by-case basis and to be

influenced by site context and ecological opportunities for example one bat box or bird box per dwelling.

**5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?:** Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

**6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary.:** Our attendance is necessary to effectively discuss the points raised in these representations.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd

**Proposal:** 13. Our Outstanding Biodiversity and Geodiversity

**1. To which part of the Our Outstanding Biodiversity and Geodiversity chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** PB03

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed above?:** No

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Our Outstanding Biodiversity and Geodiversity chapter is sound?:** No

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Our Outstanding Biodiversity and Geodiversity chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:** Whilst Taylor Wimpey continues to agree that important hedgerows (as defined by the Hedgerow Regulations 1997) should be protected and their loss or degradation should only be permitted where the mitigation hierarchy has been applied and evidenced in earnest, it is disappointing, however, that Taylor Wimpey's previous comments raised during the previous Regulation 19 Consultation have not been addressed.

Taylor Wimpey continue to object to EDDC's approach to applying the same protection and importance to 'species rich Devon hedges', which do not meet the criteria of 'important hedgerows'. We consider this approach is not justified.

Devon hedges are located across Devon and often along the perimeter of sites. As a result, it is often unavoidable to need to remove part of the Devon hedge to deliver a suitable site access.

The need to retain hedgerows on site, where possible, is adequately addressed under draft LP policy PB08, which acknowledges that there may be instances where the removal of hedgerows is justified and unavoidable. There is no justification to include Devon hedges within draft LP policy PB03.

**3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Our Outstanding Biodiversity and Geodiversity chapter sound, in respect of any**

**matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Our Outstanding Biodiversity and Geodiversity chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.:** There is no justification to include Devon hedges within draft LP policy PB03. The need to retain hedgerows on site, where possible, is adequately addressed under draft LP policy PB08

**5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?:** Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

**6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary.:** Our attendance is necessary to effectively discuss the points raised in these representations.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd

**Proposal:** 13. Our Outstanding Biodiversity and Geodiversity

**1. To which part of the Our Outstanding Biodiversity and Geodiversity chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** PB05

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed above?:** No

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Our Outstanding Biodiversity and Geodiversity chapter is sound?:** No

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Our Outstanding Biodiversity and Geodiversity chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:** It is extremely disappointing that the changes requested by \*\*\* Personal details have been removed \*\*\* as part of the previous Regulation 19 Consultation have not been made. As a result, \*\*\* Personal details have been removed \*\*\* consider that Strategic Policy PB05 continues to be unjustified and is not supported by proportionate or robust evidence.

The requirement in the East Devon Draft LP for a 20% Biodiversity Net Gain exceeds the statutory expectation and is inconsistent with the approach set out in the emerging National Planning Policy Framework. The draft NPPF (2025), which, even under transitional arrangements, must be considered as a material consideration, proposes that local plans should not seek BNG contributions above the statutory requirement except in limited circumstances, specifically where higher levels of gain can be robustly justified for particular allocated sites, and not as a blanket policy. The intention is to ensure that BNG is applied in a proportionate and consistent manner across local planning authorities, supporting nature recovery while maintaining viability and deliverability.

**3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Our Outstanding Biodiversity and Geodiversity chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Our Outstanding Biodiversity and Geodiversity chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.:** The BNG requirement within the emerging Local Plan must be aligned with the national policy

position, and the imposition of a 20% BNG standard is not justified under the emerging NPPF framework. The policy must be amended accordingly.

**5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?:** Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

**6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary.:** Our attendance is necessary to effectively discuss the points raised in these representations.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd

**Proposal:**

4. Development at the West End

**1. To which part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** WS01

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed above?:** No

**1(c). If the comment is related to a site, please state the site reference here::**  
Marlcombe

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter is sound?:** No

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.: \*\*\***  
Personal details have been removed \*\*\* continues to have concerns regarding the Plan's delivery assumptions for the new settlement.

For this policy to be effective, the quantum of development delivered through Marlcombe up until 2042 in this Draft LP should reflect a more justified delivery figure; and increase the capacity of existing housing sites allocated across East Devon within the Draft LP including uplifting the capacity at GH/ED/39b to at least 299 dwellings to ensure the housing requirement is fulfilled and the consistent delivery of homes throughout the Draft LP period.

**3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.:** For this policy to be effective, the quantum of development delivered through Marlcombe up until 2042 in this Draft LP should reflect a more justified delivery figure; and increase the capacity of existing housing sites allocated across East Devon within the Draft LP including uplifting

the capacity at GH/ED/39b to at least 299 dwellings to ensure the housing requirement is fulfilled and the consistent delivery of homes throughout the Draft LP period.

**5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?:** Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

**6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary.:** Our attendance is necessary to effectively discuss the points raised in these representations.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd

**Proposal:**

5. Development in the Towns and Villages

**1. To which part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** SD03

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed above?:** No

**1(c). If the comment is related to a site, please state the site reference here.:**  
GH/ED/39a, GH/ED/39b

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter is sound?:** No

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:** [To be read with other representations by same re. SD03 / sites GH/ED/39a and GH/ED/39b entered into Commonplace which include the majority of the wording and images in the attachment with this entry]:

STRATEGIC POLICY SD03: LAND SOUTH OF NORTHCOTE HILL – SOUTH OF THE RAILWAY LINE:

These representations and accompanying Technical Notes demonstrate that the current draft allocation at Land South of Northcote Hill – south of the railway line (GH/ED/39a), which restricts the capacity of the site to 195 homes, does not constitute effective use of land or optimises the use of land to accommodate an appropriate amount and mix of development (in accordance with NPPF 2023; Paragraph 135e).

The Draft LP policy for land south of the railway line (GH/ED/39b) must be increased to at least 299 homes for the following reasons:

- It would make efficient use of the site in accordance with national policy;

- It would enable the site to support additional uses in the form of a community park and additional facilities such as a neighbourhood hub, as well as making a more meaningful contribution towards EDDC's housing land supply and meeting the housing needs of East Devon in a sustainable location;
- The site is being promoted by a national housebuilder that is committed to delivering homes in the short-medium term – a planning application has already been submitted to East Devon District Council for a development of up to 299 homes. Increasing the quantum of development on this allocation would ensure the draft LP delivers sufficient homes throughout the first part of the Plan period to meet its needs, noting the concerns raised regarding the delivery assumptions of the new settlement east of Exeter.

To ensure the draft LP makes the most efficient use of land, it is reiterated that the draft allocation should be revised as follows [see 3(c)].

**3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.:**

Land south of Northcote Hill – south of the railway (GH/ED/39b): This site is allocated for at least 299 homes and will form a medium-scale residential extension on the eastern side of Honiton. Parts of the site are on more elevated ground and development will need to be sensitively planned to avoid adverse impacts on the nearby Blackdown Hills National Landscape area. Vehicular and pedestrian access improvements would be required, incorporating Northcote Hill into development. The development will need to maximise opportunities for localised improvements/contributions to enhance sustainable travel modes.

**5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?:** Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

**6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary.:** Our attendance is necessary to effectively discuss the points raised in these representations.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd

**Proposal:**

5. Development in the Towns and Villages

**1. To which part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** SD03

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed above?:** Yes

**1(c). If the comment is related to a site, please state the site reference here::**

GH/ED/39a, GH/ED/39b

**3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.:**

\*\*\* Personal details have been removed \*\*\* fully supports the Draft LP's recognition and identification of Honiton as a Tier 2 settlement and a sustainable location for future growth and development.

It is welcomed that land at Northcote Hill (north and south of the railway line) is identified as two draft allocations within the Draft LP (GH/ED/39a and GH/ED/39b). \*\*\* Personal details have been removed \*\*\* supports the principle of these allocations and can confirm that both sites are suitable and available for development. \*\*\* Personal details have been removed \*\*\* has submitted a planning application for each of these sites and are committed to their delivery. Both sites can contribute to the Council's immediate housing land supply.

We discuss each of these allocations in turn below [see 3a below and 3b]. While \*\*\* Personal details have been removed \*\*\* continues to support the allocations of both GH/ED/39a and GH/ED/39b, it is reiterated that the quantum of development allocated for GH/ED/39b must be increased.

Land south of Northcote Hill (north of the railway line) (site reference - GH/ED/39a): The policy has been amended to increase the allocation from 100 dwellings to 115 dwellings. This increase is welcomed by \*\*\* Personal details have been removed \*\*\* .

This site is allocated for a total of 115 homes and will form a medium-scale residential extension on the eastern side of Honiton. Vehicular and pedestrian/cycle access improvements would be required. The development will need to maximise opportunities for localised improvements/contributions to enhance sustainable travel modes. This allocation is wholly supported by Taylor Wimpey. An outline planning permission was resolved to be approved by EDDC's Planning Committee in 2023 for the development of up to 115 homes, public open space, sustainable drainage systems, landscaping, vehicular access via Tunnel Lane and associated highways improvements and infrastructure. The proposed development was for up to 115 homes. A decision notice is due imminently.

