

From:
Subject:

Planning Policy
FW: LYMPSTONE _ EAST DEVON LOCAL PLAN CONSULTATION

On 9 Jan 2023, at 15:08, David Hall <jsdrdave@gmail.com> wrote:

To whom it may concern

As a resident of the village since 1986 I wish to object to the additional housing burden planned within the EDDC local plan for Lympstone. The village has already grown very substantially and the concerns I list below already impact the village, the Exe estuary, the Green Wedge and gradually merge this area, little by not so little into one single conurbation with Exmouth. There is no capacity to absorb further housing estate without major changes to supporting infrastructure and cognisance of the adverse impact on our estuary and countryside. All this is without the future impact of the, already approved, Goodmores development on Dinan way Exmouth; on transport through the parish (Wotton Lane, Summer Lane, routes over the common to the M5) and stress to local living day to day.

The specific sites are as follows:

SITE LP _ GH/ED/73 – 46 Homes

SITE LP _ GH/ED/72 - 131 Homes

SITE LP _ LYMP_01 - 6 homes

SITE LP/GH/ED/75 - 14 homes

197 homes (600+ people? 400+ cars?)

Just the first two sites together add another 177 homes that will have the most impact on Lympstone and its services and further overload the already struggling A376 link road to the M5 and Exeter.

To detail my points of objection which various and to some extent apply to all the plans listed :

- The site is within the Coastal Preservation Area. Run off would carry material into the estuary to negative affect. It is also a part of the Green Wedge separating my village from neighbouring parishes.
- Woodbury Parish Council would be collecting income from this and making decisions which then impact on Lympstone rather than their own village.
- The A376 is already at capacity with huge tailbacks during rush hour already causing raised levels of fuel consumption and pollution. Significantly increased numbers of vehicles attempting to join the road will exacerbate this situation further.
- The village primary school is already at capacity and increased numbers of village children will need to travel to schools outside the village. This will further increase traffic and affect the social cohesion of the village.
- The doctor's surgery will also be over capacity forcing some, perhaps less able, residents to travel for health care.
- Flooding. Meeting Lane, Nutwell Lane and Gulliford dip on the A376 already flood and building on greenfield sites will only increase the run-off and the likelihood of further floods. Run-off will also increase the movement of materials from the land into the brook and then through Nutwell into the estuary. This will undermine the integrity of the Coastal Preservation Area.
- Wildlife. Any development in greenfield sites will only negatively affect wildlife. These fields are used by many species of wildlife, including otters, roe deer and shelducks which move between the estuary and the common.

In general the plans :

- Are not sustainable development - against the NPPF
- Have no infrastructure plan
- Have no impact assessment on environment, transport and services
- Increase flood risk
- Reduce and diminish biodiversity
- **It is against the neighbourhood plan voted for in local referendum**
- **Changes village boundaries to suit development goals without any consultation - and it seems to have been done with that in mind!**

I would like this objection to be added to others in your consultation. I have copied my local councillors.
Ben Ingham and Jeff Jung.

Regards
David Hall