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:**

Land south of Northcote Hill (south of the railway line) (around 195) (site reference – GH/ED/39b):

This site is allocated for a total of around 195 homes and will form a medium-scale residential extension on the eastern side of Honiton. Parts of the site are on more elevated ground and development will need to be sensitively planned to avoid adverse impacts on the nearby Blackdown Hills National Landscape area. Development should be informed by detailed assessment and design work to maximise opportunities to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the site and its wider national landscape setting. The scale (particularly height), design, lighting and materials of new development should be appropriate to the Blackdown Hills National Landscape. There should be no development on land above the 160m contour.

Provision should be made for suitably landscaped areas of open space with circular walks throughout the site, giving particular attention to the relationship with the national landscape. Vehicular and pedestrian access improvements would be required, with Northcote Hill integrated into the development layout to ensure safe and effective connectivity. The development will need to maximise opportunities for localised improvements and contributions to enhance sustainable travel modes.

The Draft LP has uplifted draft allocation GH/ED/39b from 100 dwellings to around 195 dwellings. Whilst \*\*\* Personal details have been removed \*\*\* supports the allocation of the site for residential development and the increase in allocation capacity, it must be reiterated that the site has capacity for at least 299 homes, and the draft allocation capacity must be increased accordingly [to at least 299 homes]. \*\*\* Personal details

have been removed \*\*\* has recently submitted an Outline Application for residential development up to 299 homes which is accompanied by a full suite of technical work (summarised in Section 4 of these representations [see attachment - and also inputted here in 3b and 3c]) that confirms the site can comfortably accommodate a significantly higher quantum of development. A comprehensive suite of technical assessments has recently been undertaken, which confirms that the site can accommodate a significantly higher quantum of development, while delivering an extensive community park and other public benefits, including a neighbourhood hub. The submitted planning application illustrates how a landscape-led development approach, incorporating residential provision alongside extensive areas of public open space, including a new community park, can accommodate up to 299 homes on part of the site.

In preparation of the Outline planning application, \*\*\* Personal details have been removed \*\*\* undertook a pre-application enquiry in relation to the proposed development of up to 299 homes. This engagement included meetings with Devon County Council (DCC), as Highways Authority, East Devon Planning Team and Landscape Officer. The capacity of the site was discussed and DCC confirmed the access proposals and off-site works were acceptable. The illustrative masterplan was also discussed with the Landscape Officer who provided minor comments on the provision of additional tree planting, which was incorporated within the scheme prior to application submission.

Increasing the draft allocation to at least 299 homes would represent a more efficient use of land, with a development that could deliver significant areas of public open space, and other public benefits including a neighbourhood mobility hub. The enclosed concept masterplan demonstrates how a landscape-led development, with homes provided alongside extensive areas of public open space, including a new community park, can deliver at least 299 homes.

There are no technical constraints that could impede the delivery of up to 299 homes on this site (GH/ED/39b).

This increase is essential for ensuring that the allocation (and future scheme) makes effective use of the land and optimises its potential to accommodate an appropriate amount and mix of development as well as making a meaningful contribution towards meeting housing needs in East Devon (in accordance with NPPF 2023; Paragraph 135e). Increasing the number of homes on land south of the railway line will enable the

proposed development to provide much needed homes, the potential for a mobility hub and significant public open space. Together, GH/ED/39a and GH/ED/39b can deliver a sustainable new neighbourhood to the east of Honiton, providing at least 400 homes. In doing so, the proposed allocations would significantly contribute towards the Council's housing land supply, in accordance with the Council's spatial strategy.

In December 2025, \*\*\* Personal details have been removed \*\*\* submitted an outline planning application for up to 299 dwellings, open space and infrastructure on land south of the railway line. The application is awaiting validation. This application was supported by a full suite of technical information, demonstrating that the site can accommodate up to 299 dwellings, whilst remaining sensitive to its landscape context.

The proposed development was subject to pre-application engagement with Devon County Council as highways authority and East Devon Planning Team and Landscape Officer. An illustrative masterplan depicting the proposed development is shown below [see attachments].

**3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.:** Increasing the draft allocation to at least 299 homes [see 3b].

These representations should be read alongside the concept masterplans, which have been informed by the site's technical surveys and assessments and support an increased quantum of development. These representations should also be read in conjunction with the full suite of technical information submitted in support of both planning applications on sites GH/ED/39a and GH/ED/39b.

**5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?:** Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

**6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary.:** Our attendance is necessary to effectively discuss the points raised in these representations.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd

**Proposal:**

5. Development in the Towns and Villages

**1. To which part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** SD01

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed above?:** Yes

**1(c). If the comment is related to a site, please state the site reference here::**

Exmo\_20

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter is sound?:** No

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:**

3West Developments remain supportive of the allocation and are fully committed to delivering the policy as drafted. 3West can confirm that the site is suitable, available, and deliverable. The company is actively progressing ongoing technical work, including the preparation of technical reports and will be progressing pre-application and consultation. 3West Developments is located approximately 5 miles from the site and is fully committed to the site's deliverability. However, we propose a small number of text amendments to ensure the policy operates effectively in practice:

- The policy wording should explicitly recognise that there may be circumstances where the removal of hedges and/or trees is necessary to enable an appropriate and viable scheme to come forward, and that any such loss should be weighed within the overall planning balance.
- The policy currently requires that development within the Mineral Consultation Area must be designed so as not to constrain any potential future mineral extraction. 3West Developments consider this to be overly restrictive. Instead, where discussions with the Minerals Authority conclude that the area is not suitable for mineral working, it should not be unnecessarily sterilised from development. The policy should be amended to reflect this position and provide greater flexibility.
- In relation to heritage, we consider the inclusion of the term 'extensive area' within the draft policy to be unnecessary and recommend its removal to ensure the policy is

sound. The extent of land to be kept free from development should instead be determined through the detailed heritage assessment required by the policy.

**5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?:** Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

**6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary.:** Our attendance is necessary to effectively discuss the points raised in these representations.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd

**Proposal:**

5. Development in the Towns and Villages

**1. To which part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** SD01

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed above?:** Yes

**1(c). If the comment is related to a site, please state the site reference here.:**  
Exmo\_20

**2. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter is legally compliant?:** No

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter is sound?:** No

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:**

2.23 3West Developments note the changes made to Policy SD01 since previous consultation stages and welcome the additional clarity provided in respect of heritage, biodiversity, minerals safeguarding and access considerations. The majority of these amendments reflect matters already addressed, or capable of being addressed, through the St. Johns Vision Statement and Addendum submitted previously and therefore do not undermine the suitability or deliverability of the allocation.

2.24 3West Developments are committed to the delivery of this site and can confirm that the draft allocation is deliverable. Heritage

2.25 3West Developments note the strengthened requirement for a detailed heritage assessment, explicitly referencing St John in the Wilderness church, and the establishment of an 'extensive' area around the church within which built development will not be permitted.

2.26 3West, however, consider that it is unnecessary for the word 'extensive area' to be included within the draft policy and recommend that this is omitted to ensure the policy is sound. The area of land to be kept free from development should be informed by the detailed heritage assessment required by this policy. An area of land has been kept free

from development around the church as indicated within the Vision Statement and Addendum, which has been informed by the Site's technical assessment and demonstrates how development can be concentrated in the southern parts of the site while preserving the setting and significance of the church. The allowance for open space (non-sports pitch uses) within this area, subject to no adverse heritage impacts, is welcomed and will assist in achieving high-quality placemaking. Minerals Safeguarding

2.27 3West Developments acknowledge that the northern parts of the site fall within a Mineral Safeguarding Area and a wider Mineral Consultation Area as defined in the Devon Minerals Plan. 3West Developments note the requirement for a Mineral Resource Assessment and, where appropriate, prior extraction. While the importance of safeguarding mineral resources is recognised, it is considered important that these requirements are applied in a proportionate and pragmatic manner, reflecting the likelihood of extraction being economically viable and deliverable within the plan period. Early engagement with the Mineral Planning Authority, as recommended by the policy, will be undertaken to ensure that mineral considerations do not unnecessarily constrain or delay development. The policy also indicates that development in the Mineral Consultation Area must be designed in a way to not constrain any future mineral working. 3West Developments disagree with this rigid approach and consider rather, should discussions with the Minerals Authority confirm that this area is not suitable for mineral working, then the area should not be sterilised from development. This should be reflected within the policy wording and flexibility introduced accordingly. Access Through Safeguarded Area

2.28 The explicit exception allowing for the provision of an access road and associated footway/cycleway through the safeguarded area, subject to sensitive design is also welcomed. This reflects the essential role of this infrastructure in delivering the site and supports sustainable transport objectives. 3West Developments can confirm that this is reflected within the current concept masterplan. Tree and Hedgerow Retention

2.29 The Policy requires existing hedges and trees within the site to be retained and reinforced with additional planting and habitat creation. 3West Developments are developing a scheme that will seek to meet this policy objective, however, strongly consider that the policy should be reworded to state 'where possible'. There must be acknowledgement within the policy wording that there may be instances where hedges and/or trees are required to be removed to allow for a suitable scheme to be delivered, and any loss must be considered in the overall planning balance.

**4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: No**

**5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?:** Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

**6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary.:** Our attendance is necessary to effectively discuss the points raised in these representations.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd

**Proposal:**

6. Mitigating Climate Change

**1. To which part of the Mitigating Climate Change chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** CC05

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed above?:** No

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Mitigating Climate Change chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:** Strategic Policy CC05 is not justified or supported by sufficient robust evidence. \*\*\* Personal details have been removed \*\*\* continue to object to this policy and suggest that draft Strategic Policy CC05 is removed from the Draft LP for the following reasons:

- At present the ability to access heat networks is outside of the control of the developer / landowner. As a result, this requirement is not justified for development.
- Further work is needed to demonstrate that heat networks can be secured at an affordable price that would benefit from the same safeguarding as a domestic supply.

**3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Mitigating Climate Change chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Mitigating Climate Change chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.:** Strategic Policy CC05 is removed from the Draft LP [see response to 3(b)]

**5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?:** Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

**6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary.:** Our attendance is necessary to effectively discuss the points raised in these representations.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd

**Proposal:**

6. Mitigating Climate Change

**1. To which part of the Mitigating Climate Change chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** CC02

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed above?:** No

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Mitigating Climate Change chapter is sound?:** No

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Mitigating Climate Change chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:** Strategic Policy CC02 requires all new developments to demonstrate, at the application stage, that the relevant standards can be achieved. However, it should be recognised that such information, relating to detailed interior and exterior design, will only be available at the detailed design stage and is therefore unlikely to be available at the point of submission of an Outline Planning Application. Development should be required to meet energy efficient standards in accordance with building regulations or National Policy. There is no certainty that FHS will be bought in and therefore development should not be required to meet draft standards. At present, this policy is not justified.

**3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Mitigating Climate Change chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Mitigating Climate Change chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.:** To be considered sound, the policy text should be revised to reflect this limitation [see response to 3(b)] in the level of detail that can reasonably be provided at outline stage and that Building Regulations and National Policy sets the standards.

**5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?:** Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

**6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary.:** Our attendance is necessary to effectively discuss the points raised in these representations.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd

**Proposal:**

6. Mitigating Climate Change

**1. To which part of the Mitigating Climate Change chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** CC02

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed above?:** No

**1(c). If the comment is related to a site, please state the site reference here::**  
Exmo\_20

**2. Do you consider that this part of the Mitigating Climate Change chapter is legally compliant?:** No

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Mitigating Climate Change chapter is sound?:** No

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Mitigating Climate Change chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:**

2.30 3West support East Devon District Council's ambition to achieve carbon neutrality by 2040 and recognise the important role that new development, including the Exmo\_20 allocation, can play in contributing towards this objective. The promotion of sustainable development and reductions in operational carbon emissions is supported in principle.

2.31 However, it is important that the policy framework for the Exmo\_20 site appropriately reflects the role of national standards, in particular the forthcoming Future Homes Standard (FHS), which will largely determine the sustainability and energy efficiency requirements applied to new homes across England. The implementation of the FHS will make a significant contribution towards reducing carbon emissions from residential development and will therefore support the Council's carbon neutrality objectives.

2.32 In this context, any policy requirements for the Exmo\_20 site that go beyond current future Building Regulations must be clearly justified and supported by robust evidence, including proportionate viability assumptions and assessment. At present, such proportionate evidence has not been provided. Without such justification, there is

a risk that additional or overly prescriptive requirements could undermine the viability and deliverability of this strategically important allocation.

2.33 Whilst the objective of achieving low-carbon or net-zero development is supported, it remains essential that sufficient flexibility is built into the policy to respond to evolving national standards, technological change and site-specific constraints. This is particularly important given the range of other policy requirements affecting the site, including heritage, biodiversity, mineral safeguarding, access and infrastructure provision.

2.34 In light of the above, 3West Developments considers that the draft policy as currently worded is not sound, as it is not justified (in the absence of proportionate evidence and viability testing) and not effective (given the potential implications for the deliverability of the Exmo\_20 allocation).

**4. Do you consider that this part of the Mitigating Climate Change chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?:** No

**5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?:** Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

**6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary.:** Our attendance is necessary to effectively discuss the points raised in these representations.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd

**Proposal:**

7. Adapting to Climate Change

**1. To which part of the Adapting to Climate Change chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** AR02

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed above?:** Yes

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Adapting to Climate Change chapter is sound?:** No

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Adapting to Climate Change chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:** Strategic Policy AR02 has been amended to include a number of criteria that must be met in order to protect, manage and improve water quality in East Devon. Criterion C states that all homes must meet the optional Building Regulation G2 standards of 110 litres per day. Supporting policy text states that the water cycle study provides clear evidence for adopting the stricter standard of 110 litres per day in East Devon to address water stress.

The Water Cycle Study in the Evidence Base, however, states that the per capita consumption should be reduced to 122l/h/d by 2038 and 110 l/h/d by 2050. The policy should be reworded to state that the per capita consumption is 120 l/h/d, in accordance with the Draft LP evidence base.

Furthermore, East Devon is not classified as a water stress area, posing questions about the justification for imposing limits on water usage. Water consumption is a matter already covered by the Buildings Regulations Regime, making a specific plan policy on this matter unjustified.

**3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Adapting to Climate Change chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Adapting to Climate Change chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to**

**put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph.**

**Please be as precise as possible.:** [As per response to 3(b) - ] The policy should be reworded to state that the per capita consumption is 120 l/h/d, in accordance with the Draft LP evidence base. Water consumption is a matter already covered by the Buildings Regulations Regime, making a specific plan policy on this matter unjustified.

**5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?:** Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

**6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary.:** Our attendance is necessary to effectively discuss the points raised in these representations.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd

**Proposal:**

7. Adapting to Climate Change

**1. To which part of the Adapting to Climate Change chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** AR01

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed above?:** No

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Adapting to Climate Change chapter is sound?:** No

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Adapting to Climate Change chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:** It is disappointing that the comments made during the previous Regulation 19 Consultation have not been addressed as part of this revised draft Local Plan. \*\*\* Personal details have been removed \*\*\* continues to object to the following criteria within this policy, which is not effective and therefore unsound:

Criterion a) requires development proposed in a flood risk location from any source to demonstrate that there is no sequentially preferable location for development. Whilst it is acknowledged that this Draft LP is likely to be examined against the previous NPPF (2023), planning applications will be determined against their compliance with the most up to date NPPF and NPPG. In respect of sequential tests (ST), these are only required to be undertaken in instances where build development/land rising/access or egress/internal road layout are located within areas at risk of flooding (from all sources). A ST [sequential test] is not required where POS is located within areas at risk of flooding. We consider that additional clarity is required to ensure this policy is not ambiguous to the decision-maker and therefore effective and sound.

Criterion c) requires “ensuring that space is provided on all development sites for the inclusion of SuDS designed to reduce the volume and rate of runoff to less than greenfield rates, as informed by the ‘Sustainable Drainage System – Guidance for Devon’. Surface water run-off should be managed as close to the source as possible.”

The drainage guidance provided by DCC, however, states that there is no need for developments to deliver a lower greenfield run off rate.

The policy must be reworded accordingly, as currently worded it is not justified and not supported by proportionate or robust evidence.

**3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Adapting to Climate Change chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Adapting to Climate Change chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph.**

**Please be as precise as possible.:** The policy must be reworded accordingly [see response at 3(b)], as currently worded it is not justified and not supported by proportionate or robust evidence.

**5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?:** Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

**6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary.:** Our attendance is necessary to effectively discuss the points raised in these representations.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd

**Proposal:**

7. Adapting to Climate Change

**1. To which part of the Adapting to Climate Change chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** AR01

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed above?:** No

**1(c). If the comment is related to a site, please state the site reference here.:**  
Exmo\_20

**2. Do you consider that this part of the Adapting to Climate Change chapter is legally compliant?:** No

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Adapting to Climate Change chapter is sound?:** No

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Adapting to Climate Change chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:**

2.35 3West object to the following criteria within this policy on the grounds that they are ineffective and therefore unsound. 3West is disappointed that the drafting of this policy has not been amended in response to a number of comments raised by respondents during the Phase 1 consultation, notwithstanding the concerns that were clearly expressed regarding its clarity, alignment with national policy, and practical implementation. Against this background, 3West maintains its objection to specific elements of the policy as set out below.

2.36 Criterion a) requires development proposed in areas at risk of flooding from any source to demonstrate that no sequentially preferable alternative site exists. While it is recognised that the Draft Local Plan may be examined against the 2023 NPPF, planning applications will be assessed against the most up-to-date NPPF and NPPG. In relation to the Sequential Test, this is only required where built development, land raising, access and egress, or internal road layouts are located within areas of flood risk from any source. The Sequential Test is not required where only public open space is proposed within areas at risk of flooding. Greater clarity is therefore needed to avoid ambiguity for decision-makers and to ensure the policy is effective and sound.

2.37 Criterion c) requires development sites to provide space for SuDS designed to reduce the volume and rate of surface water runoff to below greenfield rates, in accordance with the Sustainable Drainage Systems – Guidance for Devon, and to manage runoff as close to source as possible. However, Devon County Council guidance confirms that developments are not required to achieve runoff rates lower than greenfield levels.

2.38 3West Developments therefore consider that the policy is unsound as currently worded, as in its current form it is not justified and is not supported by proportionate or robust evidence.

**4. Do you consider that this part of the Adapting to Climate Change chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?:** No

**5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?:** Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

**6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary.:** Our attendance is necessary to effectively discuss the points raised in these representations.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd

**Proposal:**

8. Meeting Housing Needs

**1. To which part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** HN05

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed above?:** No

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter is sound?:**  
No

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:** This policy sets out the requirements for the provision of self-build plots within new residential schemes. The policy states that on sites of 20 or more homes, 5% of those homes are required to be serviced custom or self-build plots while on larger sites (250 homes or more), a portion of plots must be designated for affordable housing with all self-build plots.

The obligation that all self-build plots must be completed within 3 years of purchase being removed from the draft policy wording is welcomed, however, Taylor Wimpey continue to raise concerns over the stipulation that self-build plots must be marketed for a period of 24-months before being able to revert to 'normal' market housing. Taylor Wimpey reiterate that this is not reasonable. A development site may have been fully constructed and occupied within a 24-month period, and therefore the construction workers would have departed the site. It would not be reasonable for the developer to have to subsequently return to the development site to construct a small number of self-build plots that had no demand during the 24-month marketing exercise. As a result, it will be commonplace that development sites are left with unsightly undeveloped plots of land, which often delay the provision of cycle and pedestrian connections or play facilities within the site. The marketing period within this policy must be reduced to no more than 12-months.

**5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?:** Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

**6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary.:** Our attendance is necessary to effectively discuss the points raised in these representations.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd

**Proposal:**

8. Meeting Housing Needs

**1. To which part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** HN04

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed above?:** No

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter is sound?:**  
No

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:** Taylor Wimpey welcome the reduction from 100% to 50% of all new dwellings to meet the regulation M4(2) requirements or higher, however raise concerns over the uplift in the need of all new affordable homes to meet building regulation M4(3) (2) (a) or (b) requirements.

The increase in the requirement for all new affordable homes to meet building regulation M4(3) (2) (a) or (b) requirements from 5% to 15% raises concerns in regard to the viability of future developments.

The Local Plan Viability Assessment Addendum, published in November 2025, and sets out the considerations made during the previous Regulation 19 Consultation representations regarding viability. The assessment also consider changes made since the previous Local Plan Viability Assessment was published.

The assessment addendum identifies the Site (GH/ED/39b) as a Res7a site for 300 dwellings. The table below [see attachment] demonstrates the net in-combination impact from the reduction in M4(2) and the increase in M4(3) for typologies with affordable housing. The table [see attachment] demonstrates that development of 300 dwellings would result in a cost reduction of £123,243 as a result of the amendments made to the policy. Taylor Wimpey consider that this does not represent an accurate representation of reduction in cost for a development of this scale at the Site. The policy

is therefore considered to be unsound, and further viability work should be undertaken to better represent the value of reductions.

**5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?:** Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

**6. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary.:** Our attendance is necessary to effectively discuss the points raised in these representations.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd

**Proposal:** Sustainability Appraisal

**If you would like to make representations on the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) please provide your comments here, stating to which part of the SA your comments relate.:**

Alongside the revised draft Local Plan, the Council has also published a revised Sustainability Appraisal (SA), in which Land at Northcote Hill (GH/ED/39a and GH/ED/39b) have been assessed against the SA Objectives. The current SA has constrained the overall site's development capacity to 300 dwellings, comprising 115 dwellings for site reference GH/ED/39a and 195 dwellings for site reference GH/ED/39b.

Taylor Wimpey disagrees with a number of the SA scoring against the SA objectives, in particular, the assessment of objectives 2,4,5,7,9. Taylor Wimpey has provided additional evidence against each of those objectives and rescored the site accordingly, this is shown in the table below [see attachment].

The reassessment, undertaken by Boyer below [see attachment], demonstrates that the site is capable of accommodating an increased quantum of development, and therefore the draft allocation should be increased within the Draft Local Plan.

The above revised site suitability assessment [see attachment] for land off Northcote Hill, Honiton (land north and south of the railway line), which has been assessed using the site's specific technical surveys and assessments prepared by relevant technical consultants, demonstrates that the site can deliver at least 299 homes on land south of the railway line, and up to 115 homes on land north of the railway line, and continue to positively contribute towards EDDC's Sustainability Objectives.

Technical Reports: GH/ED/39a and GH/ED/39b are supported by a full suite of Technical Reports and concept masterplans which have been submitted as part of the planning applications on the site. These demonstrate the site can accommodate an increase in development and therefore the site's capacity should be increased.

The technical reports demonstrate that GH/ED/39b can accommodate a greater quantum of development than set out within the Draft LP. The technical reports are summarised below.

**Landscape Considerations:** A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment has been undertaken, with viewpoints agreed with East Devon District Council Officers. The assessment confirms that GH/ED/39b can accommodate at least 299 homes in a manner that responds positively to its landscape context, including the nearby National Landscapes. The built form is contained within the 160m contour, and substantial structural planting is proposed along the eastern edge to integrate the development with the existing landform. The effects on landscape character are considered limited and localised, particularly if the adjacent Northcote Road development is completed.

**Heritage and Archaeology:** An Historic Environment Desk Based Assessment confirms that GH/ED/39b does not include any designated heritage assets. The site forms a minor part of the views from the Dumpton Hill Fort Scheduled Monument, but the impact on the significance of designated heritage assets is negligible. Considering the above, there are no heritage or archaeology factors that would prevent the delivery of at least 299 homes on this site. The draft allocation should be amended to align with this.

**Ecology:** An Ecological Impact Assessment confirms that GH/ED/39b has no designated sites within or adjacent to its boundaries. Habitats of highest ecological value, such as broadleaved woodland, will be retained and buffered within the scheme. The assessment confirms that the site can accommodate a higher quantum of development whilst meeting national requirements and remaining technically suitable.

**Arboriculture:** An arboricultural survey confirms there are no Tree Preservation Orders, Ancient Woodlands, or Veteran Trees on the site. All trees are to be retained where possible, with any removals limited to low-quality specimens. Encroachments into root protection zones will be minor and managed by appropriate tree protection measures. The landscape strategy proposes additional tree planting along key boundaries, supplementing existing vegetation and contributing to overall biodiversity net gain. The development is not considered to result in a likely significant effect in respect of arboriculture.

**Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage:** The majority of the site lies within Flood Zone 1, with the concept masterplan being informed by this. All development including dwellings, access and egress can be delivered within Flood Zone 1 in accordance with the NPPF. The proposed development is supported by a drainage strategy, which includes sustainable urban drainage systems (SuDS) and ensures that occupiers and users will remain safe from current and future surface water flood risk for the lifetime of the development, without increasing flood risk elsewhere. The sequential test is not required in this context. The drainage network is designed not to exacerbate existing flood risk upstream or downstream, in accordance with the NPPF and Environment Agency criteria.

**Ground Conditions:** A Phase 1 Ground Investigation Report confirms the site is underlain by Head Deposits and Branscombe Mudstone Formation. The site is considered to be between very low and low risk in respect to contamination and ground gas, with no significant concerns for development. As a result of the above, the sites capacity should be increased to allow for further development.

**Noise:** An Acoustic Design Statement demonstrates that, through good acoustic design, suitable internal and external amenity standards can be achieved. The site is suitable for residential development in terms of noise levels, and the draft policy should be amended to align with this.

**Highways:** The site and proposed development is supported by a Transport Assessment and Residential Travel Plan, prepared in consultation with Devon County Council, which confirms that each development parcel can benefit from primary access routes from Northcote Hill. The access points and road hierarchy have been accepted by the Highway Authority. The scheme prioritises high-quality walking, cycling, and public transport infrastructure, in addition to traffic capacity. A pedestrian footway will be constructed along Northcote Hill's northern flank, connecting to the town centre, and a footway is also proposed along the southern boundary. GH/ED/39b is well located for access to existing bus services and Honiton Railway Station.

Trip generation and junction capacity analysis demonstrate that traffic impacts will be insignificant. The Travel Plan, to be secured through a S106 Agreement, sets out measures to reduce car use and promote sustainable transport, with effectiveness monitored over five years.

**Energy and Sustainability:** The site is supported by an Energy and Sustainability Statement, which demonstrates that the proposed development responds positively to local and national sustainability requirements. Measures include an overheating assessment, water efficiency standards, climate change allowances in flood risk and drainage, and biodiversity enhancement. The dwellings will adopt a fabric-first approach, reduce embodied carbon, be 'net zero' ready, and focus on renewable energy opportunities.

**Air Quality:** The site has been subject to an Air Quality Assessment, which confirms that, with mitigation, dust emissions during construction will be not significant, and operational impacts on NO<sub>2</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub> will be negligible. The site is suitable for residential development in air quality terms, and recommended mitigation measures will be implemented during construction.

**Health Impact Assessment:** The site and proposed development, is supported by a Health Impact Assessment, which confirms that the development will deliver health benefits by providing necessary housing, employment opportunities, and services, while reducing environmental risks and supporting improved health and wellbeing.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** Vistry Group

**Proposal:** 10. High Quality Design

**1. To which part of the High Quality Design chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** DS02

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed above?:** Yes

**2(a). If yes, and you wish to support the legal compliance of this part of the High Quality Design chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.:**

-

**3. Do you consider that this part of the High Quality Design chapter is sound?:** Yes

**3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the High Quality Design chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.:** Policy DS02:

Housing Density and Efficient Use of Land

2.53 Vistry support Policy DS02 and the requirement for residential development to maximise the number of new homes and density of the development in a manner that is compatible with the site setting and characteristics.

2.54 It is also noted that development will need to conserve and enhance the character of the area, especially in a National Landscape.

2.55 Policy DS02 has also been amended to confirm that proposal for developments of 50 or more dwellings and those in environmentally or heritage sensitive locations, especially adjacent to a National Landscape, will be required to be supported by a design code agreed with or produced by the council as planning authority. Land at Addlepool Farm is not located within any statutory or non-statutory landscape character or quality designations. In addition, the 2022 EDDC Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment concluded that the site would have no impact on the East Devon National Landscape.

2.56 The proposed masterplan for land at Addlepool Farm as considered how the village can be delivered sensitively in the context of views to the Clyst St George Church (Grade II) located to the northwest of the site, as there are locations within the site boundary that have some visibility of the church tower. Key view corridors have been retained and

are proposed as green space to ensure that the intervisibility of the church tower can be preserved

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** Vistry Group

**Proposal:** 11. Sustainable Transport and Communications

**1. To which part of the Sustainable Transport and Communications chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** TR04

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Sustainable Transport and Communications chapter is sound?:** No

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Sustainable Transport and Communications chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:** Policy TR04: Parking Standards and electric vehicle charging provision

2.57 Vistry support the principles of Policy TR04 however consider the policy to be ineffective as the blanket approach used through the requirement for an average of 1.7 spaces per Page 14 EDDC Second Regulation 19 Consultation: Representations | Land at Addlepool Farm residential development is not flexible and does not consider the site's locational context, which may justify adopting an alternative approach to parking. Vistry request that car parking requirements for development schemes should be considered on a case-by-case basis.

2.58 We therefore request that greater clarity is provided within the proposed policy text, and to ensure that Policy TR04 is considered sound, strongly recommend that the requirement of

1.7 spaces per residential dwelling is omitted.

2.59 It is noted that Policy TR04 now requests for wider environmental benefits but specifically to reduce fossil fuel vehicle emissions adversely impacting on the Pebblebed Heaths SAC/SPA. Vistry have concerns with regards to the requirements for residential development to wherever possible aim to exceed Building Regulation standards.

2.60 Policy requirements should be based upon existing legislation, and whilst it is acknowledged that requirements set out within the Future Homes Standard 2025 or successor standards will provide measures to be achieved on site, Policy TR04 should not be a duplicate to building regulations. We therefore suggest that viability should be considered as part of the policy text, with sufficient flexibility.

2.61 Land at Addlepool Farm is located within a 10km proximity of designated sites of international importance, mitigation for impacts that may occur to these sites would be secured as part of the proposals. EDDC's HELAA (2022) concluded the site would have no unacceptable impact on biodiversity.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** Vistry Group

**Proposal:** 13. Our Outstanding Biodiversity and Geodiversity

**1. To which part of the Our Outstanding Biodiversity and Geodiversity chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** PB09

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed above?:** No

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Our Outstanding Biodiversity and Geodiversity chapter is sound?:** No

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Our Outstanding Biodiversity and Geodiversity chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:** Whilst the amendments to Policy PB09 are welcomed, Vistry continue to object to Policy PB09, which is not justified and therefore not sound.

2.78 Vistry reiterate that the requirement for annual inspection reports to be prepared and issued to the LPA for a period of 5 years following completion of the planting works is not justified and should be dealt with on a case-by-case basis. As developers may not have ownership over the land as open space will often be transferred to a Management Company, whom would be responsible for the on-going maintenance of the scheme's planting, it is not justified for the developer to be held accountable for submitting annual inspection reports to the LPA.

**3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Our Outstanding Biodiversity and Geodiversity chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Our Outstanding Biodiversity and Geodiversity chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.:**

2.79 We strongly encourage this element of the policy to be revised or omitted.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** Vistry Group

**Proposal:** 13. Our Outstanding Biodiversity and Geodiversity

**1. To which part of the Our Outstanding Biodiversity and Geodiversity chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** PB07

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed above?:** No

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Our Outstanding Biodiversity and Geodiversity chapter is sound?:** Yes

**3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Our Outstanding Biodiversity and Geodiversity chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.:** Policy PB07: Ecological Enhancement and Biodiversity in the Built Environment

2.75 Policy PB07 now states that as a minimum, the detailed features or others of equivalent value are sought within new proposals. This amendment is supported by Vistry as it provides additional flexibility for ecological enhancement features to be determined on a case-by-case basis and to be influenced by site context and ecological opportunities.

2.76 Vistry therefore support Policy PB07 and recognise the importance for new development to deliver ecological enhancements.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** Vistry Group

**Proposal:** 13. Our Outstanding Biodiversity and Geodiversity

**1. To which part of the Our Outstanding Biodiversity and Geodiversity chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** PB05

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Our Outstanding Biodiversity and Geodiversity chapter is sound?:** No

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Our Outstanding Biodiversity and Geodiversity chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:** Strategic Policy PB05: Biodiversity Net Gain

2.68 Vistry acknowledge the proposed amendments to Strategic Policy PB05 and that impacts on biodiversity should be avoided or mitigated, and if there is no alternative, fully compensated. However, Vistry continue to object to Strategic Policy PB05 which is unjustified, ineffective, not consistent with national policy and is therefore unsound due to the requirement of over 10% biodiversity net gain (BNG) for major development.

2.69 The Draft LP must be consistent with national policy to be considered sound. It is therefore extremely important that the required BNG threshold should align with the mandatory requirement of a minimum of 10% in accordance with the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as inserted by Schedule 14 of the Environment Act 2022).

2.70 This is subsequently emphasised by emerging policy and the current draft NPPF consultation (2025), which is live until 10th March 2026. Whilst it is acknowledged that the Draft LP is being examined against the provisions of the previous NPPF (2023), the draft NPPF (2025) still serves as an important material consideration.

2.71 In this regard, Plan making policy N1: Identifying environmental opportunities and safeguards states that: “Development plans should only set local standards for biodiversity net gain which are in excess of the statutory net gain requirement where this is for specific site allocations, and is fully justified and deliverable. Any such requirements should not extend to categories of development which are exempt from statutory biodiversity net gain.” [Boyer emphasis]

2.72 In addition, Vistry would like to emphasise that the PPG states that: “Plan-makers should not seek a higher percentage than the statutory objective of 10% biodiversity net gain, either on an area-wide basis or for specific allocations for development unless

justified. To justify such policies, they will need to be evidenced, including as to local need for a higher percentage, local opportunities for a higher percentage and any impacts on viability for development. Consideration will also need to be given to how the policy will be implemented.” [Boyer emphasis] Page 16 EDDC Second Regulation 19 Consultation: Representations | Land at Addlepool Farm

2.73 Draft policy PB05 is therefore not consistent with national policy as highlighted within the extracts above from the NPPF and PPG, and the requirement for 20% biodiversity net gain for major development is not justified.

2.74 To be considered sound, the draft text for Strategic Policy PB05 should therefore be revised to require a 10% biodiversity net gain for major development, with any requirements in excess considered on a case-by-case basis for associated allocations within the draft Local Plan. This will ensure that biodiversity net gain is applied in a consistent manner across planning authorities and will ensure Strategic Policy PB05 is in accordance with adopted and emerging national guidance.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** Vistry Group

**Proposal:** 13. Our Outstanding Biodiversity and Geodiversity

**1. To which part of the Our Outstanding Biodiversity and Geodiversity chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** PB04

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed above?:** No

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Our Outstanding Biodiversity and Geodiversity chapter is sound?:** Yes

**3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Our Outstanding Biodiversity and Geodiversity chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.:** Vistry support Strategic Policy PB04 and understand the requirement for new development to not adversely affect the integrity of sites protected under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.

2.63 Strategic Policy PB04 requires all residential schemes within a straight line 10km distance of any part of the European sites to provide mitigation to offset increased recreational pressure associated with new development. It is noted this is in accordance with the South-East Devon Wildlife – Joint Habitats Sites Mitigation Strategy (SEDESMS) which was agreed in July 2025.

2.64 In terms of mitigation measures, the SEDESMS states: “...to ensure effectiveness, mitigation needs to include a package of measures that work together in an integrated way. For example, educating visitors, reinforcing messages with site-based staff, and providing the right infrastructure to meet visitor needs and influence visitor behaviour could all fit together as part of a mitigation package, but are the kinds of measures that cannot be delivered in a piecemeal way, implemented by individual developments.”

2.65 As detailed within the SEDESMS, mitigation measures are therefore split into:

- Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMMS); and Page 15 EDDC Second Regulation 19 Consultation: Representations | Land at Addlepool Farm
- Off-site infrastructure (including SANGs – ‘Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace’ and local projects).

2.66 Vistry support this approach to mitigation and agree where required that suitable avoidance, mitigation and compensation measures will be required where potential adverse impacts are identified.

2.67 Land at Addlepool Farm is located within approximately 0.5km south west of the Exe Estuary RAMSAR, SSSI and SPA to the south west. Addlepool Village will provide substantial areas of green infrastructure which will include new recreational routes extending public access into the Site. The mitigation for any recreational impacts that may occur would be secured as part of the proposals in the form of financial contributions towards improved access management and provision of substantial alternative recreation locations.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** Vistry Group

**Proposal:** 14. Open Space and Sports and Recreation

**1. To which part of the Open Space and Sports and Recreation chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** OS02

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed above?:** No

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Open Space and Sports and Recreation chapter is sound?:** Yes

**3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Open Space and Sports and Recreation chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.:**

Vistry support Policy OS02 and the updated text that acknowledges that site typography or other planning constraints can prevent or severely limit scope for policy delivery on site. This policy wording provides sufficient flexibility and is effective, ensuring that housing delivering will not be hindered.

2.81 Land at Addlepool Farm will provide opportunities for sport, recreation and open space in accordance with Policy OS02, including the delivery of a significant quantum of public open space, village green, allotments, new woodland, potential for sports pitches, community orchard, and children's play areas. This will ensure the development is centred on promoting healthy communities.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** Vistry Group

**Proposal:**

3. The Spatial Strategy

**1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?:**

Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** SP07

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed in the table above?:** No

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?:** Yes

**3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.:** Strategic Policy SP07: Delivery of Infrastructure

2.15 Vistry acknowledge the need for infrastructure on a strategic and local level to support growth within East Devon. Vistry therefore support the amendments to Strategic Policy SP07, particularly regarding the removal of the requirement for development to support the 'wider community'. Page 7 EDDC Second Regulation 19 Consultation: Representations | Land at Addlepool Farm

2.16 The removal of this text from the draft policy ensures the draft wording is in accordance with National Guidance and supports the notion that infrastructure must be suitable for the development to be acceptable in planning terms, and that there is no requirement for development to support the needs of the wider community.

2.17 Additional clarification could be added to the Draft Policy text to ensure that it is clear that infrastructure to support proposed development must meet the tests set out within Regulation 122 (as amended by the 2011 and 2019 Regulations) (necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; directly related to the development; and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development).

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:** Additional clarification could be added to the Draft Policy text to ensure that it is clear that infrastructure to support proposed development must meet the tests set out within Regulation 122 (as amended by the 2011 and 2019 Regulations) (necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; directly related to the development; and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development).

**5. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?:** Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** Vistry Group

**Proposal:**

3. The Spatial Strategy

**1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?:**

Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** SP03

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed in the table above?:** Yes

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?:** No

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:** Strategic Policy SP03:

Housing Requirement by Designated Neighbourhood Area

2.12 Vistry object to the policy wording of SP03 and consider that additional changes to the text are required to ensure the policy is consistent with National Policy.

2.13 Whilst it is welcomed that paragraph 3.15 has been updated to acknowledge that this policy establishes a minimum housing requirement for the 42 Designated Neighbourhood Areas (DNAs), Vistry Group consider that greater emphasis should be placed on this minimum housing requirement and that the DNA should not be a ceiling for growth.

2.14 This emphasis will ensure Policy SP03 aligns with the Government's overarching objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes under paragraph 60 of the NPPF (2023). The policy wording is therefore not sound in its current draft. The Draft LP text should therefore be updated to reflect the above.

**3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.:**

Whilst it is welcomed that paragraph 3.15 has been updated to acknowledge that this policy establishes a minimum housing requirement for the 42 Designated Neighbourhood Areas (DNAs), Vistry Group consider that greater emphasis should be placed on this minimum housing requirement and that the DNA should not be a ceiling for growth.

2.14 This emphasis will ensure Policy SP03 aligns with the Government's overarching objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes under paragraph 60 of the NPPF (2023). The policy wording is therefore not sound in its current draft. The Draft LP text should therefore be updated to reflect the above

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** Vistry Group

**Proposal:**

3. The Spatial Strategy

**1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?:**

Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** SP02

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed in the table above?:** Yes

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?:** No

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:** Strategic Policy SP02: Levels of Future Housing Development

2.4 Vistry support the principles of Strategic Policy SP02 and the acknowledgement that the NPPF requires Local Plans to identify and meet as a minimum the objectively assessed development needs for their area. However, Vistry object to the overall housing requirement and stepped trajectory approach and raise comments in relation to the affordable housing figures contained within the supporting text, which is not justified.

2.5 It is noted that paragraph 3.8 has received a minor update to confirm that: “In the event of housing not being delivered in accordance with the plan and/or the identified need for new homes changing in the future, including taking account of possible unmet needs in neighbouring areas, the requirements of national policy and legislation for a review/update of the plan will be followed.”

2.6

2.7 Vistry support this addition and the acknowledgement that a plan review will be required in future if the identified housing need or housing delivery change. The Draft LP states in paragraph 3.10 that the East Devon Housing Needs Assessment 2025 shows an affordable housing need from 2020 to 2040 of 4,108 homes (current and future needs), an increase from 4,070, and an additional 1,170 homes for those in private rent but who aspire to home ownership and can afford discounted market housing products. The affordable housing need figure fails to extend to the end of the Plan period (2042), the final two years of the plan period are no longer accounted for. The full affordable need across the Draft LP period has therefore not been considered.

2.8 To be positively prepared, and in acknowledgement of the above acute affordable housing need, the Draft LP should increase the housing numbers proposed as at present, the Plan continues to only meet 80% of its local housing need. Page 6 EDDC Second Regulation 19 Consultation: Representations | Land at Addlepool Farm

2.9 Paragraph 3.12 continues to state that the proposed “new community provision of new homes will come forward under a stepped trajectory that will provide an annual average of 850 dwellings per year from 2020/21 to 2031/32 and 1,070 per year from 2032/33 to plan end at 2041/42”.

2.10 Vistry continue to object to the proposed stepped trajectory as this is not considered to be effective plan-making. The stepped trajectory approach is wholly unsuitable in the context of this Draft LP, it places significant reliance on meeting EDDC’s housing requirement within the latter parts of the Plan period, when housing delivery is least known. This is not an effective or justified approach given the District’s acute affordable housing need and housing crisis and noting that EDDC are intending to benefit from the NPPF transitional arrangements and a housing requirements figure that already falls short of the local housing need. The stepped trajectory also places an over-reliance on housing delivery within the new settlement, with overly optimistic delivery assumptions that are not supported by robust or proportionate evidence.

2.11 Large-scale strategic developments of the quantum planned for Marlcombe require extended timeframes to secure the necessary planning permissions, implementation and delivery. Consequently, the Council needs to take a realistic delivery approach. As drafted, there is significant uncertainty as to whether the new communities will be delivered before the end of the plan period. The Council must reconsider the approach to site selection. Land at Addlepool Farm can contribute to the Council’s housing need in the short to medium term, supplementing housing delivery within existing draft allocations and allowing for a reduction in the housing delivery assumptions associated with the new settlement to more realistic assumptions.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** Vistry Group

**Proposal:**

3. The Spatial Strategy

**1. To which part of the Spatial Strategy chapter does your representation relate?:**

Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** SP01

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed in the table above?:** No

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter is sound?:** Yes

**3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Spatial Strategy chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.:** Strategic Policy

SP01: Spatial Strategy

2.2

2.3 Vistry continue to support the principle of SP01. As detailed in previous written representations, to ensure that the Draft LP is positively prepared we consider that the identification of land at Addlepool Farm as an allocation, alongside the existing allocation of a new town at Marlcombe, would provide the Council with greater assurance that the Plan was capable of delivering its housing requirement, particularly in the inevitable event that housing delivery within the new town is delayed.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** Vistry Group

**Proposal:**

4. Development at the West End

**1. To which part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** WS10

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed above?:** No

**1(c). If the comment is related to a site, please state the site reference here.:** Land North of Topsham

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter is sound?:** No

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:**  
Strategic Policy WS10: Development Next to the M5 and North of Topsham

2.27 Vistry object to Strategic Policy WS10 and the allocated site next to the M5 and north of Topsham. Strategic Policy WS10 unjustified and unsound for the following reasons:

- The site is located within Grade 1 agricultural land (HELAA 2022 Assessment) and therefore does not comply with draft Policy OL10.
  - The site extends across multiple administrative boundaries and will require cross-boundary working with Exeter City Council, subsequently requiring the development to consider infrastructure needs of both authority areas.
  - Within previous consultations from EDDC, the site was identified as being located within a Green Wedge which raises significant concerns from Vistry regarding the impact of the draft allocation on the purpose and functionality of the Green Wedge designation. Whilst the Green Wedge designation excludes sites covered by Strategic Policy WS10, the inclusion of the site within the Green Wedge signifies that this development would lead to coalescence and is therefore not suitable for development.
- Page 9 EDDC Second Regulation 19 Consultation: Representations | Land at Addlepool Farm

- The proposed development would result in sporadic, isolated development that would contribute to coalescence of Topsham and Clyst St Mary.

2.28 There are other development sites within the vicinity of draft allocation WS10 that are more suitable for development, with less technical constraints, would not lead to the coalescence of settlements, would result in less adverse impacts, and would accord with the emerging spatial strategy and policies. Land at Addlepool Farm offers a more suitable site for development and must be considered as a suitable alternative to the proposed allocation of Strategic Policy WS10.

2.29 Land at Addlepool Farm is not located within a Green Wedge, and the proposed development would not compromise the coalescence of settlements. Addlepool Farm provides a suitable alternative within an area of lower agricultural land quality and is located within a strategic network route that will require less significant infrastructure improvements to come forward.

2.30 Land at Addlepool Farm can therefore deliver a housing scheme at a similar scale to land north of Topsham and can make a meaningful contribution to EDDC's housing land supply in the short to medium term with a less site constraints

**4. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter complies with the duty to cooperate?: No**

**4(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.:** Strategic Policy WS10: Development Next to the M5 and North of Topsham

2.27 Vistry object to Strategic Policy WS10 and the allocated site next to the M5 and north of Topsham. Strategic Policy WS10 unjustified and unsound for the following reasons:

- The site is located within Grade 1 agricultural land (HELAA 2022 Assessment) and therefore does not comply with draft Policy OL10.
- The site extends across multiple administrative boundaries and will require cross-boundary working with Exeter City Council, subsequently requiring the development to consider infrastructure needs of both authority areas.
- Within previous consultations from EDDC, the site was identified as being located within a Green Wedge which raises significant concerns from Vistry regarding the impact of the draft allocation on the purpose and functionality of the Green Wedge designation. Whilst the Green Wedge designation excludes sites covered by Strategic Policy WS10, the inclusion of the site within the Green Wedge signifies that this development would lead to coalescence and is therefore not suitable for development.

- The proposed development would result in sporadic, isolated development that would contribute to coalescence of Topsham and Clyst St Mary.

2.28 There are other development sites within the vicinity of draft allocation WS10 that are more suitable for development, with less technical constraints, would not lead to the coalescence of settlements, would result in less adverse impacts, and would accord with the emerging spatial strategy and policies. Land at Addlepool Farm offers a more suitable site for development and must be considered as a suitable alternative to the proposed allocation of Strategic Policy WS10.

2.29 Land at Addlepool Farm is not located within a Green Wedge, and the proposed development would not compromise the coalescence of settlements. Addlepool Farm provides a suitable alternative within an area of lower agricultural land quality and is located within a strategic network route that will require less significant infrastructure improvements to come forward.

2.30 Land at Addlepool Farm can therefore deliver a housing scheme at a similar scale to land north of Topsham and can make a meaningful contribution to EDDC's housing land supply in the short to medium term with a less site constraints

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** Vistry Group

**Proposal:**

4. Development at the West End

**1. To which part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** WS09

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed above?:** No

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter is sound?:** Yes

**3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Development in the Towns and Villages chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.:**

Vistry support Strategic Policy WS09 and the continued identification of Clyst Valley Regional Park (CVRP).

2.26 Land at Addlepool Farm provides an opportunity for a sustainable new community that will strongly support the expansion of the CVRP for the following reasons:

- The objectives of the CVRP will be achieved through the contribution of development at Addlepool Farm.
- The number of communities that will benefit from the park, offering greater connectivity and access to a wider audience along the eastern edge of Exeter will be increased from the delivery of Addlepool Farm.
- The proximity of Addlepool Farm to the expansion boundary of CVRP will enable the active and healthy places criteria.
- Green links with Clyst St George will be enhanced, providing future and existing residents with improved access to green space and public open space.
- The location of Addlepool Farm along the Clyst Valley Trail, the Walking and Cycling infrastructure of the Clyst St George would also be improved, enhancing accessibility into the CVRP and along Exmouth Road and Woodbury Road through the provision of sustainable movement.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** Vistry Group

**Proposal:**

6. Mitigating Climate Change

**1. To which part of the Mitigating Climate Change chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** CC05

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed above?:** No

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Mitigating Climate Change chapter is sound?:** No

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Mitigating Climate Change chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:** Strategic Policy  
CC05: Heat Networks

2.32 Strategic Policy CC05 is not justified or supported by sufficient robust evidence. Vistry object to this policy and suggest that draft Strategic Policy CC05 is removed from the Draft LP for the following reasons:

- At present the ability to access heat networks is outside of the control of the developer / landowner. As a result, this requirement is not justified for development.
- Further work is needed to demonstrate that heat networks can be secured at an affordable price that would benefit from the same safeguarding as a domestic supply.

2.33 Land at Addlepool Farm falls below the suggested threshold of 1,200 dwellings and is therefore not anticipated to deliver a heat network.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** Vistry Group

**Proposal:**

6. Mitigating Climate Change

**1. To which part of the Mitigating Climate Change chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** CC02

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed above?:** No

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Mitigating Climate Change chapter is sound?:** Yes

**3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Mitigating Climate Change chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.:** Strategic Policy CC02: Net-Zero Carbon Development

2.31 Vistry support the principles of EDDC's target to become carbon neutral by 2040, however the Draft Policy text should be updated to acknowledge that the implementation of Future Homes Standard (FHS) will largely influence the sustainability requirements that will be adopted for housebuilding across England. The implementation of the FHS will support East Devon's target to become carbon neutral by 2040, and therefore, any policy requirement which goes beyond the requirements of building regulations (now or in the future) must be justified and supported by relevant viability assumptions and assessment.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** Vistry Group

**Proposal:**

7. Adapting to Climate Change

**1. To which part of the Adapting to Climate Change chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** AR02

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed above?:** No

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Adapting to Climate Change chapter is sound?:** No

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Adapting to Climate Change chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:** The policy amendment is not supported by proportionate evidence. Previous comments raised by Vistry have not been considered with the amendments made to the Draft LP wording. Vistry therefore still consider that Strategic Policy AR02 is unjustified for the following reasons:

- East Devon is not considered a water stress area, and therefore the requirement for a specific plan policy on water quality and efficiency is considered to be unjustified.
- Criterion C requires homes to meet the Building Regulation G2 standards of 110 l/h/d, with supporting evidence referencing the accompanying Water Cycle Study. On review of the Water Cycle Study, this states that the per capita consumption should be reduced to 122 l/h/d by 2038 and 110 l/h/d by 2050.
- Vistry consider that the proposed policy text should be consistent with current Building Regulations G2 and the water efficiency standard of 125 litres per day to ensure the policy is not unsound. A lower water efficiency standard of 110 l/h/d is not supported by evidence.

2.41 Any requirements regarding water quality should be consistent with national policy, which in this case paragraph 180e) the NPPF requires planning policies and decisions to prevent: “new and existing development from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability. Development should, wherever possible, help to improve local environmental conditions such as air and water quality, taking into account relevant information such as river basin management plans”.

2.42 The policy text should be amended to state that developers cannot impose water usage restrictions, and that developers can only install and encourage occupiers to adopt water efficient methods post-occupation. In addition, the Draft LP text should be updated in accordance with Building Regulations G2 and the water efficiency standard of 125 litres per day.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** Vistry Group

**Proposal:**

7. Adapting to Climate Change

**1. To which part of the Adapting to Climate Change chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** AR02

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed above?:** No

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Adapting to Climate Change chapter is sound?:** No

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Adapting to Climate Change chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:** Strategic Policy AR02: Water Quality and Efficiency

2.38 Additional text has been included within Strategic Policy AR02 to ensure the policy is in accordance with the resolution of the 2nd September 2025 Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) that “the update on the Water Cycle Study be noted and to include a strategic policy on water quality, as generally described in paragraph 6.3 of this report, the details of which would be finalised following the completion of the water cycle study be agreed.”

2.39 Concerns were raised at the SPC that collectively policies within the Local Plan required improvements to water quality, there was no overarching policy bringing these requirements together, and would likely include:

- A requirement for major development proposals to demonstrate what measures can reasonably be taken to enhance the water environment;
- A requirement for development to make adequate provision of water services including timely provision of foul water so that development does not overload the sewer network;
- The phasing of development to ensure the avoidance or mitigation of any adverse impacts to residents on water supply or wastewater infrastructure; Page 11 EDDC Second Regulation 19 Consultation: Representations | Land at Addlepool Farm
- Provision of appropriate surface water drainage and disposal; and

- Measures to protect aquifers and Source Protection Zones.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** Vistry Group

**Proposal:**

7. Adapting to Climate Change

**1. To which part of the Adapting to Climate Change chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** AR01

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed above?:** No

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Adapting to Climate Change chapter is sound?:** No

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Adapting to Climate Change chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:** Strategic Policy AR01: Flooding

2.34 Vistry consider that Strategic Policy AR01 is unjustified.

2.35 Criterion a) requires applications for development proposed in a flood risk location from any source to demonstrate that there is no sequentially preferable location for development and, if necessary, that development complies with the exception test (unless this has been undertaken through a site allocation within the emerging local plan). To ensure that criterion a) is consistent with national policy and the NPPF, we consider that additional clarity is required to ensure that this policy is not ambiguous to the decision-maker, and that planning applications will be determined against their compliance with the most up to date National Guidance and Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). We propose that the policy wording is reworded accordingly to ensure it is clear that ST are not required where development/land rising/access or egress/internal road layout is located within areas at risk of flooding.

2.36 Criterion c) requires space to be provided on all development sites for the inclusion of SuDS designed to reduce the volume and rate of runoff to less than greenfield rates, as informed by the 'Sustainable Drainage System – Guidance for Devon'. Guidance provided by DCC does not require development to deliver a lower greenfield run off rate, and as a result the current policy wording is unjustified and not supported by proportionate or robust evidence. The policy wording must be reworded to clarify that existing greenfield run off rates are not required to be exceeded, as delivering a betterment is not a requirement from DCC.

2.37 The proposed policy wording continues to lack flexibility and is overly onerous to the development industry, without appropriate justification. Additional amendments are therefore required to the proposed policy text to ensure that there is flexibility and is appropriately justified.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** Vistry Group

**Proposal:**

8. Meeting Housing Needs

**1. To which part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** HN05

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed above?:** No

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter is sound?:**  
No

**3(a). If yes, and you wish to support the soundness of this part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter, please use this box to set out your comments.:**

-

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:** Strategic Policy  
HN05: Self-Build and Custom Build Housing

2.51 Vistry support the principle of Strategic Policy HN05, however the current policy wording is not considered to be justified, and therefore is unsound for the following reasons:

- No justification has been given to the requirement for all new development above 20 dwellings to provide 5% service custom and self-build plots.
- There is no consideration of the demand for custom and self-build plots and how this will impact development on a case-by-case basis. Where there is no demand, the developer should not be penalised for not delivering specialised housing on new developments.
- No clarification is provided regarding how these plots will be utilised if there is no demand.

2.52 To ensure that the policy is justified and therefore sound, the policy text should be clarified to state that such specialised housing will be sought on new developments where there is an evidenced market demand. If there is no market demand, it should be acknowledged that units should revert to market housing to meet local demand.

**3(c). Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter sound, in respect of any matters you have identified above. You will need to say why each modification will make this part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or paragraph. Please be as precise as possible.:** To ensure that the policy is justified and therefore sound, the policy text should be clarified to state that such specialised housing will be sought on new developments where there is an evidenced market demand. If there is no market demand, it should be acknowledged that units should revert to market housing to meet local demand.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** Vistry Group

**Proposal:**

8. Meeting Housing Needs

**1. To which part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** HN04

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed above?:** No

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:** Vistry recognise the growing need for accessible homes and support the principle of Strategic Policy HN04. We welcome the reduction from 100% to 50% that all new dwellings meeting regulation M4(2) requirements or higher.

2.50 The Draft LP has increased the requirement for all new affordable homes to meet building regulation M4(3) (2) (a) or (b) requirements from 5% to 15%. Vistry raises significant concern with regards to this change and its implications on the viability of future developments.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** Vistry Group

**Proposal:**

8. Meeting Housing Needs

**1. To which part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** HN03

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed above?:** No

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:** Strategic Policy HN03: Housing to Meet the Needs of Older People

2.46 Vistry support the principle of Strategic Policy HN03, however consider that the current policy wording is not effective, nor justified, for the following reasons:

- Whilst the need for units for older persons within EDDC is acknowledged, greater emphasis should be placed on the viability of this provision.
- Not all sites will be suitable to provide older persons specialist housing and should therefore be assessed on a case-by-case basis.
- The required provision for sites should be determined on a case-by-case basis, using evidence where necessary to demonstrate that there is a market demand the specific needs of the local area.

2.47 The policy text must be reworded to recognise that older persons units will only be required where there is up to date evidence and an evidenced market demand, subject to viability.

2.48 Addlepool Farm would create a new sustainable village and destination. Should there be a demand for specialised homes, these could be delivered as part of the future scheme in accordance with Strategic Policy HN03.

**Full name:** Iwan Easton

**Organisation (where relevant):** Boyer Planning

**Other party name (if relevant):** Vistry Group

**Proposal:**

8. Meeting Housing Needs

**1. To which part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter does your representation relate?:** Policy

**1(a). Please write down the paragraph, policy or figure number that your representation relates to.:** HN02

**1(b). Does your comment relate to one of the changes listed above?:** No

**3. Do you consider that this part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter is sound?:**  
No

**3(b). If no, please give details of why you consider this part of the Meeting Housing Needs chapter is not sound. Please be as precise as possible.:** Strategic Policy  
HN02: Affordable Housing

2.43 Vistry support the principle of Strategic Policy HN02 and understand the requirement for the provision of affordable housing to assist the Council in meeting and addressing housing need and the worsening affordability gap within EDDC. However, at present, the proposed policy is not in accordance with 86(d) of the NPPF (2023) which states that planning policies should “be flexible enough to accommodate needs not anticipated in the plan, allow for new and flexible working practices (such as live-work accommodation), and to enable a rapid response to changes in economic circumstances.”.

2.44 Whilst amendments have been made to the proposed policy wording, the policy continues to have no flexibility for the development industry and fails to recognise market variance within Page 12 EDDC Second Regulation 19 Consultation: Representations | Land at Addlepool Farm the breakdown of affordable housing tenures and mix. Vistry therefore continue to raise concerns regarding the current policy requirements. To be considered effective and sound, the policy wording be amended to:

- Include additional flexibility, with the use of local market information to inform the appropriate tenure breakdown, beyond what is set out within the District wide housing needs assessment.
- Ensure the policy considers affordable housing mix on a case-by-case basis.
- Allow alternative housing mixes where necessary.

- Allow developers to depart from the proposed affordable housing mix should sufficient market evidence be provided, particularly if the proposed development provides the required affordable housing percentage required.

2.45 It is noted that the rest of East Devon is required to provide 35% affordable housing. In accordance with Strategic Policy HN02 Addlepool Village is proposed to deliver 35% affordable housing which will assist the Council in meeting their affordable housing need.